



TO: Planning Commissioners Chair and Members

SUBMITTED BY: Peter Imhof, Planning and Environmental Review Director

PREPARED BY: Lisa Prasse, Current Planning Manager
Mary Chang, Supervising Planner

SUBJECT: Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project with height and setback adjustments and Final EIR located at 7925 Hollister Avenue, APN 079-210-059; Case Nos. 22-0001-CDPH (in concept); 22-0009-DP-CUP; and 22-0032-DRB.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Adopt Resolution 26-____ entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta, recommending that the City Council of the City of Goleta, California: 1) Adopt environmental findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, 2) Certify the Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 2024120923), 3) Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and 4) Approve Alternative 4 (Extended Bicycle Path) Development Plan and Conditional Use Permit for the Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project at 7925 Hollister Avenue Goleta; APN 079-210-059; Case Nos. 22-0001-CDPH (in concept); 22-DP-CUP; and 22-0032-DRB.
2. Adopt Resolution 26-____ entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City Of Goleta, California recommending that the City Council of the City of Goleta, California approve the Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path Development Plan for the Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project with height and setback adjustments and deny the Original Project proposal for the Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project at 7925 Hollister Avenue Goleta; APN 079-210-059; Case Nos. 22-0001-CDPH (in concept); 22-DP-CUP; and 22-0032-DRB.

APPLICANT

Sandpiper Golf Trust, LLC
280 Chestnut Avenue
Westmont, Illinois 60559

REPRESENTATIVE

Steve Welton
SEPPS
1625 State Street #1
Santa Barbara CA 93101

JURISDICTION

The City is the lead agency for the project under CEQA, and the City Council will be the decision-maker for the entirety of the project. The Planning Commission's role is as a recommending body regarding the adequacy of the environmental analysis contained within the Final EIR, and the merits of the project. As the matter will automatically be reviewed by the City Council, an appeal process is not applicable. Further, since this project is located in the Coastal Zone, a Coastal Development Permit is required from the California Coastal Commission after the conclusion of the City's review process.

INTRODUCTION

The originally proposed Sandpiper Golf Course Project includes a 4-foot wide decomposed granite trail to be installed along the City public right of way along Hollister Avenue to act as a sidewalk for pedestrian travel whereas Alternative 4, which was evaluated by the project EIR, includes the development of a Class 1 bicycle and pedestrian pathway. Alternative 4 includes all of the applicant's requested changes to the golf course and Barnsdall Gas Station. As further explained below, the decomposed granite trail associated with the originally proposed project is not consistent with the City's General Plan, Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan, engineering standards, and Americans with Disabilities Act requirements regarding durability and sustainability for sidewalks. Alternative 4 complies with all City, State, and federal law. This staff report and accompanying documents analyzes Alternative 4 and recommends its approval.

BACKGROUND

Historical Use/ Development

The approximately 193-acre project site was previously occupied by the Ellwood Oil Field, which ceased operation in the 1960's after more than 30 years of operation. There are thirteen abandoned oil wells remaining on the project site.

The golf course was developed in 1972, prior to the enactment of the California Coastal Act (1976). The initial construction of the golf course was approved by the County of Santa Barbara with building and grading permits. In 2002, the project site became subject to City of Goleta jurisdiction at the time of incorporation.

Most of the project site is used for recreational purposes and is developed with the Sandpiper Golf Club, which includes a golf course, clubhouse, vehicle parking with 124 spaces for golfers and employees, a comfort station (i.e., a facility that offers food,

beverages, and restrooms), and a maintenance yard that consists of buildings, trailers, sheds, and a fuel station.

The Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station is located on the northeastern portion of the project site adjacent to Hollister Avenue. The gas station building was originally constructed in 1929 and has been vacant since the 1960s. The gas station was designated as a historic landmark by the County of Santa Barbara in 1990 and is listed on the Goleta Historic Resources Inventory and is a City-designated Historic Landmark. The project would restore the gas station building and use it in conjunction with the proposed Rio Grande Coffee Shop, which would be open to the public.

A City right-of-way (ROW) easement is located along the northern portion of the project site adjacent to Hollister Avenue. As part of the project, the City would abandon 14,651 square feet of ROW to the property owner to be used for site access improvements and vehicle parking. The abandonment of the ROW requires approval of the City Council pursuant to California Streets and Highway Code Section 8335, which will come back to Council for consideration after the Coastal Development Permit is obtained.

Land Use Designations and Project Objectives

The Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan has applied an “Open Space/Active Recreation” land use designation to the project site. The project site also has an “Open Space/Active Recreation” zoning designation. This zone district is intended for public parks or active recreational activities and facilities. Allowed uses include passive open space and recreational facilities with the approval of a CUP.

The primary objectives of the project are listed below:

1. Maintain and improve golf course playability and establish a new golf course routing plan that more closely follows the natural topography of the project site.
2. Reduce golf course turf area and replace with native and coastal-appropriate landscaping to restore the golf course to a more natural state, thereby reducing water usage and agrichemical application.
3. Provide improved recreational and dining facilities for golfers, diners, and special event attendees at the Sandpiper Golf Club.
4. Provide enhanced maintenance facilities to support Sandpiper Golf Club operations.
5. Rehabilitate, preserve, and adaptively reuse the historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station.
6. Protect water quality and bluff stability by converting existing private septic systems to public sewers and utilizing sand capping to filter stormwater.
7. Improve public views across the property from Hollister Avenue by undergrounding overhead utility lines and implementing other improvements.
8. Improve coastal access for the public in the vicinity of the project site.

The preliminary review of the project conducted by the City concluded it would have the potential to result in potentially significant environmental impacts because it would result in activities, such as development within or adjacent to Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas, areas that may be contaminated, and cultural resources sites. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared for the project. The Draft EIR was circulated for a 46-day public review period between October 16 and December 1, 2025. The Draft EIR determined that with the implementation of identified mitigation measures the project's environmental impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Design Review Board Review

On January 27, 2026, the Design Review Board (DRB) conducted a conceptual review of the proposed project and recommended Preliminary Design approval to the Planning Commission and City Council. While the DRB unanimously recommended approval, DRB asked the applicant to consider refinements to the final design regarding:

- the proposed clubhouse building elevator tower.
- the clubhouse building windows to minimize bird strikes.
- the use of colored concrete rather than decomposed granite for the on-site bicycle path.
- the timing of the restoration of the Barnsdale Gas Station Building in conjunction with the completion of the proposed golf course renovations; and potential site safety/maintenance conditions associated with the design of the clubhouse roof.

These items have been incorporated into Condition Nos. 73 and 91 in Exhibit D to Attachment 2.

Historic Preservation Commission Review

On February 26, 2026, the Historic Preservation Commission determined that the proposed modifications to the historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, and the Barnsdall Rio Grande Café portion of the Sandpiper project are consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Structures. The Commission unanimously recommended that the City Council approve the proposed project.

Native American Consultation

On February 28, 2024, shortly after the project's application was deemed complete, the City of Goleta sent AB 52 consultation request letters to local Native American representatives identified by the Native American Heritage Commission, notifying them of the project in accordance with Government Code Section 65352. Native American tribes that were sent consultation letters included the Barbareño Band of Chumash Indians, Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians, Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians, Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation, Chumash Council of Bakersfield, and Northern Chumash Tribal Council. In the consultation request letters, the City asked that the tribes respond within 30 days if they would like an opportunity to consult on the project.

The City received responses from the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians, Barbareño Band of Chumash Indians, and the Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation, all of which requested to visit the project site. Representatives of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians and Barbareño Band of Chumash Indians visited the project site on March 18,

2025, and September 5, 2024, respectively. The representatives requested that tribal cultural resources mitigation be applied to the project; that a Chumash representative participate in ground disturbance monitoring; and that project-related workers receive Workers Environmental Awareness Program training. These requests have been included as proposed mitigation measures and conditions of approval. After repeated attempts to contact the Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation received no response, on May 15, 2025, the City notified the tribe that the consultation process was concluded.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Major elements of the proposed project are identified and briefly described below.

- Demolition of the existing golf course clubhouse and the construction of a new clubhouse facility.
- Demolition of the existing parking lot located adjacent to the clubhouse, and the construction of new parking facilities.
- Modifications to and re-routing of the existing 18-hole golf course with landscaping and irrigation improvements,
- Replacement of existing maintenance facilities and an existing comfort station (i.e., restroom).
- Construction of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop adjacent to the historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, and the adaptive reuse and restoration of the gas station building to provide seating and bicycle amenities for the new shop.
- An amendment to the Sphere of Influence area for the Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD), so the District can provide sewer service for the proposed clubhouse, maintenance yard, and comfort station.
- Hollister Avenue right-of-way (ROW) abandonment by the City.
- Improvements along Hollister Avenue, and various coastal access improvements.

New Clubhouse Building. The existing 9,305 square-foot clubhouse would be demolished and replaced with a new 37,179 square foot building. The proposed clubhouse would have two above-ground levels that provide 16,019 square feet of floor area and a basement that would be 21,160 square feet. The first above-ground level would be dedicated to golf operations and accessory uses, and the second story would be used for food and beverage services. The basement level of the clubhouse would be used for receiving materials and supplies, golf cart storage, and other support operations.

The above-ground portion of the clubhouse would have a glass elevator enclosed within a glass structure in the center of the clubhouse, sloped turf walls, and a turf roof. The majority of the new clubhouse would not exceed the Open Space/Active Recreation Zone's 25-foot height limit; however, a minor portion of the main roof structure would have a maximum height of 29 feet, and the passenger elevator structure would have a

maximum architectural projection height of 33 feet. The proposed maximum building heights are only slightly higher than the existing clubhouse, which has a maximum height of 28 feet 6 inches. The project applicant requests a Development Plan adjustment to allow a portion of the proposed clubhouse building roof to exceed the 25-foot height limit. The 25-foot height exceedance of the proposed elevator tower is allowed by Zoning Ordinance Section 17.24.080, which allows elevator towers to exceed maximum building heights by 10 feet.

Golf Course Improvements. The proposed redesign of the existing 18-hole golf course includes various elements such as grading and rerouting selected fairways and holes, new native plant landscaping that would result in a 50 percent reduction in the existing amount of irrigated turf, installation of new drought-tolerant turf, and replacement of irrigation systems with a new weather-controlled system.

The golf course rerouting plan includes the conversion of the existing Hole 18 near the clubhouse to an event lawn. The project also includes new cart return paths only at tee boxes and greens, which would reduce the amount of concrete cart paths from the current 154,829 square feet to 92,346 square feet. The redesign would reduce the amount of irrigated turf from 125 acres to 62 acres, with a corresponding reduction in the amount of nutrients and agrichemicals required for golf course maintenance. The remaining 63 acres would be converted to native landscaping around the golf course.

The project also includes the removal of the concrete cart path and existing Arizona-style¹ concrete crossing and culvert west of Hole 4, which pass through Devereaux Creek and associated ESHA. In place of the crossing and culvert in Devereaux Creek, a free-standing wooden bridge would be installed beyond the top of the bank. Habitat restoration would occur southwest of the proposed bridge crossing. Restoration activities would consist of re-establishment of the creek channel with sandstone boulders and planting of riparian vegetation on the creek bank.

Maintenance Facility. The project includes demolition, repair, upgrade, and/or modernization of the existing maintenance buildings, trailers, and sheds that are located along the eastern portion of the project site. The existing 7,555 square foot maintenance facility would be replaced with a 7,476 square foot facility consisting of two structures. Offices, employee restrooms, lockers, and small equipment storage would be in a new 4,316 square foot structure, and vehicle and golf course equipment storage would be in a 3,160 square foot storage structure. Additionally, several new unenclosed structures would be provided, consisting of a covered trash and recycling area, covered materials and landscape amendment storage structure, covered cart washing structure, and a pump equipment area.

Comfort Station. The existing 290 square foot comfort station would be replaced with a two-structure, 329 square foot comfort station located adjacent to Green 6. The proposed comfort station would consist of a 121 square foot restroom adjacent to a 208 square foot refreshment center and storage building. The maximum height of the new comfort station

¹ An Arizona crossing is a type of at-grade culvert crossing that was developed for use in the southwestern United States.

would be 15 feet. The new comfort station would be integrated into the project site landscape and would feature gently sloped, turfed roofs.

Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station/Rio Grande Coffee Shop. The historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station would be restored and adaptively reused as part of a new café, renamed the Rio Grande Coffee Shop. The Rio Grande Coffee Shop would consist of two parts: the restored existing 349 square foot Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station to serve as seating for the café, and a new 695 square foot café building designed to resemble a 1920's gas station service bay. New wooden trellises would be added to the west of the historic gas station building, and on the eastern and western sides of the proposed café building. The café would have a total of 14 indoor seats and 32 outdoor seats. The project also includes a new 24-foot-wide driveway that leads to a 14-space parking area east of the new café building. The café would also include electric bicycle charging station designed to look like antique gas station pumps.

Project Site Parking. Existing parking lots on the project site are located at the clubhouse (124 spaces), at the maintenance yard (10 spaces), and at the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station (5 spaces). The project would include the redesign of parking areas, such that the clubhouse parking lot and nearby gravel over-flow lot west of the clubhouse, would have 135 spaces, the maintenance facility would have 10 spaces, and the Rio Grande Coffee Shop would have 14 spaces. In total, the project would provide 159 on-site parking spaces, resulting in an increase of 23 parking spaces compared to existing conditions.

Goleta West Sanitary District Service. The existing clubhouse and comfort station are served by septic tank systems while the existing maintenance building has been connected to the GWSD sewer system since 1972. The project proposes to connect the new clubhouse, comfort station, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop to the GWSD sewer system by installing new sewer laterals that connect to existing GWSD sewer lines in Hollister Avenue. The existing on-site septic systems would be abandoned in accordance with Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Services (Santa Barbara County EHS) requirements.

GWSD would provide sewer services for the new structures through an Out of Area Service Agreement. To implement this project component, a change to GWSD's Sphere of Influence would require approval by the Santa Barbara County Local Agency Formation Commission.

Hollister Avenue Right-of-Way Abandonment. The project includes a realignment of the Hollister Avenue right-of-way (ROW) adjacent to the project site. As proposed, the City would abandon approximately 14,651 square feet of ROW to the property owner and that area would be used for vehicle parking and project site access. The ROW area to be retained by the City is of sufficient size to accommodate potential future road improvements at the Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oak intersection. Any future improvements at this intersection would need to be added to the City Capital Improvement Program and undergo environmental review, etc., at the time funding became available.

Due to the configuration of the realigned ROW on the project site, eight proposed vehicle parking spaces would encroach slightly into a required 10-foot-wide front yard setback,

as measured from the proposed ROW alignment. The project applicant has requested a Development Plan adjustment to facilitate the proposed setback encroachment.

Hollister Avenue Improvements. The project would provide various improvements to Hollister Avenue and project site entrances, as well as landscape enhancements on both sides of Hollister Avenue. Proposed improvements include but are not limited to the following:

- Improvements to the Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oaks Road intersection.
- Median, left turn lane, and curb and gutter improvements along Hollister Avenue.
- Undergrounding of overhead utility lines along the project's frontage of Hollister Avenue into a joint power and communications trench.
- Relocation of the existing bus stop and pocket approximately 200 feet east, across from planned Fire Station No. 10.
- Improvements to Hollister Avenue at the Rio Grande Coffee Shop.
- Installation of pedestrian ramps and striping to create new crosswalks at the west and south legs of the Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road intersection.
- Reconstruction of the maintenance facility driveway access and striping for the addition of a left-hand turn lane to enter the maintenance yard.

Coastal Access Improvements and Easement Dedication. Coastal access improvements proposed by the project include: construction of a sidewalk extending eastward from the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station to connect with an existing sidewalk at the northeast project site boundary; and construction of a Type 4 path (i.e., a path with a decomposed granite surface) along the Hollister Avenue ROW, which would extend westerly from the Rio Grande Coffee Shop to the proposed clubhouse parking lot.

The project also includes the dedication of a lateral access easement along the project site beach frontage and a permanent lateral access along Hollister Avenue adjacent to the project site that would serve as an extension of the De Anza coastal trail. The project would also include the dedication of five acres of Bell Canyon, located along the western edge of the project site, to a qualified land conservation entity. No access or other improvements are proposed for the Bell Canyon area. The existing unimproved and unmaintained beach access trail is presently located in the proposed dedication area.

Project Operation and Construction Characteristics. The project would retain the existing golf course operating hours, which are 6:30 am to 8:30 pm seven days a week. The clubhouse and restaurant would remain open until 10:00 pm and the bar would remain open until midnight. The Rio Grande Coffee Shop's operating hours would be 6:30 am to 4:30 pm.

The golf course currently supports an average of 35,368 rounds of golf per year. The project would reduce golf rounds to approximately 32,000 rounds per year by increasing the time between tee-offs. The project would provide upgraded clubhouse facilities that could be used for special events, along with a dedicated event lawn space and additional parking. However, the upgraded facilities would not affect the size or number of events

currently held at the golf course. The project site currently hosts approximately 40 special events of various types and sizes per year, including wedding receptions, corporate events, and charity events. Special events would conclude by 10:00 pm.

The project site currently provides employment for 35 full-time staff members within the clubhouse, restaurant, and maintenance yard. The project would provide an additional 21 full-time employment positions, for a total of 56 projected full-time staff. The project would include expansion of the clubhouse restaurant and construction of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, which would result in increased visitors to the Sandpiper Golf Club.

Proposed lighting at the clubhouse, Rio Grande Coffee shop, parking lots, and maintenance facility would consist of a combination of exterior path lights, bollard lights, down lights with tree straps, in-wall lights, under-step and handrail strip lights, and sign lighting at entries and directional signage. Exterior lighting would consist of downward, directed fixtures. Lighting for the project site would be designed to conform with Goleta Municipal Code Chapter 17.35. The proposed project would not include lighting to accommodate night play, as night play neither occurs under existing operation conditions nor is planned as part of the project.

Project-related construction activities would include demolition, site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, architectural coating, and landscaping phases. Construction is anticipated to last approximately 18 months, starting in 2027. Construction staging and parking would occur on-site. Construction debris would be hauled via U.S. 101 to the Tajiguas Landfill. Construction vehicles and equipment would access the project site and staging areas via Hollister Avenue.

Project grading would require approximately 86,500 cubic yards (CY) of soil cut and 56,000 CY of soil fill. After compaction and shrinking, the remaining soil (30,500 CY) would be distributed around graded areas to achieve the proposed golf course design. Due to the potential for stained or odiferous soil to be encountered during golf course recontouring, it is estimated that approximately 2,422 CY of soil may be exported off-site via 158 total truck trips over 13 days. The maximum fill slope would be 27 feet, located at the clubhouse where it transitions to the event lawn to the southwest. The maximum cut slope would be 11 feet, located on the golf course. Use of retaining walls would be limited, except for adjacent to the proposed clubhouse basement, where a 15-foot retaining wall is needed to facilitate delivery access underneath the clubhouse.

Change to General Plan Figure CE 4-1 (Special Status Species and Environmental Sensitive Habitat Area) and OS 3.5 (Open Space). One component of the project application submittal included a request for a General Plan Amendment (GPA). The GPA initiation request was to study the proposed removal of the following ESHA designations from Figure CE 4-1 and Figure OS 3.5. On April 16, 2024, the City Council initiated the GPA consisting of the following:

- Removal of ESHA designations adjacent to Devereux Creek in areas where the creek is contained within a pipe.
- Removal of the golf course pond as designated ESHA.

- Removal of the special-status species designation (California red-legged frog, *Rana draytonii*) adjacent to the golf course pond.
- Adding purple needle grass (*Nassella pulchra*) to the southeast corner of the parcel as ESHA.
- Adding Santa Barbara honeysuckle (*Lonicera subspicata*) at the southeast property line as ESHA.
- Adding sage scrub adjacent to Devereux creek as ESHA.
- Adding three special-status species designations (raptor nests) adjacent to Devereux creek.
- Adding woolly seablite (*Suaeda taxifolia*) and cliff malacthris (*Malacothrix saxatilis*) within sage scrub in various locations as ESHA.
- Adding black walnut to ESHA within Bell Canyon.
- Adding a coastal wetland in the middle of site adjacent to the ocean as ESHA.

On November 19 2024, the City Council amended General Plan Policy CE 1.5 (Corrections to Map of ESHAs) to eliminate the need for a General Plan amendment to Figures CE 4-1 and OS 3.5. The November 2024 amendment made the following revisions to General Plan Policy CE 1.5:

- Made it clear that ESHA boundary changes are not considered a General Plan Amendment for a project.
- Maintained that only the Planning Commission (or City Council if the project would otherwise go to the City Council) has the authority to approve a project with ESHA boundaries that differ than those shown in the General Plan.
- Included a commitment that the City will update the General Plan ESHA boundaries every five (5) years.
- Required a public hearing, with specific noticing, for any project that includes a proposed ESHA map change.
- Required the Planning Commission (or City Council) make a specific finding regarding the ESHA boundaries for any project that includes a proposed ESHA map change.

When this amendment was adopted, the need for the GPA became moot; however, the Planning Commission and City Council are being asked to make the determination regarding the proposed ESHA boundary changes in accordance with the new language of General Plan Policy CE 1.5.

DISCUSSION

Project Design

As proposed, the project would construct a “Type 4” path (i.e., a path constructed of decomposed granite) on south side of Hollister Avenue adjacent to the project site. The use of decomposed granite to construct this path does not meet the Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan (“BPMP”), an implementation action from the General Plan, which envisions a bike path along this stretch of Hollister Avenue. The use of this material also poses issues for City compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”). The Draft EIR evaluated four alternatives to the proposed project, including Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path, which would expand and enhance public transportation opportunities on

and adjacent to the project site. Staff is recommending approval of Final EIR Alternative 4: “Extended Bicycle Path” for the Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project for several reasons, the most important of which is that Alternative 4 achieves General Plan consistency by implementing the requirements of the BPMP.

It is important to note why the City adopted the BPMP. The City of Goleta’s *Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan* provides goals and objectives to create infrastructure, programs, and policies that implement the bicycle- and pedestrian-related goals of the City’s General Plan. As noted by the BPMP, the General Plan recognizes the importance of bicycle and pedestrian travel, and identifies alternative modes of transportation to reduce dependency on automobiles and to improve environmental quality and create “low stress” multi-use pathways. General Plan Policy TE 11 (Bikeways Plan) specifically relates to the development of a comprehensive bikeway system in the City, and the objective of this Policy is to “*encourage increased bicycle use for commuting and recreational purposes by developing an interconnected circulation system for bicycles that is safe, convenient, and within a visually attractive environment.*” Other community-wide advantages to providing comprehensive alternative transportation opportunities identified by the BPMP include reduced vehicle miles travelled and associated reductions in air pollutants and greenhouse gases, enhanced health benefits and recreation opportunities, and safe commuting routes for persons that rely on the use of alternatives modes of transportation.

The BPMP identifies various bicycle and pedestrian improvements that are critical in creating a comprehensive alternative transportation network in the City. One of the identified improvement corridors is the “Goleta Loop,” which would establish a multi-use path around the City. It is envisioned that as part of this loop, a continuous route would be located along Hollister Avenue, extending from the western end of the City, which would provide connections to UCSB, the coast, and other regional bikeways.

The following discussion focuses on the merits of Alternative 4.

Under Alternative 4, golf course renovations and new project site building construction would occur similar to the proposed project, however, the bicycle path adjacent to Hollister Avenue would be a 10- to 14-foot wide Class I (i.e., concrete) bicycle path and would extend approximately 0.3 mile beyond the project site’s eastern boundary to connect with an existing Class I pathway located just west of Pebble Beach Drive. Alternative 4 was selected for evaluation by the EIR because it would meet the requirements of the General Plan, namely the BPMP.

Furthermore, a bike path would promote the use of alternative transportation methods by connecting this currently undeveloped stretch of Hollister Avenue to the existing Class I path between Pebble Beach Drive and Pacific Oaks Road. The construction of a bike path between Pebble Beach Drive and Cathedral Oaks would encourage alternative modes of transportation so that residents, especially families with children and seniors, from the Winchester Canyon and El Encanto Heights neighborhoods can travel safely on a dedicated path to the Ellwood Mesa Open Space, Sperling Preserve, and access to existing vertical accessways to the Pacific Ocean; and would better support the City’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies related to costal access and active transportation. Students from the Winchester Canyon and El Encanto Heights

neighborhoods can also bike safely to Ellwood Elementary School. In turn, students from the Ellwood neighborhood would also have a safer bike path to get to Brandon Elementary School and Dos Pueblos High School.

The Draft EIR concluded that Alternative 4 would result in reduced transportation-related impacts by facilitating the use of alternative modes of transportation. Impact reductions would include but are not limited to actions, such as reducing transportation-related air emission, energy use, and greenhouse gas emissions, and enhancing access to recreation facilities by providing a safe path that provides connections to beach access points at the Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve. In addition, Alternative 4 would meet all of the proposed project's objectives; would better support the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies related to vertical beach access and active transportation; and would comply with the BPMP, whereas the proposed project does not.

The proposed decomposed granite path also poses challenges with the City's future compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA"). A sidewalk constructed of decomposed granite would be prone to erosion and unevenness in moist weather conditions and rain. The compromised surface would pose safety hazards to pedestrians, especially those on wheelchairs. The hardened path proposed in Alternative 4 would save the City on long-term maintenance costs as opposed to a decomposed granite path that will likely need to be resurfaced more often to maintain safety and path of travel requirements under the ADA.

Alternative 4 would have a somewhat increased short-term construction noise impact due to additional construction along Hollister Avenue that would place construction equipment closer to residences than would occur under the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, however, Alternative 4 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 to ensure construction noise levels do not exceed Goleta's 65 dBA construction noise standards. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, Alternative 4's construction noise impact would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Consistency.

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 4 includes the renovation of the golf course, new clubhouse and other proposed accessory buildings, renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande gas station and construction of a coffee shop building, and other proposed improvements to and adjacent to Hollister Avenue. Also similar to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would require Development Plan adjustments for the proposed encroachment of eight parking spaces into the required front yard setback, and to allow minor portions of the proposed clubhouse to exceed a height of 25 feet.

Alternative 4 would include the installation of the same storm drain and outlet within a small area of arroyo willow thickets ESHA along Devereux Creek as would occur with the proposed project and would also have the same potential to conflict with General Plan/Local Coastal Plan Policy CE 1.6 (Protection of ESHAs). Alternative 4 would include trenching for underground utilities and would have a similar potential to conflict with Policy CE 9.5 (Mitigation of Impacts to Native Trees) compared to the proposed project. Other impacts of Alternative 4 related to biological resource, cultural and tribal cultural resources, and short-term construction noise and water quality impacts would also be

similar to the impacts of the proposed project. Reducing the environmental impacts of the project and Alternative 4, as well as consistency with applicable policies of the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, would be achieved through implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-11, CUL-1 through CUL-4, HYD-1, NOI-1, TCR-1, and TCR-2.

When compared to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would enhance compliance with General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies OS 2.2 (Planned Vertical Accessways) and OS 2.4 (Mitigation of Impacts to Vertical Coastal Access) by facilitating lateral pedestrian connectivity along Hollister Avenue that improves public access for all Goleta residents to vertical access points toward the shoreline.

The proposed project would not provide bluff top lateral access or vertical beach access onsite. However, the extent of the Class I bike path proposed under Alternative 4 would compensate for the proposed project's lack of a bluff top lateral access and vertical access by (1) increasing the lateral access along Hollister Avenue that would connect to multiple vertical access points that allow visitors to the Ellwood Mesa to access the beach and lateral bluff access points located offsite and (2) providing a safe and smooth surface that is wide enough to accommodate two direction flow of walking and alternative modes of transportation to multiple lateral and vertical access points located off the project site.

Alternative 4 would also enhance compliance with General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policies VH 3.5 (Pedestrian-Oriented Design), TE 1.1 (Alternative Modes), TE 2.3 (Diversion of Automobile Trips to Alternative Modes), and TE 10.4 (Pedestrian Facilities in New Development) when compared to the proposed project by providing an extended bike path that connects existing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure instead of a Type 4 path that would only be located on the project site. By encouraging additional alternative modes of transportation, Alternative 4 would better reduce consumption of non-renewable energy sources.

Alternative 4 would also enhance compliance with the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, which implements the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Transportation Element policies. One of the goals and objectives of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan is to provide more active means of transportation (bicycle and walking) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by reducing vehicle miles traveled. To meet this objective, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan identifies a need for a Class I multi-use pathway along Hollister Avenue from Cathedral Oaks Road to Elderberry Drive, which would directly support Policies TE 10 and TE 11 from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. These policies require pedestrian or bicycle linkages that are safe and convenient for all Goleta residents. Alternative 4 would complete and extend this multi-use pathway and would result in consistency with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan's goals and policies, whereas the Type 4 path under the proposed project does not meet the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan requirements.

Zoning Consistency

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path would result in the renovation of an existing golf course and restoration of the historic Barnsdall gas station building, and would be an outdoor recreation use that is consistent with uses allowed in the Open Space – Active Recreation (OS-AR) zone district with the approval of a

Conditional Use Permit. Alternative 4 would be consistent with applicable building coverage and vehicle parking requirements. All proposed structures to be located on the project site would be consistent with the setback requirements of the OS-AR zone district. The proposed encroachment of eight (8) vehicle parking spaces into the required front yard setback may be allowed with the approval of a Development Plan Adjustment, as described below. The proposed clubhouse building would predominately be consistent with the building height requirements of the OS-AR zone district, and the small portion of the building's roof that would exceed 25 feet may be allowed with the approval of a Development Plan Adjustment, as described below.

ESHA Changes

Based on information provided in the *Biological Resources Assessment Report for the Sandpiper Golf Club Project provided as EIR Appendix D-1*); EIR Appendix D-2 (*Memorandum Describing Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs) for the Sandpiper Golf Club Project*), and Section 4.3 (*Biological Resources*), substantial evidence has been provided supporting a determination that the requested changes to Conservation Element Figure CE 4-1 (Special Status Species and Environmental Sensitive Habitat Area) and Open Space Element Figure OS 3.5 (Open Space) are warranted.

While three areas on the 193-acre site would no longer be considered ESHA, seven additional areas would be based on site-specific study and analysis. The biological report provided by the applicant has been peer reviewed as part of the environmental work performed during the preparation of the EIR. The requested General Plan Figure revisions would remove ESHA designations from the following areas: a) along Devereux Creek, where the creek is contained within a culvert; b) the golf course pond, and c) California red-legged frog habitat associated with the pond. Other updates to General Plan Figures 4-1 and 3.5 would add ESHA designations at specified project site locations where sensitive resources were identified by the project-specific biological resource studies. In accordance with General Plan Policy CE 1.5, Section 10 of the Development Plan Resolution includes the required finding to support these changes.

Lastly, the Final EIR determined that with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures, the project's potential impacts to all project site ESHA resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Preliminary Design Approval

The project would result in the construction of a new clubhouse, maintenance facilities, coffee shop building, and comfort station. The proposed clubhouse, maintenance facilities, and comfort station would be located in the vicinity of existing project site structures, and the visible portions (i.e., floor area provided above surrounding grade) of the new buildings would generally have a size, bulk and scale that is similar to the existing buildings they would replace. After proposed golf course construction, grading, and landscaping activities are completed, the visual character of the project site, including south-facing views of the Pacific Ocean from Hollister Avenue, and north-facing views of the Santa Ynez Mountains, would be preserved. In addition, existing views of the coast would be enhanced by the proposed undergrounding of overhead utility lines located along the south side of Hollister Avenue and adjacent to the project site.

The design of the clubhouse would emulate the natural topography of the project site by integrating the structure within the green landscape and complementing the grassy hills, bluffs, and ocean waves. Many of the “back of house” elements associated with the golfing activities and the clubhouse, such as trash collection, golf cart storage, mechanical equipment etc., would be located in the subterranean basement and would not be visible to the public. The proposed plant palette would supplement existing project site vegetation and would include a variety of native plants and shrubs compatible with the site’s coastal climate.

Further, the renovation of the golf course includes the installation of new drought tolerant turf and irrigation system. The project would reduce the amount of irrigated turf from 125 acres to 62 acres. The remaining 63 acres would be converted to native landscaping. The golf course will continue to be unlit except for low level cart path lights for safety. Additionally, a variety of new lighting fixtures would be installed at the project site to aid users to primarily access the clubhouse and the parking lot. Lastly, the design refinements requested by the DRB have been included as Condition No. 73 in the Development Plan Conditions of Approval.

Adaptive Reuse of Barnsdall – Rio Grande Gas Station

The Barnsdall-Rio Grande Gas Station historically functions as a gas station with a detached building that housed a restaurant. The proposed project would result in the restoration of the historic Rio Grande Gas Station for its use as part of the proposed Rio Grande Coffee Shop (café). Barnsdall – Rio Grande Gas Station has fallen into disrepair overtime. The addition of the café with the restoration of the Barnsdall-Rio Grande building would be in keeping with the original use of the site.

The proposed rehabilitation of the structure would be extensive and include items such as replicating missing ceramic tilework, repair existing plaster and the roof assembly, repair or replicate the original windows, remodel the interior of the building, and install replica period-style gasoline pumps that would function as electric bicycle charging stations. As proposed, this component of the proposed project is consistent with applicable policies of the City’s Visual and Historic Resources Element and complies with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties.

The adaptive reuse of the Barnsdall – Rio Grande Gas Station is a much-anticipated aspect of the project and would preserve and facilitate the use of a beloved historical community resource. Staff, along with the DRB and HPC, appreciate the care and attention to detail that the applicant has proposed in the methods and materials proposed to facilitate the rehabilitation needed. Further the additional new elements (i.e., café building, pergolas.) support the historic character of the Barnsdall – Rio Grande Gas Station with the 1920’s automobile service design, which is appropriate for the setting of this historic resource. The placement of the new café building and trellis would maintain a distinct separation between the historic building and new construction in keeping with the Secretary of Interior Standards. The work proposed at the Barnsdall-Rio Grande Gas Station site will be done sensitively and will bring new life to a treasured local historic landmark.

Water, Sewer and Traffic

Water Use. The proposed project would reduce the amount of irrigated turf on the project site from 125 to 62 acres. As a result, the project site's existing water demand would be reduced by approximately 150.7 acre-feet per year. The Goleta Water District has determined it has sufficient water supplies to serve the proposed project's anticipated water demand.

Sewer. The existing golf course clubhouse and comfort station are served by an on-site, private septic tank system, and the existing maintenance building has been connected to Goleta West Sanitary District's (GWSD) sewer system since 1972. The proposed project would abandon the existing septic systems and connect the new clubhouse, comfort station, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop to the GWSD sewer system. Prior to project construction, GWSD would revise their Sphere of Influence and require the project applicant to obtain a Sewer Connection Permit. The project applicant would enter into an Out of Area Service Agreement with GWSD such that the proposed development may be connected to existing GWSD facilities. It is estimated that the entire project would generate a total of approximately 0.005 MGD (4,603 gallons per day) of wastewater. The proposed project's anticipated wastewater generation would be adequately accommodated by the existing capacity of the Goleta Sanitary District Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Traffic. The proposed project would reduce golf rounds from an average of 35,368 rounds per year to approximately 32,000 rounds per year (a reduction of approximately 3,368 rounds, or 9.5 percent) due to an increase in the time between tee-offs. Therefore, the golf course renovation component of the project would reduce vehicle miles traveled associated with use of the golf course. The proposed clubhouse would result in a net increase of 5,433 square feet in restaurant space and the proposed Rio Grande Coffee Shop would result in a net increase of 1,905 square feet in restaurant space. The total net increase in retail space would be 7,338 square feet, which is less than the 10,000 square foot screening threshold for potential vehicle miles travelled (VMT) impacts included in the City's VMT Guidelines. Therefore, the project's clubhouse restaurant and Rio Grande Coffee Shop are presumed to have a less than significant impact on vehicle miles traveled.

Right of Way Realignment/Vacation Request

The project applicant has requested that the City vacate ROW along Hollister Avenue to be used by the property owner (applicant) for vehicle parking, landscaping and project site access. The amount of ROW area to be abandoned by the City is 14,651 square feet. The ROW area to be retained remains adequate to serve the project. The ROW area to be retained by the City would also be adequate for potential future improvements at the Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oak intersection. The proposed ROW abandonment would not affect public access to or through the site and would not conflict with the implementation of Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path. This agenda item does not include the City's formal vacation of the City ROW yet, since it would not be in the City's interest to give up right of way before the project has been approved by all entitlement agencies. Staff will bring an item back to Council for review of vacation of right of way pursuant to the Streets & Highways Code after the project has obtained entitlement from all relevant agencies.

Development Plan Findings

The project is subject to Development Plan With Adjustment Findings as required by Goleta Municipal Code Sections 15.59.030 and 17.59.040. The required Development Plan and Development Plan Adjustment Findings are presented in Attachment 2 and are summarized below.

As described above and in Attachment 2, with the implementation of mitigation measures identified by the proposed Final EIR, the project would be consistent with applicable policies of the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan.

The Project site is adequate in size, shape, location, and physical characteristics to accommodate the intensity of Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path, as the Alternative would renovate but not result in substantial changes to the configuration of the existing golf course, and proposed new buildings would generally be located at or near the sites of existing structures that are to be replaced. The extended bicycle path would be located in existing Hollister Avenue ROW, which can accommodate the 10-14-foot-wide path that would be developed under this Alternative.

Environmental impacts of the proposed project and Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path have been fully analyzed, and the environmental impacts will be mitigated to the maximum extent feasible and to a less than significant level. Proposed mitigation measures are described in the Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project Final EIR, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP").

Development Plan Adjustment Findings

The design of the project requires minor adjustments to zoning standards related to the maximum height of the proposed clubhouse building, and the project site's required front yard setback. The requested height adjustment would apply to only small portions of the clubhouse building and in general would be similar to building height exceedances of the existing clubhouse building. The requested reduction in front yard setback would allow eight parking spaces to encroach slightly into the setback area adjacent to Hollister Avenue. The requested adjustments would not result in or contribute to any potential inconsistency with the requirements of the General Plan.

Conditional Use Permit Findings

A Conditional Use Permit is required to allow the proposed golf course use within the Open Space/Active Recreation zone district. As summarized above and detailed in Attachment 2, the proposed project and Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path would be consistent with requirements of the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. In addition, with the implementation of mitigation requirements identified by the project's Final EIR, the proposed project and Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle path will not be injurious to the health, safety and general welfare of the neighborhood.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

EIR Process

The City of Goleta is the CEQA lead agency for the project and determined that an EIR would be necessary to study the potential impacts of the Project. On December 26, 2024,

the City sent to the State Clearinghouse a Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) stating that an Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse #2024120523) would be prepared for the project. The City held a hearing on January 15, 2025, regarding the scope of the environmental review, and the City received 23 comment letters regarding the NOP.

Following the circulation of the NOP, a Draft EIR was prepared. The environmental impact analysis concluded that with the implementation of identified mitigation measures all the project’s environmental impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level related to the following environmental issue areas:

- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Noise
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems

A Mitigation and Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared for the project and is included as Exhibit C to Attachment 1.

The Draft EIR was released for public review for 46 days from October 16 to December 1, 2025. In total, 46 written comment letters were received during the public comment period. Two (2) comment letters were from State agencies (Caltrans and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife); three letters were from interested organizations, and 41 letters were from individuals. 32 of the letters from individuals indicated support for the project. During the public review period, the City held an Environmental Hearing Officer (EHO) meeting on November 6, 2025. One person provided comments in support of the project at the EHO meeting

Alternatives Considered

Four alternatives to the Project were evaluated in the Draft EIR. In addition to the mandatory “No Project” alternative, three alternatives were evaluated that focus on reducing the project’s environmental impacts and providing enhanced compliance with Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Comprehensive Plan policy requirements, while still meeting most of the basic project objectives. The four alternatives evaluated include:

- **Alternative 1: No Project.** This alternative assumes that the proposed project is not approved and the Sandpiper Golf Club is not renovated. The existing conditions at project site would not be changed, and the golf course operations would continue unchanged compared to existing conditions.
- **Alternative 2: Clubhouse Renovation Only.** Under this alternative, only the existing clubhouse would be demolished and reconstructed, similar to the design of the proposed project. This alternative would not include golf course recontouring, replacement of the existing comfort station or maintenance facilities, restoration and adaptive reuse of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station or construction of the Rio

Grande Coffee Shop, coastal access improvements, dedication of an open space easement in Bell Canyon, or Hollister Avenue improvements.

- **Alternative 3: Revised Site Plan.** This alternative would consist of revising the site plan for the project to shift the proposed location of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop 75 feet southwest, such that the Coffee Shop and associated parking lot would be located approximately 50 feet southwest of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. The purpose of this alternative is to reduce potential construction equipment vibrations and resulting impacts to the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station building.
- **Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path.** This alternative would include the construction of a new clubhouse, comfort station, Rio Grande Coffee Shop, maintenance yard, golf course recontouring, dedication of lateral access easements, dedication of a conservation easement in Bell Canyon, and undergrounding of existing utility lines, which would be the same as the proposed project. Additionally, Alternative 4 would include most of the Hollister Avenue improvements as described for the proposed project. However, rather than a Type 4 (decomposed granite surface) path along the south side of Hollister Avenue, Alternative 4 would include a 10- to 14-foot wide Class I (concrete surface) bicycle path within Hollister Avenue's southern right-of-way, extending approximately from the Hollister Avenue and Cathedral Oaks Road intersection to an existing Class I bicycle path just west of Pebble Beach Drive.

Compared to the proposed project and other alternatives, Alternative 2 (Clubhouse Renovation Only) would achieve some of the proposed project's objectives and, due to a reduced construction footprint and schedule, was determined to be the environmentally superior alternative. However, Alternative 2 would only partially meet the proposed project's objectives related to providing improved recreation and dining facilities and converting existing private septic systems to public sewers.

In conclusion, Alternative 4 would encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation and result in related reductions in energy use, would be consistent with Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies related to encouraging alternative modes of transportation and coastal access, and would implement the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan related to active means of transportation. Therefore, staff recommends the adoption of Alternative 4.

Final EIR

Following the close of the Draft EIR public review period, a Final EIR was prepared. The Final EIR includes responses to the comments received regarding the Draft EIR, and related minor revisions to the text of the Draft EIR. None of the revised EIR text includes substantial new information that would require the recirculation of the Draft EIR. The comments and the responses to comments are provided in Section 7 of the Final EIR. The Draft EIR and Final EIR are available on the City's website at: <https://www.cityofgoleta.org/your-city/planning-and-environmental-review/ceqa-review>.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21092.5, the City provided copies of its responses to commenting public agencies at least ten (10) days prior to the City's Planning Commission consideration of the Final EIR and the Project.

CEQA Resolution

Attachment 1 to this staff report is a Resolution recommending certification of the Final EIR, adoption of CEQA findings, and adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

The Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA. The Planning Commission is being asked to recommend the City Council certify the Final EIR consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15090. Further, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 provides that no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified that identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more of the following findings for each of the project's significant effects:

- 1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.
- 2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- 3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

As mentioned above, the Project and Alternative 4 will not have a significant effect on the environment. Exhibit A to Attachment 1 is the Findings of Facts and contains the following Sections:

- Section I – Introduction of the Findings of Fact Document
- Section II – Findings regarding environmental impacts not requiring mitigation
- Section III – Findings for impacts that are less than significant with mitigation incorporated
- Section IV – Findings for impacts that cannot be fully mitigated to less than significant level
- Section V – Findings regarding cumulative impacts
- Section VI – Findings regarding irreversible environmental changes
- Section VII – Findings regarding growth inducing
- Section VIII – Findings regarding alternatives

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

When making CEQA Findings of Fact, CEQA requires the lead agency to also adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes that it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15091(d)). A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") has been prepared for Alternative 4 and is included as Exhibit C to Attachment 1.

Environmental Conclusion

The Final EIR prepared for the proposed project sufficiently analyzes its potentially significant environmental impacts and evaluates four alternatives to the project. The alternatives analysis examines the environmental impacts of each alternative, as well as the ability of the alternatives to meet the objectives of the project.

Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path would result in the implementation of the proposed project, but would include a Class I bicycle path along the south side of Hollister Avenue that would extend off-site to the west to intersect with an existing Class I path near Pebble Beach Drive. This alternative was not identified as the environmentally superior alternative by the Final EIR, but would implement the objectives of the proposed project, and be more closely aligned with the transportation requirements of the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan and the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan when compared to the proposed project.

The Planning Commission has been asked to consider the above information and if it concurs, to adopt Attachment 1 to the staff report, thereby recommending to the City Council certification of the Final EIR, the adoption of the CEQA findings, and adoption of the MMRP.

CONCLUSION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend certification of the Final EIR, adoption of the Findings of Fact, adoption of the MMRP, and approval of Alternative 4 to the City Council, for the reasons outlined above and as stated in the attached Resolutions and their accompanying Exhibits.

PUBLIC NOTICE

On April 16, 2026, a notice of the availability of the Final EIR and the Planning Commission hearing was published in the Santa Barbara Independent. On April 15, 2026, the notice was also mailed to residents and property owners within a 1000' radius of the project site, and an electronic notification was sent to all interested parties as well. In addition, on April 10, 2026, the on-site notice was updated. The site has been posted with story poles since January 13, 2026.

LEGAL REVIEW BY: Winnie Cai, Deputy City Attorney

APPROVED BY: Peter, Imhof, PER Director

ATTACHMENTS

1. Adopt Resolution 26-_____ entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta, recommending that the City Council of the City of Goleta, California: 1) Adopt environmental findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, 2) Certify the Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 2024120923), 3) Adopt the Mitigation

Monitoring and Reporting Program, and 4) Approve Alternative 4 (Extended Bicycle Path) Development Plan and Conditional Use Permit for the Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project at 7925 Hollister Avenue Goleta; APN 079-210-059; Case Nos. 22-0001-CDPH (in concept); 22-DP-CUP; and 22-0032-DRB.

Exhibit A – Findings of Fact

Exhibit B – <https://www.cityofgoleta.org/your-city/planning-and-environmental-review/ceqa-review/sandpiper-golf-course>

Exhibit C – MMRP

2. Adopt Resolution 26-____ entitled “A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta, California recommending that the City Council of the City of Goleta, California approve the Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path Development Plan for the Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project with height and setback adjustments and deny the Original Project proposal for the Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project at 7925 Hollister Avenue Goleta; APN 079-210-059; Case Nos. 22-0001-CDPH (in concept); 22-DP-CUP; and 22-0032-DRB.

Exhibit A – Plans

Exhibit B – General Plan Consistency

Exhibit C – Zoning Consistency

Exhibit D – Conditions of Approval

3. Staff Presentation

4. Applicant's Presentation

Attachment 1

SANDPIPER GOLF COURSE RENOVATION CEQA RESOLUTION

Exhibit A: Findings of Fact

Exhibit B: Given the size of the
Final EIR link to the Final EIR:

<https://www.cityofgoleta.org/your-city/planning-and-environmental-review/ceqa-review/sandpiper-golf-course>

Exhibit C – MMRP

RESOLUTION NO. 26 - ____.

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF GOLETA, RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL: 1) ADOPT ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, 2) CERTIFY THE SANDPIPER GOLF COURSE RENOVATION AND NEW CLUBHOUSE PROJECT FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (SCH #2024120923), 3) ADOPT THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM, AND 4) APPROVE ALTERNATIVE 4 (EXTENDED BICYCLE PATH) DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR THE SANDPIPER GOLF COURSE RENOVATION AND NEW CLUBHOUSE PROJECT AT 7925 HOLLISTER AVENUE GOLETA; APN 079-210-059; CASE NOS. 22-0001-CDPH (IN CONCEPT); 22-DP-CUP; AND 22-0032-DRB

WHEREAS, on November 21, 2022, Mr. Steve Welton, of Suzanne Elledge Planning and Permitting, representative for the Property Owner, Sandpiper Golf Trust, LLC, ("Owner" submitted an application for the renovation of an existing golf course, and

WHEREAS, the Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project (the "Project") proposes to demolish the existing golf course clubhouse and construct a new, multi-story clubhouse (2 above grade and 1 below grade), construct additional parking spaces, make modifications to the existing 18-hole golf course, make landscaping and irrigation improvements, replace existing maintenance facilities, replace an existing comfort station, construct the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, and reuse and restore the historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas station to provide seating and bicycle amenities for the Rio Grande Coffee shop, incorporate the new clubhouse and comfort station into the Sphere of Influence for the Goleta West Sanitary District ("GWSD"), vacate the Hollister Avenue right-of-way from the City, dedicate a five-acre easement at Bell Canyon to a qualified land conservation entity; and make improvements along Hollister Avenue, including revised project site entry points, a new public trail, undergrounding of electrical and utility lines, bus stop relocation, make curb and sidewalk improvements, and request an adjustment to allow the maximum height of the proposed clubhouse building to be increased from 25 feet to 29 feet; and

WHEREAS, a General Plan Amendment (GPA) to modify Conservation Element Figure 4-1 and Open Space Element Figure 3-5 of the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan was originally included as part of the application. However, on November 19, 2024, the City Council changed the General Plan. As a result, the Sandpiper GPA was no longer needed; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Project is located on a 193-acre site I in the Coastal zone at 7925 Hollister Avenue, Assessor's Parcel Number 079-210-059, in the City of Goleta, in Santa Barbara County California; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Project requires approvals of a Conditional Use Permit and Development Plan with adjustments (22-0009-DP-CUP), Coastal Development Plan (in concept, 22-001-CDPH), design approval (22-0032-DRB), Demolition Permit, Building Permit, Grading Permit, and Encroachment Permit, and

WHEREAS, pursuant to section 21067 of the Public Resources Code, and section 15367 of the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15000 et seq.), the City of Goleta is the lead agency for the proposed Project; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines section 15082, on December 26, 2024, the City sent to the Office of Planning and Research and each responsible and trustee agency a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") stating that an Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse #2024120923) would be prepared; and

WHEREAS, nineteen (19) comment letters from five agencies and fourteen members of the public and organizations were received in response to the NOP; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.9 and State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15082(c) and 15083, the City held a duly noticed Scoping Meeting on January 15, 2025, to solicit comments on the scope of the environmental review of the proposed Project; and

WHEREAS, a Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR") was prepared, incorporating comments received in response to the NOP; and

WHEREAS, the Draft EIR determined that mitigation measures were required to mitigate impacts to a less than significant level for the following resource areas: Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Utilities and Service Systems; and

WHEREAS, the Draft EIR further concluded that the proposed Project would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15085, a Notice of Completion was prepared and filed with the Office of Planning and Research on October 16, 2025; and

WHEREAS, as required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15087(a), the City provided Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR to the public at the same time

that the City sent Notice of Completion to the Office of Planning and Research, on October 16, 2025; and

WHEREAS, during the public comment period, copies of the Draft EIR and technical appendices were available for review and inspection at City Hall, on the City's website, and at the Goleta Valley Library Express and Goleta Community Center; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15087(e), the Draft EIR was circulated for at least a 45-day public review and comment period from October 16, 2025 to December 1, 2025; and

WHEREAS, during the public review and comment period, the City consulted with and requested comments from all responsible and trustee agencies, other regulatory agencies, and others pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15086; and

WHEREAS, on November 6, 2025, the City held an Environmental Hearing Officer meeting, where one verbal comment was received; and

WHEREAS, the City received 46 written comment letters on the Draft EIR; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21092.5, the City provided copies of its responses to commenting public agencies at least ten (10) days prior to the City's consideration of the Final EIR; and

WHEREAS the City released the Final EIR ("Final EIR"), which consists of the Draft EIR, all technical appendices prepared in support of the Draft EIR, all written comment letters received on the Draft EIR, written responses to all written comment letters received on the Draft EIR, and errata to the Draft EIR and technical appendices; and

WHEREAS the "EIR" consists of the Final EIR and its attachments and appendices, as well as the Draft EIR and its attachments and appendices (as modified by the Final EIR); and

WHEREAS all potentially significant adverse environmental impacts were sufficiently analyzed in the EIR; and

WHEREAS, as contained herein, the City has endeavored in good faith to set forth the basis for its decision on the Project; and

WHEREAS all of the requirements of the Public Resources Code and the State CEQA Guidelines have been satisfied by the City in connection with the preparation of the EIR, which is sufficiently detailed so that all of the potentially significant environmental effects of the Project have been adequately evaluated; and

WHEREAS the EIR prepared in connection with the Project sufficiently analyzes the Project's potentially significant environmental impacts, and the EIR analyzes four alternatives to the Project, including Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path ("Alternative 4"), examining the environmental impacts of each alternative as well as the ability of the alternatives to meet Project objectives; and

WHEREAS, Alternative 4 would include the construction of a new clubhouse, comfort station, Rio Grande Coffee Shop, maintenance yard, golf course recontouring, dedication of lateral access easements, dedication of a conservation easement at Bell Canyon, and undergrounding of existing utility lines, which would be the same as the proposed Project. In lieu of the Type 4 trail along the south side of Hollister Avenue, Alternative 4 would include a 10- to 14-foot Class I bicycle path within Hollister Avenue's southern right-of-way, extending approximately from the Hollister Avenue and Cathedral Oaks Road intersection to an existing Class I bicycle path just west of Pebble Beach Drive, approximately 0.3 mile beyond the Project site's eastern boundary; and

WHEREAS, in contrast to the Project, Alternative 4 would reduce the impacts to air quality, energy, greenhouse gases, land use, parks and recreation, and transportation through the encouragement of alternative transportation and corresponding reduction in automobile travel; and

WHEREAS Alternative 4 would increase public access to the Ellwood Mesa Open Space, the Sperling Preserve, the Pacific Ocean and related beach access points through a safe and wide path, and therefore better support the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies related to vertical access and active transportation, and comply with the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, Alternative 4 would also meet all project objectives, and in fact further Project Objective 1. Improve coastal access for the public in the vicinity of the project site; and

WHEREAS the City has made certain findings of fact, as set forth in **Exhibit A** to this Resolution, attached hereto and incorporated herein, based upon the oral and written evidence presented to it as a whole and the entirety of the administrative record for Alternative 4, which are incorporated herein by this reference; and

WHEREAS the City finds that Alternative 4's environmental impacts that are identified in the EIR as less than significant and do not require mitigation are described in **Section II of Exhibit A**; and

WHEREAS the City finds that Alternative 4's environmental impacts that are identified in the EIR as less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures are described in **Section III of Exhibit A**; and

WHEREAS the City finds that Alternative 4 has no significant and unavoidable environmental impacts that cannot be fully mitigated to a less than significant level, as described in **Section IV of Exhibit A**; and

WHEREAS the cumulative impacts of Alternative 4 identified in the EIR and set forth herein, are described in **Section V of Exhibit A**; and

WHEREAS, the potential significant irreversible environmental changes that would result from Alternative 4 identified in the EIR and set forth herein, are described in **Section VI of Exhibit A**; and

WHEREAS, the existence of any growth-inducing impacts resulting from Alternative 4 identified in the EIR and set forth herein, are described in **Section VII of Exhibit A**; and

WHEREAS, alternatives to Alternative 4 that might further reduce the already less than significant environmental impacts are described in **Section VIII of Exhibit A**; and

WHEREAS, all the mitigation measures identified in the EIR and necessary to reduce the potentially significant impacts of Alternative 4 to a level of less than significant are set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) in **Exhibit B** to this Resolution, attached hereto and incorporated herein; and

WHEREAS, prior to taking action, the City has heard, been presented with, reviewed and considered all of the information and data in the administrative record, including but not limited to the EIR, and all oral and written evidence presented to it during all meetings and hearings; and

WHEREAS, the EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City and is deemed adequate for purposes of making decisions on the merits of the Project; and

WHEREAS, no comments made in the public hearings conducted by the City and no additional information submitted to the City have produced substantial new information requiring recirculation of the EIR or additional environmental review of the Project under Public Resources Code section 21092.1 and State CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5; and

WHEREAS all other legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF GOLETA:

SECTION 1. The above recitals are true and correct and incorporated herein by reference.

SECTION 2. The Planning Commission hereby finds that it has been presented with the EIR which it has reviewed and considered, and further finds that the EIR is an accurate and objective statement that has been completed in full compliance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines. The Planning Commission finds that the EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City. The Planning Commission declares that no evidence of new significant impacts or any new information of “substantial importance” as defined by State CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5, has been received by the City after circulation of the Draft EIR that would require recirculation. Therefore, the Planning Commission hereby recommends City Council certify the EIR based on the entirety of the record of proceedings.

SECTION 3. The Planning Commission hereby recommends City Council adopt the “CEQA Findings of Fact” which were prepared in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines sections 15091 and which are attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by this reference.

SECTION 4. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081.6, the Planning Commission hereby recommends City Council adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program attached hereto as Exhibit C and incorporated herein by this reference. Implementation of the Mitigation Measures contained in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is hereby made a condition of approval of the Project. In the event of any inconsistencies between the Mitigation Measures set forth in the EIR or the Findings of Fact and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program shall control.

SECTION 5. Based upon the entire record before it, including the EIR, Findings of Fact, and all written and oral evidence presented, the Planning Commission hereby recommends City Council approve Alternative 4.

SECTION 6. The documents and materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which this Resolution has been based are located at Goleta City Hall, located at 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, California 93117. The custodian for these records is the City Clerk. This information is provided pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081.6.

SECTION 7. Planning Commission hereby recommends City Council to direct City staff to cause a Notice of Determination to be filed and posted with the County Clerk and the State Clearinghouse within five working days of the adoption of this Resolution.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this ____ day of ____ April, 2026.

ANNE MILLER
PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

DEBORAH S. LOPEZ
CITY CLERK

WINNIE CAI
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA)
CITY OF GOLETA) ss.

I, DEBORAH S. LOPEZ, City Clerk of the City of Goleta, California, DO
HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution No. 26-__ was duly adopted by
the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta at a regular meeting held on the __
day of _____ 2026, by the following roll call vote of the Commission:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

(SEAL)

DEBORAH S. LOPEZ
CITY CLERK

Exhibit A – Findings of Fact
Exhibit B –Link to the Final EIR
Exhibit C – MMRP

Attachment 1

SANDPIPER GOLF COURSE RENOVATION CEQA RESOLUTION

Exhibit A: Findings of Fact

EXHIBIT A
CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT

The California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.) (“CEQA”) requires that public agencies shall not approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report (“EIR”) has been certified that identifies one or more significant adverse environmental effects of a project unless the public agency makes one or more written Findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each Finding (State CEQA Guidelines [Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15000 et seq.], § 15091). This document presents the CEQA Findings of Fact made by the City of Goleta, in its capacity as the CEQA lead agency, regarding the Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project – Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path (“Alternative 4”), evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (“Draft EIR”) and Final Environmental Impact Report (“Final EIR”) for the Project.

SECTION I.
INTRODUCTION

Public Resources Code section 21002 states that “public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]” Section 21002 further states that the procedures required by CEQA “are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects.”

Pursuant to section 21081 of the Public Resources Code, a public agency may only approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been completed that identifies any significant environmental effects if the agency makes one or more of the following written finding(s) for each of those significant effects accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
2. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

As indicated above, section 21002 requires an agency to “avoid or substantially lessen” significant adverse environmental impacts. Thus, mitigation measures that

“substantially lessen” significant environmental impacts, even if not completely avoided, satisfy section 21002’s mandate. (*Laurel Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City Council* (1978) 83 Cal.App.3d 515, 521 [“CEQA does not mandate the choice of the environmentally best feasible project if through the imposition of feasible mitigation measures alone the appropriate public agency has reduced environmental damage from a project to an acceptable level”]; *Las Virgenes Homeowners Fed., Inc. v. County of Los Angeles* (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 300, 309 [“[t]here is no requirement that adverse impacts of a project be avoided completely or reduced to a level of insignificance . . . if such would render the project unfeasible”].)

While CEQA requires that lead agencies adopt feasible mitigation measures or alternatives to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts, an agency need not adopt infeasible mitigation measures or alternatives. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002.1(c) [if “economic, social, or other conditions make it infeasible to mitigate one or more significant effects on the environment of a project, the project may nonetheless be carried out or approved at the discretion of a public agency”]; see also State CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(a) [an “EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible”].) CEQA defines “feasible” to mean “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.” (Pub. Resources Code, § 21061.1.) The State CEQA Guidelines add “legal” considerations as another indicia of feasibility. (State CEQA Guidelines, § 15364.) Project objectives also inform the determination of “feasibility.” (*Jones v. U.C. Regents* (2010) 183 Cal. App. 4th 818, 828-829.) “[F]easibility” under CEQA encompasses “desirability” to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.” (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 401, 417; see also *Sequoiah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715.) “Broader considerations of policy thus come into play when the decision making body is considering actual feasibility[.]” (*Cal. Native Plant Soc’y v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1000 (“*Native Plant*”); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21081(a)(3) [“economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations” may justify rejecting mitigation and alternatives as infeasible] (emphasis added).)

Environmental impacts that are less than significant do not require the imposition of mitigation measures. (*Leonoff v. Monterey County Board of Supervisors* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337, 1347.)

The California Supreme Court has stated, “[t]he wisdom of approving . . . any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced.” (*Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 576.) In addition, perfection in a project or a project’s environmental alternatives is not required; rather, the requirement is that sufficient information be produced “to permit a reasonable choice of alternatives so far as

environmental aspects are concerned.” Outside agencies (including courts) are not to “impose unreasonable extremes or to interject [themselves] within the area of discretion as to the choice of the action to be taken.” (*Residents Ad Hoc Stadium Com. v. Board of Trustees* (1979) 89 Cal.App.3d 274, 287.)

SECTION II.
FINDINGS REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACTS NOT REQUIRING MITIGATION

The City Council hereby finds that the following potential environmental impacts of Alternative 4 are less than significant and therefore do not require the imposition of Mitigation Measures.

A. AESTHETICS

1. Scenic Vistas

Threshold: Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-16 through 4.1-20, 6-49.)

Explanation: **Construction.** The project site includes portions of Hollister Avenue (including a bicycle path along Hollister Avenue from Cathedral Oaks Road to Pebble Beach Drive), a locally designated scenic corridor, and is in the vicinity of three locally designated scenic corridors (U.S. 101, Calle Real, and Cathedral Oaks Road). Existing views of the project site from U.S. 101, Calle Real, and most of Cathedral Oaks Road are obscured by intervening buildings (single-family residences), elevated topography, and mature vegetation. Construction of Alternative 4 would thus not substantially degrade views of scenic vistas from these three scenic corridors. The project site is in the vicinity of three publicly accessible scenic viewpoints (Sandpiper Golf Club, Hollister Avenue [East Devereaux Creek], and Hollister Avenue [West Devereaux Creek]). Furthermore, the project site is visible from recreational trails within Santa Barbara Shores Park, which offer views of the Goleta shoreline and Pacific Ocean.

Construction of Alternative 4 would be visible from public locations that offer views of City designated scenic vistas. Specifically, construction of the proposed clubhouse, maintenance facility, Rio Grande Coffee Shop, Hollister Avenue improvements, golf course recontouring, and installation of underground utility lines would be visible from the Hollister Avenue scenic corridor and related scenic viewpoints. Golf course recontouring would also be visible from Santa Barbara Shores Park. Construction activities would include site preparation, grading, paving, utility trenching, and building construction, all of which would require heavy machinery and materials storage on the project site. Temporary construction features, such as scaffolding, construction trailers, or safety fencing, may also occur on the project site.

Although construction activities would be visible to the public from the Hollister Avenue scenic corridor, scenic viewpoints, and Santa Barbara Shores Park, such visual impacts would be temporary. Moreover, the phasing of construction activities would limit the duration and extent of visual degradation such that construction would not occur throughout the entire project site at one time. Further, as a Condition of Approval 67, the City would require that the construction site be screened with fencing during construction, which would reduce views of equipment and the construction sites from public viewing areas. Therefore, construction of Alternative 4 would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, and impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-16 through 4.1-17, 6-49.)

Operation. Views of the project site would be visible from public locations that offer views of City-designated scenic vistas, including the Hollister Avenue scenic corridor, scenic viewpoints, and Santa Barbara Shores Park.

Alternative 4 would include the removal of an oak tree within the Hollister Avenue ROW as well as the removal of 39 non-native trees generally located within the proposed parking areas at the new clubhouse and maintenance yard, and within the golf course playing areas. Alternative 4 includes the planting of 116 trees, resulting in a net increase of 65 trees on the project site. To offset the removal of the oak tree, the project would include the planting of a replacement 72-inch box oak on the project site. Eighty three (83) of the new trees would be planted within the new parking areas. Additional trees would be located along the western perimeter of the golf course to provide visual screening of the Venoco facility; near the Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oaks Road intersection to soften views of the proposed clubhouse and parking areas; and at strategic locations within the golf course to soften views of the maintenance yard and Rio Grande Coffee Shop. The locations of new trees were selected to maintain existing views of the Pacific Ocean. The addition of new trees along the western perimeter of the golf course, around the clubhouse, at the maintenance yard, and at the Rio Grande Coffee Shop would not interfere with public views of the Pacific Ocean because no views of the Pacific Ocean are visible from public roads at these locations. Further, the addition of new trees at the maintenance yard would screen the maintenance yard structures and fence from Hollister Avenue and improve existing views from the roadway. The addition of new trees at the clubhouse would be similar to the existing, vegetated conditions that surround the clubhouse, and would screen views of the new, paved parking areas from Hollister Avenue. Therefore, the addition of new trees would not

interfere with previous, unobstructed, scenic views from public locations. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-17, 6-49.)

The undergrounding of the existing power lines would improve scenic views from Hollister Avenue of the Pacific Ocean by removing the existing obstruction. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-17, 6-49.)

KVP 1 (Santa Barbara Shores Park): This location is at Santa Barbara Shores Park, south of Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve. Northwestern-facing views of the golf course are visible from this viewpoint. However, the proposed clubhouse, comfort station, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop would not be visible from this viewpoint, and the proposed golf course layout would not result in a substantial change to the visual landscape. Alternative 4 would not result in a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas of the Santa Ynez Mountains or Goleta shoreline from Santa Barbara Shores Park. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-25, 6-49.)

KVP 2 (Hollister Avenue at Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station): This location is along Hollister Avenue, a locally designated scenic corridor, and is the location of the Hollister Avenue (East Devereaux Creek) scenic viewpoint. South-facing views of the proposed Rio Grande Coffee Shop, Hollister Avenue improvements, and undergrounding of power lines would be visible from this viewpoint. However, the proposed restoration of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station would improve the quality of views from Hollister Avenue, as the existing structure is aging and in a state of disrepair; the Rio Grande Coffee Shop would be visually and architecturally compatible with the restored historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station; the improvements along Hollister Avenue would not result in substantial changes to the visual landscape; and the addition of new vegetation and landscaping, and undergrounding of power lines, would result in a more cohesive and integrated visual landscape. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not result in a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas of the Goleta shoreline or Pacific Ocean visible from this portion of the Hollister Avenue scenic corridor or Hollister Avenue (East Devereaux Creek) scenic viewpoint. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-25, 6-49.)

KVP 3 (Hollister Avenue at Sandpiper Golf Club Golf Course): This location is along Hollister Avenue, a locally designated scenic corridor, and is the location of the Hollister Avenue (West Devereaux Creek) scenic viewpoint. South-facing views of the existing project site are visible from this viewpoint. Features of Alternative 4 that would be visible from this viewpoint include golf course improvements, Hollister Avenue improvements, and the

undergrounding of power lines. However, the golf course improvements would add unintrusive wooden fencing along the project site and would not result in substantial changes to the visual landscape. The Hollister Avenue improvements would add greenery and a recreational pathway through the area, and the undergrounding of power lines would remove visual clutter and provide unobstructed views of the golf course, distant coastal bluffs and Pacific Ocean. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not result in a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas of the Goleta shoreline or Pacific Ocean visible from this portion of the Hollister Avenue scenic corridor or Hollister Avenue (West Devereaux Creek) scenic viewpoint. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-25, 6-49.)

KVP 4 (Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oaks Road Intersection): This location is near the Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oaks Road intersection. South-facing views of the existing project site are visible from this viewpoint. Features of Alternative 4 that would be visible from this viewpoint include golf course improvements, Hollister Avenue improvements, the undergrounding of power lines, and the new clubhouse. However, the golf course improvements and Hollister Avenue improvements would not result in substantial changes to the visual landscape; the undergrounding of power lines would remove visual clutter and provide unobstructed views of the golf course, distant coastal bluffs and Pacific Ocean; and the new clubhouse would be visually integrated into the landscape via sloped turf walls and a turf roof that would match surrounding greenery. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not result in a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas of the Goleta shoreline or Pacific Ocean visible from the Sandpiper Golf Club scenic viewpoint. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-25 through 4.1-26, 6-49.)

KVP 5 (Hollister Avenue, Sandpiper Golf Club Clubhouse): This location is along Hollister Avenue, a locally designated scenic corridor. South-facing views of the existing project site, including the clubhouse, are visible from this viewpoint. Features of Alternative 4 that would be visible from this viewpoint include the new clubhouse, Hollister Avenue improvements, and undergrounding of power lines. However, the new clubhouse would include scenic features such as glass, turf walls, and a turf roof, which would complement the surrounding scenery; the proposed Hollister Avenue improvements would not result in substantial changes to the visual landscape; and the undergrounding of power lines would remove visual clutter and improve overall views of the Sandpiper Golf Course and clubhouse. Additionally, visual impacts of the proposed Development Plan Adjustment request to allow parking within the front yard setback would be substantially similar to the existing conditions. Therefore,

Alternative 4 would not result in a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas of the Goleta shoreline or Pacific Ocean visible from this portion of the Hollister Avenue scenic corridor. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-26, 6-49.)

As discussed in the above subsections, the proposed changes to existing visual conditions would remove visual clutter and overall would not obstruct existing scenic views, substantially change existing visual conditions associated with the golf course, or result in new structures that are incompatible with existing conditions. Therefore, project operations would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, and impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-16 through 4.1-20, 6-49.)

2. Scenic Resources

Threshold: Would the Project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Finding: No impact. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-26, 6-49.)

Explanation: U.S. 101 is eligible for designation as a State Scenic Highway throughout Goleta, but is not officially designated as a State Scenic Highway in the vicinity of the project site. The project site is approximately 430 feet south of U.S. 101. Buildings, topography, and vegetation obscure views of the project site and existing on-site development from vehicles travelling along U.S. 101. Therefore, there would be no impact on scenic resources within an eligible State Scenic Highway. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-26, 6-49.)

3. Visual Character

Threshold: Would the project, in non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-27 through 4.1-29, p. 6-50.)

Explanation: Given that Alternative 4 would facilitate redevelopment in an urbanized area, the impact discussion of visual character and views is focused on consistency with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. The following subsections

describe Alternative 4's consistency with applicable zoning and other regulations that govern scenic quality.

City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan

Alternative 4 would be consistent with the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. For example, Alternative 4 would be consistent with Policies VH 1.1, Scenic Resources; VH 1.2, Scenic Resources Map; VH 1.3, Protection of Ocean and Island Views; VH 1.4, Protection of Mountain and Foothill Views; VH 1.5, Protection of Open Space Views; VH 1.6, Preservation of Natural Landforms; and VH 1.8, Private Views; as Alternative 4 would maintain or improve both public and private scenic views from or through the project site of the Santa Ynez Mountains, Goleta shoreline, Pacific Ocean, and Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve. Alternative 4 would be consistent with Policies VH 2.1, Designated Scenic Corridors; VH 2.2, Preservation of Scenic Corridors; VH 2.3, Development Projects Along Scenic Corridors; VH 2.4, Public Improvements; and VH 2.5, Linkages between Scenic Areas; as the Alternative 4 would maintain or improve scenic views from the locally designated Hollister Avenue scenic corridor. Alternative 4 would be consistent with Policies VH 3.3, Site Design; VH 3.4, Building Design; VH 3.5, Pedestrian-Oriented Design; VH 4.9, Landscape Design; VH 4.10, Streetscape and Frontage Design; VH 4.11, Parking Lots; VH 4.12, Lighting; VH 4.14, Utilities; and VH 4.16, Green Building; as Alternative 4 would include visually appealing and unintrusive design, green building practices, and appropriate landscaping in all proposed improvements, including the clubhouse, comfort station, maintenance yard, Rio Grande Coffee Shop, golf course layout, associated parking lots, Hollister Avenue improvements, and coastal access improvements. Alternative 4 would be consistent with Policy VH 4.15, Site-Specific Visual Assessments, as visual simulations were used to evaluate the effects of the proposed redevelopment and impacts on scenic views. Alternative 4 would be consistent with Policy VH 5.5, Alterations to Historic Resources, and Policy VH 5.7, New Construction, as the proposed restoration and adaptive reuse of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station would meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the Rio Grande Coffee Shop would be aesthetically compatible with the existing historic building. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-27 through 4.1-28, 6-49.)

Goleta Zoning Code

The project site is zoned as Open Space/Active Recreation. Allowed uses within this zone include community gardens, government buildings, park and recreation facilities, passive open space, and

outdoor recreation (with a Conditional Use Permit). As the proposed redevelopment of the project site would consist of outdoor recreational facilities with associated recreational and support structures, and the project applicant would be required to obtain a Conditional Use Permit, Alternative 4 would thus be permitted in the Open Space/Active Recreation zone. Alternative 4 would be required to comply with development regulations pursuant to Section 17.12.030 of the City's Zoning Code. Alternative 4 would meet the development standards, including maximum lot coverage and maximum building height, of the Open Space/Active Recreation zone. Additionally, Alternative 4 would include a Development Plan Adjustment request to allow vehicle parking within the front yard setback; this proposed Adjustment would result in visual conditions that are substantially similar to existing conditions. The proposed maximum height of the clubhouse building would be 29 feet, which would be similar to existing conditions (under which the clubhouse has a height of 28 feet 6 inches) and visual impacts would be minimized due to the presence of existing mature vegetation surrounding the clubhouse. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-28, 6-49.)

California Coastal Act

The project site is located in the Coastal Zone. Views of the Pacific Ocean through the project site are currently visible from public locations such as Santa Barbara Shores Park, Hollister Avenue, and the westernmost portion of Cathedral Oaks Road. Alternative 4 would not obstruct views of the Pacific Ocean from Santa Barbara Shores Park, as no structures would be visible from Santa Barbara Shores Park. In addition, the recontoured golf course would be similar to existing conditions, with the addition of more native plants as landscaping. Alternative 4 would improve views of the Pacific Ocean from Hollister Avenue and Cathedral Oaks Road (including from pedestrian facilities along the roadways) due to the proposed undergrounding of power lines, which would provide clearer and unobstructed views of the Pacific Ocean and surrounding Goleta shoreline. Thus, Alternative 4 would protect scenic and visual qualities, including views of the ocean, thereby adhering to Section 30251 of the California Coastal Act. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-28, 6-49.)

FAR Part 77

The project site is within the FAR Part 77 airspace surface for the Santa Barbara Airport (Santa Barbara County Association of Governments 2023). Height restrictions for development on the project site, as identified by FAR Part 77, range from 361 feet to 411 feet as stipulated in the Airport Land Use Plan for the Santa Barbara

Airport (Santa Barbara County Association of Governments 2023). Proposed project improvements would have a maximum height of 33 feet and thus would not exceed the 361- foot threshold. Therefore, Alternative 4 would be consistent with regulations for FAR Part 77 airspace surfaces. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-29 through 4.1-28, 6-49.)

Alternative 4 would be consistent with applicable zoning and other regulations that govern scenic quality. Impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-27 through 4.1-29, p. 6-50.)

4. Light and Glare

Threshold: Would the Project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-29 through 4.1-30, p. 6-50.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 construction is not anticipated to occur during evening or nighttime hours in accordance with Section 17.39.070 of the City's Zoning Code, which limits construction activities from Monday to Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Thus, Alternative 4 would not introduce new light sources to the project site during the construction time period. Alternative 4 would not include lighting to accommodate night play, as night play neither occurs under existing operational conditions nor is planned as part of Alternative 4. Any new light sources would be related to the expanded clubhouse and parking lot areas and additional security lighting as needed. Consequently, the following discussion focuses on Alternative 4's operational impact involving light and glare.

Light

Alternative 4 would introduce new sources of security lighting from the proposed parking lot at the Rio Grande Coffee Shop once operational. Light sources associated with the clubhouse, clubhouse parking lots, comfort station, and maintenance yard, as well as lighting of the cart paths, would be similar to existing conditions and used for security purposes. Proposed lighting at the clubhouse, Rio Grande Coffee shop, parking lots, and maintenance yard would consist of a combination of exterior path lights, bollard lights, down lights with tree straps, in-wall lights, understep and handrail strip lights, and sign lighting at entries and directional signage. Exterior lighting would consist of downward, directed fixtures. Proposed path lighting associated with all proposed project structures would provide safety and security for guests and course personnel who enter or exit the property before dawn or after dusk. Proposed project lighting

would be designed in accordance with City standards, including the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy 4.12, Lighting, which requires outdoor lighting fixtures to be designed, located, aimed downward or toward structures (if properly shielded), retrofitted if feasible, and maintained in order to prevent over-lighting, energy waste, glare, light trespass, and sky glow (City of Goleta 2006).

Moving sources of light would come from the headlights of vehicles driving on roadways near the project site, such as Hollister Avenue, and entering or exiting the project site early in the morning and evening. While operation of Alternative 4 would involve vehicle travel, and thus potential light from vehicles, these lighting sources would be similar to existing conditions surrounding the project site, as residential and commercial vehicles are frequent in the area, given the site's proximity to the U.S. 101 and Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oaks Road interchange.

Alternative 4's light sources would be similar to existing conditions. New sources of light associated with the proposed parking lots and Rio Grande Coffee Shop would be directed downwards, and all project-related lighting would comply with City regulations that aim to prevent over-lighting and light trespass. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not create a new substantial source of light that could affect daytime or nighttime views. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-29 through 4.1-30, 6-49.)

Glare

Alternative 4 would introduce new sources of glare in the form of focused, intense light from sunlight reflecting on the glass surfaces of the clubhouse, comfort station, maintenance yard, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop, as well as from parked car windows within the new parking lots associated with the maintenance yard and Rio Grande Coffee Shop. However, the new clubhouse and comfort station would primarily feature turf elements, and the maintenance yard and Rio Grande Coffee Shop would be constructed with muted shades of stucco and tan, all of which would reduce substantial glare from the proposed buildings. Additionally, vegetative screening around the clubhouse and maintenance yard would reduce off-site impacts of glare from both the proposed structures and parked cars, and the comfort station would be located in the southeastern portion of the project site and would have limited potential to produce off-site glare impacts. Adjacent land uses include few glare-sensitive receptors (confined to single-family residences along Hollister Avenue, to the northeast), thus, the potential for glare-related impacts would be

limited. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-39, 6-49.)

Overall, potential impacts associated with the creation of a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-29 through 4.1-30, p. 6-50.)

B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

1. Farmland Conversion

Thresholds: Would the Project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide significance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

Finding: No impact. (Draft EIR, p. 4.17-1.)

Explanation: According to the California Department of Conservation's (DOC) California Important Farmland Finder, the project site does not contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Specifically, the project site is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land (DOC 2022), which is defined as land occupied by structures with a building density of at least 1 unit to 1.5 acres, or approximately 6 structures to a 10-acre parcel. This designation is used for golf courses, among other developed land uses (DOC 2025). As such, Alternative 4 would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide significance to non-agricultural use. No impact would occur. (Draft EIR, p. 4.17-1.)

2. Agricultural Zoning

Thresholds: Would the Project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

Finding: No impact. (Draft EIR, p. 4.17-1.)

Explanation: The project site is zoned for open space and active recreation uses, and is not zoned for agricultural use. No agricultural land uses occur in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not have the potential to result in conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act contract. No impact would occur. (Draft EIR, p. 4.17-1.)

3. Forestland Zoning

Thresholds: Would the Project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

Finding: No impact. (Draft EIR, p. 4.17-2.)

Explanation: The project site does not contain forest land or timberland and is not zoned for Timberland Production. Development of Alternative 4 would not conflict with existing zoning, or cause rezoning of, forest land or land zoned for timberland production; and would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest land. No impacts to forestland would occur. (Draft EIR, p. 4.17-2.)

4. Loss of Forest Land

Thresholds: Would the Project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Finding: No impact. (Draft EIR, p. 4.17-2.)

Explanation: The project site does not contain forest land or timberland and is not zoned for Timberland Production. Development of Alternative 4 would not conflict with existing zoning, or cause rezoning of, forest land or land zoned for timberland production; and would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest land. No impacts to forestland would occur. (Draft EIR, p. 4.17-2.)

5. Conversion of Farmland or Forestland

Thresholds: Would the Project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Finding: No impact. (Draft EIR, p. 4.17-2.)

Explanation: The project site does not contain forest land or timberland and is not zoned for Timberland Production. Development of Alternative 4 would not conflict with existing zoning, or cause rezoning of, forest land or land zoned for timberland production; and would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest land.

No impacts to forestland would occur. (Draft EIR, p. 4.17-2.)

C. AIR QUALITY

1. Air Quality Plans and Air Quality Standards

Threshold: Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.2-11 through 4.2-13.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 does not propose any change to the project site's existing land use that would result in substantial additional population growth in the project area, and therefore would not conflict with the land use assumptions utilized by SBCAG, which informs the 2022 Ozone Plan's emissions forecast. Based on estimates from the California Department of Finance, in 2024, Goleta's population is approximately 32,515 people (California Department of Finance 2024). Alternative 4 would result in approximately 21 additional employees, which could cause indirect growth; however, because these jobs would likely come from the local workforce, it is not expected that people would be required to relocate to Goleta. In a conservative scenario where all projected employees and their families were to relocate to Goleta, there would be a population growth of 55 people,³ which would raise Goleta's population to approximately 32,570 people⁴ when Alternative 4 is operational (California Department of Finance 2024). SBCAG's growth forecast estimates that the population in Goleta would increase by 2,185 residents from the population of 32,515 residents to 34,700 residents by 2050. In addition, the growth forecast estimates that jobs would increase by 3,100 jobs from 27,970 jobs in 2030 to 31,070 jobs by 2050. Therefore, the addition of 21 employees and 55 new residents to Goleta would be within the SBCAG growth projections utilized within the 2022 Ozone Plan to forecast emissions (SBCAG 2019).

In addition, in accordance with standard practices in the City, the standard SBCAPCD fugitive dust control measures enforced through SBAPCD Rule 345 would be required for project implementation.

As Alternative 4 would be consistent with the 2022 Ozone Plan's emissions forecast assumptions and would incorporate the standard fugitive dust control measures recommended by SBCAPCD during construction activities, Alternative 4 would be consistent with the 2022 Ozone Plan. Therefore, Alternative 4 would have a less than significant impact related to conflicts with or obstruction of

implementation of the applicable air quality plan. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.2-11 through 4.2-13.)

2. Cumulatively Considerable Pollutant Emissions

Threshold: Would the Project result in cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.2-13 through 4.2-15, 6-50 through 6-51.)

Explanation: **Construction.** Construction-generated emissions are temporary and short-term. Construction activities such as demolition, grading, construction worker travel to and from the project site, delivery and hauling of construction supplies and debris to and from the project site, hauling of import soil to the site, and fuel combustion by on-site construction equipment would generate emissions of O3 precursors (ROC and NOX), CO, SO2, and fugitive dust (PM10 and PM2.5).

Alternative 4 would extend the bicycle path from the project site's eastern boundary to Pebble Beach Drive, and therefore would result in a small increase in criteria air pollutant emissions during construction compared to the proposed project. Under Alternative 4, approximately 0.49 acre of additional ground disturbance would occur, which is approximately 0.28 percent of the total anticipated ground disturbance of 174.43 acres under the proposed project. Alternative 4's maximum annual construction emissions are 1.03 tons per year of reactive organic compounds, and 3.36 tons per year of nitrogen oxides, which do not exceed the applicable SBCAPCD thresholds of 25 tons per year. As such, Alternative 4 would not exceed the applicable SBCAPCD thresholds. Therefore, project construction would not contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and this impact would be less than significant.

Operation. Operation of Alternative 4 would generate criteria air pollutant emissions associated with area sources (e.g., architectural coatings, consumer products, and landscaping equipment) energy sources (i.e., use of natural gas for space and water heating), and mobile sources (i.e., vehicle trips to and from the project site). Alternative 4 would however reduce long-term criteria pollutant emissions by promoting alternative modes of transportation. Specifically, the inclusion of a 10- to 14-foot Class I bicycle path within Hollister Avenue's southern right-of-way would facilitate

increased use of bicycles and pedestrian travel. This enhanced connectivity to regional bike infrastructure and transit stops, including accommodation of an existing bus stop and a proposed bus stop near Cathedral Oaks Road, would reduce reliance on automobile travel and associated vehicle emissions. Therefore, operational impacts would be reduced when compared to Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant because the emissions generated by the operation of Alternative 4 would not exceed the County's operational thresholds used by the City of Goleta for this analysis. In addition, air pollutant emissions from vehicle trips would be reduced compared to existing conditions, corresponding with the reduction in total rounds of golf allowed annually compared to existing conditions. Therefore, project operation would not contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and this impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.2-13 through 4.2-15, 6-50 through 6-51.)

3. Sensitive Receptors

Threshold: Would the Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.2-15 through 4.2-16, 6-50 through 6-51.)

Explanation: The closest sensitive receptors are single-family residences located adjacent to the east of the project site. Construction would not result in substantial increases in vehicle trips and therefore would not result in substantial adverse air quality impacts related to carbon monoxide. Construction activities including golf course contouring would occur between 210 and 1,800 feet away from existing residential areas and receptors. DPM, VOC, and NOx emissions during construction would not be concentrated in one area of the project site but would be spread over the entirety of the project site. These emissions would be short-term, temporary, and cease following the completion of construction. Based on the existing wind patterns at the project site, with winds blowing primarily northeast to southwest, emissions would be carried away from sensitive receptors. Based on the distance of emissions to sensitive receptors, wind patterns on the project site, and temporary construction emissions that would not be concentrated in one area, construction of Alternative 4 would have a less than significant impact related to exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Operation of Alternative 4 does not involve the use of equipment that would increase TAC emissions at the project site and therefore would

not result in substantial adverse air quality impacts related to carbon monoxide. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and this impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.2-15 through 4.2-16, 6-50 through 6-51.)

4. Other Adverse Emissions

Threshold: Would the Project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.2-16, 6-51.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 would generate oil and diesel fuel odors during construction from equipment use. The odors would be limited to the construction period and would be intermittent and temporary. Furthermore, these odors would dissipate rapidly with distance from in-use construction equipment. Accordingly, project construction would not result in other emissions, such as those leading to odors, that would adversely affect a substantial number of people.

Alternative 4 would include food preparation at the clubhouse restaurant and Rio Grande Coffee Shop. However, odors associated with food preparation would primarily be confined to the indoor dining areas of these project features. Food-related odors would also dissipate rapidly, and given the northeast to southwest wind patterns, would not be carried to nearby development north and east of the project site. Similar to construction rules, odors from activities at the maintenance facility (such as fueling) would be intermittent, temporary, and these odors would dissipate rapidly with distance and be carried away from nearby development given the on-site wind patterns. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not result in emissions leading to odors that would adversely affect a substantial number of people. This impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.2-16, 6-51.)

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Sensitive Species

Threshold: Would the Project 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-36 through 4.3-51, 6-52.)

Explanation: **Special-Status Plant Species**

The following special-status plant species were observed on the project site: cliff malacothrix, red sand verbena, Santa Barbara honeysuckle, southern California black walnut, and woolly seablite.

Direct Impacts.

Alternative 4 would not involve ground disturbance or other construction activities within Bell Canyon, where red sand verbena and southern California black walnut occur. Additionally, recontouring of the golf course would not overlap with the existing location of woolly seablite along the coastal bluff. Therefore, no direct impacts to red sand verbena, southern California black walnut, and woolly seablite would occur.

Impacts from human presence during operation of the Sandpiper Golf Club, such as the trampling of special-status plant species, could occur. However, Alternative 4 would limit the overall number of golfers using the golf course, and would not change the existing hours of operation. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not result in increased human presence such that it could lead to direct impacts to special-status plant species. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-36, 6-51 through 6-52)

Operation and maintenance (associated with the golf course) of Alternative 4 would be similar to existing conditions, as the proposed pathway would not require substantial long-term maintenance activity. Alternative 4 would restore approximately 2,831 square feet of riparian habitat ESHA. Therefore, operation and maintenance activities would have a less than significant impact on special-status plant species. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-37, 6-51 through 6-52)

Special-Status Wildlife Species

14 special-status wildlife species were identified on the project site during surveys, or have been identified near the project site. The following analysis focuses on potential impacts to the invertebrate, fish, amphibian, reptile, and bird species previously identified on or near the project site. Burrowing owl, which is a California Species of Special Concern, was not observed during surveys of the project site. Furthermore, the project site lacks suitable habitat for burrowing owl, and the potential for the species to occur is low. Consequently, impacts to burrowing owl are not addressed in the following analysis.

Crotch's Bumble Bee. Crotch's bumble bee has the potential to

occur on the project site, given the California Natural Diversity Database includes an occurrence of Crotch's bumble bee approximately 0.2 mile from the project site. However, the maintained nature of the project site limits available floral resources, burrows, and microhabitats that Crotch's bumble bee might utilize. Additionally, microhabitats, where available, are primarily located in areas near protected eucalyptus woodland (along the eastern boundary of the project site), as well as scrub and riparian habitat associated with coastal bluffs, Devereux Creek, and Bell Canyon Creek, where no construction activities are proposed. Alternative 4 would result in minimal new development and would not substantially change the biological setting of the project site, and impacts to Crotch's bumble bee habitat would be less than significant.

Operation and maintenance of Alternative 4 would be similar to existing conditions. However, Alternative 4 would reduce the amount of irrigated turf from 125 acres to 62 acres, with a corresponding reduction in the amount of fertilizers and pesticides required for golf course maintenance. Golf course personnel would continue to manage turf to require the minimum amount of fertilizers and pesticides to maintain the golf course. Alternative 4 would involve the conversion of 63 acres of former golf course to native landscaping. Therefore, operation and maintenance activities would have a less than significant impact on Crotch's bumble bee. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-37, 6-51 through 6-52)

Globose Dune Beetle. The nearest occurrences of globose dune beetle are at the mouth of Tecolote Creek, approximately 0.3 mile west of the project site and 0.4 mile west of the golf course. Potential habitat on the project site is limited to areas well away from the golf course, specifically on the west side of Bell Canyon Creek lagoon. The project site generally lacks the dune habitat suitable for this species, with the possible exception of a small area west of Bell Canyon Creek lagoon, which is more than 200 feet from the golf course. Alternative 4 would not involve construction activities in Bell Canyon, and would thus not have the potential to impact globose dune beetle or its habitat. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-38, 6-51 through 6-52)

Monarch Butterfly. Monarch butterfly has been observed on the project site. No project activities would occur within 200 feet of the monarch butterfly roost in Bell Canyon. No clustering or overwintering monarch butterflies were detected on the project site during the 2021-2022 surveys. In the eastern portion of the project site, proposed storm drain, grading, replacement of an existing maintenance building, construction of the replacement cart paths, and sandcapping would occur within the western edge of the

eucalyptus windrow. The windrow is mapped as part of the Xerces Site #2747 but only provides marginally suitable temporary transitory habitat and is therefore not considered ESHA. These activities would occur in existing developed areas and would not require removal of or major impacts to these trees. Proposed sewer line trenching, grading, cart path replacement, and sandcapping would occur at the northern and western edge of the eucalyptus grove surrounding Devereux Creek, which is designated Monarch Butterfly Roosting Habitat ESHA. The sewer line would occur from the southern on-site portion of Devereux Creek to the proposed comfort station and would be routed or the alignment shifted to avoid removal of mature trees or major damage¹ to their roots through applicant-proposed tree protection measures. None of the proposed activities within Monarch Butterfly Roosting Habitat ESHA would require removal of trees or vegetation contributing to monarch butterfly habitat.

Operation and maintenance of Alternative 4 would be similar to existing conditions. Alternative 4 would restore approximately 2,831 square feet of riparian and upland overwintering monarch butterfly habitat ESHA. Therefore, operation and maintenance activities would have a less than significant impact on monarch butterfly. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-38 through 4.3-39, 6-51 through 6-52)

Tidewater Goby. Tidewater goby occurs on the project site within Bell Canyon Creek. Habitat for tidewater goby is absent elsewhere on the project site. Alternative 4 would not result in direct impacts to tidewater goby, as the nearest activities to Bell Canyon Creek would consist of sandcapping, approximately 100 feet to the east.

Operation and maintenance of Alternative 4 would be similar to existing conditions. Operation and maintenance activities would have a less than significant impact on tidewater goby. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-39, 6-51 through 6-52)

California Red-legged Frog. Suitable habitat for California red-legged frog occurs on the project site within Bell Canyon, which is approximately 100 feet from proposed sandcapping activities. Additionally, although the golf course pond and aquatic habitat in the unnamed wetland feature near the coastal bluff are not considered suitable breeding habitat for California red-legged frog, the species has been observed in these locations during the period when frogs are dispersing through habitats surrounding breeding ponds.

Alternative 4 would not involve activities that would directly affect aquatic habitat within Bell Canyon. Operation and maintenance of Alternative 4 would be similar to existing conditions. Operation and

maintenance activities would have a less than significant impact on California red-legged frog. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-39, 6-51 through 6-52)

Southwestern Pond Turtle. Operation and maintenance of Alternative 4 would be similar to existing conditions. Operation and maintenance activities would have a less than significant impact on southwestern pond turtle. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-39 through 4.3-40, 6-51 through 6-52)

Cooper's Hawk, White-Tailed Kite, and Other Raptor Species. Operation of the replacement cart path would not result in substantial adverse effects to red-tailed hawk, as the cart path would not establish new human presence in the area but would maintain existing conditions of human travel in this location. Operation and maintenance of Sandpiper Golf Club under Alternative 4 would be similar to existing conditions. Operation and maintenance activities would have a less than significant impact on raptors. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-40, 6-51 through 6-52.)

Yellow Warbler and Other Special-Status Bird Species. Operation and maintenance of Sandpiper Golf Club under Alternative 4 would be similar to existing conditions. Operation and maintenance activities would have a less than significant impact on special-status bird species. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-49, 6-51 through 6-52)

2. Riparian Habitat

Threshold: Would the Project 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?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-51 through 4.3-55, p. 6-52.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 would be similar to existing conditions and would have a Class III, less than significant, impact on riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities.

Indirect Impacts on ESHA and ESHA Buffers. Alternative 4 would not result in increased human presence during project operation and maintenance activities such that it could lead to indirect impacts to ESHA. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-51, 6-51 through 6-52.)

Direct Impacts on ESHA and ESHA Buffers. Direct impacts to riparian habitat types or sensitive natural communities designated as

ESHA and ESHA buffers would include the construction and operation of new structures or facilities within ESHA or ESHA buffers. However, the proposed clubhouse, comfort station, maintenance facility, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop would be located within currently developed areas. Construction of new features that could result in direct impacts to ESHA or ESHA buffers include the extension of the bicycle path and underground utility trenching on Hollister Avenue, storm drain outlet, cart path, and a sewer line, as well as proposed grading, sandcapping, and landscaping activities, as discussed in the following subsections.

Grading, Landscaping and Sandcapping. Alternative 4 would involve grading for recontouring and sand capping within the 100-foot ESHA and SPA buffers for Devereux Creek, where nonnative grasses (wild oats and annual brome grassland) would be replaced with the recontoured golf course. However, the existing nonnative grasses within the buffer are currently part of the golf course. Furthermore, the proposed daylighting of downstream portions of Devereux Creek, via removal of an underground culvert, would improve the overall biotic quality of Devereux Creek.

Grading and sandcapping would occur within Monarch Butterfly Roosting Habitat ESHA and ESHA buffer along the eastern boundary of the site. These activities are not anticipated to result in removal or major impacts to trees within the ESHA or alter the surface hydrology or remove native vegetation within the ESHA buffer, as the proposed activities would be limited to surface-level modifications that avoid tree root zones and alterations to drainage patterns.

Grading and sandcapping would also occur near the coastal bluffs and within the ESHA buffers for quailbush scrub and California brittle bush – ashy buckwheat scrub alliance, both of which are considered coastal bluff scrub/coastal sage scrub ESHA under the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. However, the grading (recontouring) and sandcapping would promote infiltration of water, reduced waterlogging, and better root growth. Proposed activities would be consistent with the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 5.3 and would avoid ESHA and occur within the ESHA buffer only in areas that are already existing golf course, and would remain turf or playable areas of the golf course. Alternative 4 would involve the installation of native plants in all graded and sand capped areas that are not playable, pursuant to the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 5.3. Therefore, proposed grading, landscaping and sandcapping activities would have a less than significant impact on ESHA. (Draft

EIR, pp. 4.3-51 through 4.3-55, p. 6-52.)

3. Wildlife Movement

Threshold: Would the Project 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?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-57 through 4.3-59, p. 6-52.)

Explanation: **Noise.** Operational noise levels would not exceed the City's 65-decibel noise standard and would be similar to existing conditions. Impacts on wildlife movement from operational noise would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-59, 6-51 through 6-52.)

Light. Alternative 4 construction is not anticipated to occur during evening or nighttime hours in accordance with Section 17.39.070 of the City's Zoning Code, which limits construction activities from Monday to Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.. Thus, Alternative 4 would not introduce new light sources to the project site during the construction time period. Impacts on wildlife movement as a result of construction lighting would be less than significant.

Alternative 4 would introduce new sources of light from the proposed parking lots and Rio Grande Coffee Shop once operational. Light sources associated with the clubhouse, comfort station, and maintenance yard, as well as lighting of the cart paths, would be similar to existing conditions. Proposed lighting at the clubhouse, Rio Grande Coffee shop, parking lots, and maintenance yard would consist of a combination of exterior path lights, bollard lights, down lights with tree straps, inwall lights, under-step and handrail strip lights, and sign lighting at entries and directional signage. Alternative 4 lighting would be designed in accordance with City standards, including the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy 4.12, Lighting, which requires outdoor lighting fixtures to be designed, located, aimed downward or toward structures (if properly shielded), retrofitted if feasible, and maintained in order to prevent over-lighting, energy waste, glare, light trespass, and sky glow (City of Goleta 2006). Alternative 4 would not include lighting to accommodate night play, as night play neither occurs under existing operational conditions nor is planned as part of Alternative 4. Therefore, impacts on wildlife movement as a result of operational project lighting would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-59, 6-51 through 6-52.)

Human Presence. Construction of Alternative 4 would result in increased human presence, due to construction workers, at the project site. However, project construction is not anticipated to occur during evening or nighttime hours in accordance with Section 17.39.070 of the City's Zoning Code, which limits construction activities from Monday to Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5 p.m.. Many wildlife species are nocturnal or crepuscular, and during the day, when construction activities would occur, these animals are typically resting or hiding. Therefore, increased human presence during construction would be unlikely to substantially interfere with wildlife movement, and construction impacts would be less than significant.

Alternative 4 would consist of redevelopment of the Sandpiper Golf Club. Following implementation of Alternative 4, current land uses would remain the same. Alternative 4 would not result in increased human presence during project operation. Therefore, impacts on wildlife movement as a result of human presence would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-60 through 4.3-59, p. 6-52.)

4. Habitat Conservation Plans

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Finding: No impact. (Draft EIR, p. 6-52.)

Explanation: The project site is not subject to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan (CDFW 2023). Therefore, Alternative 4 would not conflict with these plans. No impact would occur. (Draft EIR, p. 6-52.)

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Historical Resources

Threshold: Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines, section 15064.5?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.4-14 through 4.4-18, p. 6-53.)

Explanation: The maintenance yard structures are less than 45 years of age and thus ineligible for qualification as historical resources, the golf course is not eligible as a designated historic landscape, and the comfort station and clubhouse are not eligible as individual resources for the

NRHP, CRHR, or City of Goleta Landmarks due to a lack of significance and architectural merit. Consequently, the clubhouse, golf course, comfort station, and maintenance yard do not constitute historical resources for the purposes of CEQA analysis, and project improvements involving the clubhouse, golf course, comfort station, and maintenance yard would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.4-14 through 4.4-18, p. 6-53.)

2. Archaeological Resources

Threshold: Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines, section 15064.5?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.4-18 through 4.4-22, p. 6-53.)

Explanation: **Operation.** The study identified six cultural resources within the project site. These resources do not possess subsurface deposits or information substantial enough to address research questions regarding prehistoric/historic activities and technological practices (Langan 2025). Therefore, these resources neither meet the criteria of a significant resource or unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA, nor the criteria required to be eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. One previously identified, prehistoric archaeological site (CA-SBA-3496) would not be subject to construction-related ground disturbance. Two previously identified prehistoric archaeological sites (CA-SBA-1321, and CA-SBA-3945), a prehistoric isolate (P-42-038647) and the two newly identified prehistoric archaeological sites (Dudek-Sandpiper-001 and Dudek-Sandpiper-002) would be subject to project-related ground disturbance; however, as these resources are not eligible for listing on the CRHR or NRHP or for consideration as a unique archaeological resource, impacts to these resources as a result of project implementation would not be significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.4-18 through 4.4-22, p. 6-53.)

3. Human Remains

Threshold: Would the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.4-22 through 4.4-23, p. 6-53.)

Explanation: No human remains or prehistoric villages where human remains and/or cemeteries are known to exist within the project site. In the

event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains during construction, the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that all construction activities halt in the vicinity of the discovery and the County Coroner be contacted immediately. The County Coroner would make a determination of origin and disposition of the human remains pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the coroner would notify the NAHC, which would determine and notify a most likely descendant (MLD). The MLD would complete an inspection of the site within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The MLD would be responsible for the ultimate disposition of the remains, as required by Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

Construction of the extended bicycle path area is located within disturbed right-of-way of Hollister Avenue and with lower potential to contain unknown human remains. With regulatory compliance, Alternative 4's impact to human remains would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.4-22 through 4.4-23, p. 6-53.)

F. Energy

1. Wasteful Use of Energy

Threshold: Would the Project result in potentially significant impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.5-9 through 4.5-10, 6-53 through 6-54.)

Explanation: **Construction.** Alternative 4 would require demolition, site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, architectural coating, and installation of landscaping. Alternative 4 would also extend the bicycle path to Pebble Beach Drive.

Energy use during construction would be temporary in nature and heavy-duty equipment used would be typical of similar-sized construction projects in the region. In addition, project contractors would be required to comply with the provisions of the California Code of Regulations Title 13 Sections 2449 and 2485, which prohibit diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles and off-road diesel vehicles from idling for more than five minutes and would minimize unnecessary fuel consumption. Heavy-duty equipment would be subject to the USEPA Construction Equipment Fuel Efficiency Standard, which would also minimize inefficient, wasteful, or

unnecessary fuel consumption. These practices would result in efficient use of energy necessary to perform construction of Alternative 4. Adherence to regulatory requirements designed to reduce energy consumption would ensure the construction of Alternative 4 would not involve the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy, and impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.5-9, 6-53 through 6-54.)

Operation. Operation of Alternative 4 would require energy use in the form of electricity, natural gas, and gasoline consumption. Natural gas or electricity would be used for heating and cooling systems and kitchen facilities, and electricity would be used for lighting and appliances. Golf carts would be powered by electricity. Gasoline consumption would be attributed to vehicular travel to and from the project site. Alternative 4 would be supplied electricity by SCE and natural gas by SCG.

Alternative 4 would comply with standards set in California Building Code Title 24, including solar-ready building requirements, which are specifically crafted so that buildings are required to be energy efficient and not consume energy in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner. These standards are also more stringent related to energy efficiency than the California Building Code standards applicable at the time the existing on-site structures were developed. Therefore, Alternative 4's facilities would be designed to be more energy efficient than the existing on-site facilities. Alternative 4 would meet CALGreen energy performance standards through compliance with mandatory requirements of the 2025 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Furthermore, Alternative 4 would be designed in accordance with the City's Energy Performance Reach Code which would provide electric-ready facilities for the use of electric infrastructure. In addition, the proposed design of the maintenance building allows for the installation of solar panels on the roof which could contribute to renewable energy use on-site.

Under existing conditions, golf carts on-site are electric and would remain electric with implementation of Alternative 4. Given that Alternative 4 would reduce the total amount of golf rounds available per year, energy use associated with the golf carts would not substantially increase energy demand compared with existing conditions.

Alternative 4 would comply with CALGreen standards and California Code of Regulations provisions which would minimize Alternative 4's potential to result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary

consumption of vehicle fuels. With the implementation of applicable energy efficiency measures, operation of Alternative 4 would not substantially increase energy demand compared with existing conditions.

However, Alternative 4 would reduce long-term energy demand associated with transportation by promoting alternative modes of travel. Specifically, the inclusion of a Class I bicycle path within Hollister Avenue's southern right-of-way would facilitate increased use of bicycles and pedestrian travel, reducing reliance on automobiles and associated fuel consumption. The extended bicycle path would connect to existing regional bike infrastructure and transit stops, including an existing bus stop near the Ellwood Mesa Open Space and a proposed bus stop near Cathedral Oaks Road, further supporting reduced automobile travel and fuel consumption and facilitating regional access to the proposed Rio Grande Coffee Shop, the Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve, commercial areas east of the project site, and the University of California-Santa Barbara. Therefore, Alternative 4's impact related to the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy resources would be reduced when compared to Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.5-9 through 4.5-10, 6-53 through 6-54.)

2. Energy Efficiency Plans

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.5-10 through 4.5-11, p. 6-54.)

Explanation: The City's CAP, Strategic Energy Plan, General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, and Municipal Code contain measures intended to increase energy efficiency and expand the use of renewable energy in Goleta. Alternative 4 would comply with CALGreen and the Building Energy Efficiency Standards, which would result in increased energy efficiency for on-site facilities compared to existing conditions. Alternative 4 would obtain electricity from SCE. In accordance with SB 100, SCE is required to increase renewable energy procurement to 60 percent by 2030, and 100 percent by 2045. Accordingly, Alternative 4 would be supplied with renewable electricity in accordance with the requirements of SB 100. In addition, the proposed design of the maintenance building allows for the installation of solar panels on the roof, which would be consistent with the measures of the City's CAP, Strategic Energy Plan, General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, and Municipal Code to expand

renewable energy infrastructure in Goleta. Alternative 4 would include the redesign of parking areas to support the golf course and associated uses, such that the clubhouse parking lot (including the existing main lot, as well as a new, decomposed granite overflow lot to the west of the clubhouse) would provide an additional 14 spaces and the Rio Grande Coffee Shop would provide an additional 9 spaces compared to existing conditions. Of the 23 net new spaces added from proposed project design, 18 (approximately 78 percent) would be EV charging spaces, which would encourage the use of EVs and the reduction of vehicle fuel consumption. The project's EV charging spaces would fulfil the requirements of the CALGreen intervening code update. Furthermore, the addition of EV charging spaces would comply with Section 15.12.050 of the City's Municipal Code which requires new non-residential construction to construct at least 30 percent of new parking spaces to be EV capable or include EV charging infrastructure. Accordingly, Alternative 4 would not conflict with state or local EV parking requirements.

The City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan includes Policies TE 1.6, TE 7.2, and TE 7.12, which allow the City to require developers to provide improvements that reduce the use of single-occupancy vehicles, requires the City to collaborate with the Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District to ensure bus transit is reliable throughout Goleta, allows the City to require new or substantially renovated development to incorporate design measures to facilitate transit use. The City's CAP includes measures such as requiring projects to dedicate land for bicycle trails, requiring projects along transit corridors to provide for transit access, and requiring preferential parking to commuters who carpool, vanpool, ride-share, or use alternatively fueled vehicles.

Alternative 4 would comply with the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policies TE 1.6, TE 7.2, and TE 7.12, through the relocation of the bus stop approved by the Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District and surrounding Hollister Avenue improvements to facilitate access to the bus stop. Alternative 4 would comply with the City's CAP through inclusion of 52 bicycle parking spaces and bicycle amenities at the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, including construction of a 10-foot-wide Class I bicycle entrance with a bollard that would connect to an existing Class I bicycle path adjacent to Hollister Avenue east of the project site. These proposed bicycle amenities would encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation by project employees and the general public, which would reduce vehicle travel and associated fuel consumption. In addition, the continued use of electric-powered golf carts would provide alternatively fueled vehicles, and the reduction in total

rounds of golf would correspondingly reduce the electricity consumption associated with golf cart travel on-site. These project design features would ensure Alternative 4 would not conflict with or obstruct the City's CAP, Strategic Energy Plan, General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, or Municipal Code. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. This impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.5-10 through 4.5-11, p. 6-54.)

G. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

1. Fault Rupture

Threshold: 1(a) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.6-10, 6-54.)

Explanation: The project site does not overlie an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone; however, the southeastern portion of the project site overlies the More Ranch Fault, which is part of the Mission Ridge Fault System and is considered active. However, no structural development (i.e., the proposed clubhouse, Rio Grande Coffee Shop, or comfort station) would occur on or within 50 feet of the More Ranch Fault. In addition, no proposed utility lines would cross the fault line. Accordingly, Alternative 4 would comply with the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Safety Element Policy SE 4.4, which requires development to be located further than 50 feet to any active fault line but permits nonstructural development in such areas (City of Goleta 2006a). Development within 50 feet of the More Ranch Fault is limited to fairways, greens, bunkers, and cart paths. These project features do not require deep excavations or boring of large areas that could otherwise create unstable seismic conditions or stresses in the Earth's crust leading to fault rupture.

Although the project site is partially intersected by the More Ranch Fault, Alternative 4 would not directly or indirectly cause the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault. This impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.6-10, 6-54.)

Threshold: 1(c) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.6-19, 6-54.)

Explanation: Liquefaction potential at the proposed clubhouse, Rio Grande Coffee Shop, and comfort station is very low. Alternative 4 design would incorporate design measures required by the CBC which reduce the potential for substantial adverse effects due to liquefaction, including foundation design and soil compaction techniques. Because the potential for liquefaction for soils underlying the proposed clubhouse, Rio Grande Coffee Shop, and comfort station is very low, regulatory compliance with the CBC would be sufficient to minimize the risk of loss, injury, or death involving liquefaction on site. This impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.6-19, 6-54.)

Threshold: 1(d) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.6-19 through 4.6-20, 6-54.)

Explanation: The portions of the project site west of the golf course pond, along the bluff faces at the southern project site boundary, and sloped areas in the central portion of the project site are considered to have high landslide potential. However, Alternative 4 would not place structures in areas of high landslide potential or areas exceeding 20 percent grade. In addition, no development would occur along the bluff faces at the southern project site boundary. Only activities related to the proposed golf course improvements (i.e., grading and rerouting, relandscaping, installation of turf and replacement of irrigation systems) would occur in areas west of the golf course pond and in sloped areas in the central portion of the project site with high landslide potential. While these activities would involve ground disturbing activities, the maximum cut slope on the golf course would be 11 feet, which would not result in substantial changes to the existing on-site slopes of the golf course. This cut slope height would also not exceed the 15-foot-tall threshold identified within the County of Santa Barbara's 2024 Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual. Maximum on-site slopes from grading would be at a 4 horizontal to 1 vertical grade south of the clubhouse, which would ensure slopes gradually increase and would not exceed a grade of 1.5 horizontal to 1 vertical identified in the County of Santa Barbara's 2024 Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual. Accordingly, the grading associated with golf course improvements

would not substantially increase the potential for a landslide to occur on the project site beyond existing conditions. Therefore, Alternative 4's impact related to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.6-19 through 4.6-20, 6-54.)

2. Soil Erosion

Threshold: Would the Project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.6-20 through 4.6-21, 6-55.)

Explanation: **Construction.** Grading operations would increase the potential for erosion and sedimentation; if grading activities occur during the rainy season, or in the event of heavy storms, soils from the site could be entrained, eroded, and transported off-site. Alternative 4 would result in a total of 174.92 acre of total ground disturbance. However, construction projects of one or more acres are subject to the requirements of the Construction Stormwater General Permit, which requires preparation and implementation of a SWPPP to control the discharges of pollutants, including sediment, into local surface water drainages. Examples of BMPs that may be implemented during construction include the use of geotextiles and mats, temporary drains and swales, silt fences, and sediments traps. Erosion control practices may include the use of drainage controls such as down drains, detention ponds, filter berms, or infiltration pits; removal of any sediment tracked offsite within the same day that it is tracked; containment of polluted runoff onsite; use of plastic covering to minimize erosion from exposed areas; and restrictions on the washing of construction equipment.

In addition to the Construction Stormwater General Permit requirements, construction activities would be subject to the requirements of Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code which requires preparation of an erosion and sediment control plan in order to obtain a grading permit. The City accepts a SWPPP in lieu of an erosion control and sediment plan, if the SWPPP contains the requirements of the City's required elements of an erosion and sediment control plan identified in Section 15.09.290 of the City's Municipal Code. As stated in Municipal Code Section 15.09.110, the City's Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee would review the SWPPP as part of the grading permit application to ensure the City's required elements of an erosion and sediment control plan are implemented within the SWPPP. Accordingly, the SWPPP prepared for Alternative 4 would include information on

proposed practices that would be used during construction to retain sediment on-site, minimize erosion, and utilize vegetation for erosion control, as well as a summary of precautionary measures to be taken to ensure vehicle use does not result in erosion.

With mandatory implementation of the SWPPP and erosion control measures, construction of Alternative 4 would minimize the potential to cause substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. This impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.6-20 through 4.6-21, 6-54 through 6-56.)

Operation. Alternative 4 would include implementation of the same stormwater control infrastructure and site design BMPs as the proposed project to minimize erosion during operation. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would not substantially increase the rate of runoff on the site compared to existing conditions, as the impervious surfaces added to the project site would represent an increase of less than 0.2 percent compared to existing conditions. Alternative 4's impact related to erosion would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.6-20 through 4.6-21, 6-55.)

3. Unstable Soils

Threshold: Would the Project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Finding: No impact. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-55 through 6-56.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 would not locate structures in an area subject to substantial liquefaction potential, landslide hazards, or potential for soil collapse. Potential impacts associated with geotechnical hazards would be minimized with adherence to the CBC. Alternative 4 may require groundwater dewatering during construction, but groundwater dewatering would be limited to the localized perched water on the project site and would be temporary, only occurring if perched groundwater is encountered. Therefore, construction of Alternative 4 would not result in substantial groundwater withdrawals that could result in subsidence on-site. Therefore, Alternative 4's impact related to the risk of landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-55 through 6-56.)

4. Expansive Soils

Threshold: Would the Project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-55 through 6-56.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 would locate structures on soils with very low potential for expansion. The construction contractor would be required to comply with the requirements of the CBC, including the use of non-expansive fill material, to minimize the potential for structural hazards associated with soil expansion. Alternative 4's impact related to creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property related to expansive soil would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-55 through 6-56.)

5. Septic Tanks

Threshold: Would the Project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

Finding: No impact. (Draft EIR, p. 6-56.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 would involve connecting the clubhouse, comfort station, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop to the Goleta West Sanitary District sewer system and the abandonment of the private septic systems serving the existing clubhouse and comfort station. Alternative 4 would not involve the installation of additional septic tanks on-site and therefore would not result in impacts related to the use of septic tanks. Therefore, Alternative 4 would have no impact related to soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks, which would be the same level of impact compared to the proposed project. (Draft EIR, p. 6-56.)

H. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

1. Emissions Generation

Threshold: Would the Project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.7-12 through 4.7-13, 6-56 through 6-57.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 would slightly increase the scope of the proposed project's construction activities. However, the increase in GHG emissions would be nominal given the small areas of additional construction activities (approximately 0.28 percent of the total project area) when amortized over 30 years. Alternative 4's operation would include the same components as the proposed project and therefore generate the same GHG emissions as operation of the proposed project. Accordingly, the combined construction and operation emissions of Alternative 4 would be slightly increased when compared to the proposed project, and would not result in substantial GHG emissions. Therefore, Alternative 4's impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

Alternative 4 would include design features to promote renewable energy use, energy efficiency, water efficiency, and reductions in vehicle travel, all of which contribute to the creation of minimal GHG emissions. Alternative 4 would include EV charging infrastructure that exceeds California Green Building Standards and City requirements for EV charging infrastructure.

Alternative 4's proposed facilities would be designed in accordance with energy efficiency standards. Alternative 4 would incorporate water efficient fixtures to reduce water consumption for landscaping, plumbing, and irrigation consistent with the latest Title 24 Green Building Code and Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Alternative 4 would also include the new water-efficient irrigation system which would reduce GHG emissions associated with water use. Impacts would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.7-12 through 4.7-13, 6-56 through 6-57.)

2. Emission Reduction Plans

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-56 through 6-57.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 would reduce long-term GHG emissions by promoting alternative modes of transportation. The inclusion of a Class I bicycle path within Hollister Avenue's southern right-of-way would facilitate increased use of bicycles and pedestrian travel, reducing reliance on personal vehicles and associated transportation emissions.

Alternative 4 would include additional active transportation facilities when compared to the proposed project and therefore would encourage active transportation and the reduction of GHG emissions from vehicles to a greater extent than the proposed project. Thus, Alternative 4 would be consistent with applicable GHG reduction plans; impacts would be reduced when compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant. This impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-56 through 6-57.)

I. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

1. Hazardous Materials

Threshold: Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Finding: Less than significant (Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-15 through 4.8-16, 6-57 through 6-58.)

Explanation: **Construction.** Hazardous materials used during construction of Alternative 4 would be handled in accordance with the same regulations as the proposed project, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Waste Control Law, and California Code of Regulations Title 22. Construction of Alternative 4 would occur in compliance with a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan to reduce potential spills. All hazardous material transport, use, or disposal associated with Alternative 4's operation would comply with existing hazardous materials regulations established by United States Environmental Protection Agency, the State of California, the County of Santa Barbara, and the City of Goleta. These regulations prescribe measures for the safe transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials to reduce risk of spills. Accordingly, Alternative 4's impact related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

Operation. Alternative 4 operation would involve the continued use of the site as a golf course and associated facilities, including a restaurant, comfort station, and maintenance yard. The hazardous materials that would be utilized during operation of Alternative 4 would include the continued use of fertilizers, pesticides, and fungicides to maintain landscaping on the golf course, as well as fuels and engine oils to maintain vehicles and equipment used for golf course operations. The majority of hazardous materials used to operate the golf course would be stored in the maintenance yard,

which would include a roofed materials and landscape amendment storage area. Hazardous materials would be stored in accordance with the requirements of the Santa Barbara Public Health Department's Consolidated Unified Program Agency Hazardous Material Division and the Santa Barbara County Agriculture Commissioner to reduce risk of leaks and spills. Both agencies would conduct regular inspections, require ongoing reporting and annual employee training, and provide oversight regarding the proper storage of hazardous materials. Furthermore, all hazardous material transport, use, or disposal associated with Alternative 4's operation would comply with existing hazardous materials regulations established by USEPA, the State of California, the County of Santa Barbara, and the City of Goleta. These regulations prescribe measures for the safe transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials to reduce risk of spills.

With compliance with existing regulations governing transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, Alternative 4 would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment during operation. Impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-15 through 4.8-16, 6-57 through 6-58.)

2. Hazards Near Schools

Threshold: Would the Project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-24 through 4.8-25, 6-58.)

Explanation: **Operation.** The Ellwood School is located within 0.25-mile of the proposed location of the maintenance yard where pesticides, herbicides, fungicides, and petroleum products would be stored during operation. However, under existing conditions, the maintenance yard currently stores hazardous materials used for operation of the Sandpiper Golf Club, and Alternative 4 would not change the location of the maintenance yard. Furthermore, Alternative 4 would reduce the volume of hazardous materials needed for on-site operations, as Alternative 4 would involve reduction of irrigated turf from 125 acres to 62 acres, with a corresponding reduction in the amount of fertilizers and pesticides required for golf course maintenance.

The operational use of hazardous materials would be carried out in accordance with all applicable and existing hazardous material regulations established by USEPA, State of California, County of

Santa Barbara, and City of Goleta, which prescribe measures for the safe transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials to reduce risk of spills. With adherence to existing regulatory requirements, proposed project operation would not pose a significant hazard to existing or proposed schools within 0.25-mile of the project site due to the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. As such, the operational impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-24 through 4.8-25, 6-58.)

3. Public Airports

Threshold: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-28 through 4.8-29, 6-58.)

Explanation: The project site is also not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The airport nearest to the project site, the Santa Barbara Airport, is located approximately 2.4 miles east of the project site. The project site is located outside of the safety and noise contours established within the Santa Barbara Airport Land Use Plan (Santa Barbara County Association of Governments 2023). The project site is located within Review Area 2 of the Santa Barbara Airport's Airport Influence Area and the FAR Part 77 airspace surface. However, the maximum height of proposed development on the project site is anticipated to be 33 feet from grade; therefore, no proposed Alternative 4 components would exceed the 361 feet to 411 feet height restrictions established in FAR Part 77. Accordingly, Alternative 4 would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise related to airport operations for people residing or working in the project area. This impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-28 through 4.8-29, 6-58.)

4. Emergency Plans

Threshold: Would the Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Finding: Less than significant (Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-29, 6-58.)

Explanation: The Santa Barbara County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan identifies United States Route 101 and Hollister Avenue as

evacuation routes (County of Santa Barbara 2023). Construction staging and parking would occur on the project site and therefore would not impair implementation of the Santa Barbara County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan. The proposed improvements on Hollister Avenue would require encroachment into the right-of-way and temporary partial lane closures on Hollister Avenue, which could result in temporary disruptions to access on Hollister Avenue. However, in accordance with Chapter 12.02 of the City's Municipal Code, the project applicant would be required to maintain at least one safe crossing for vehicles and must implement measures to minimize disruption to existing traffic conditions. In addition, the project applicant's construction contractor would be required to implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan during construction on Hollister Avenue. The Construction Traffic Management Plan would require implementation of traffic control measures and minimization of disruptions to critical access points at the project site for emergency service vehicles during construction on Hollister Avenue, which would be reviewed for potential safety concerns and approved by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department and the Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Office. With implementation of the Construction Traffic Management Plan, proposed construction on Hollister Avenue would not result in interference with emergency response or evacuation.

Proposed project operations at the golf course and Rio Grande Coffee Shop would not involve closures on Hollister Avenue. Operation of Alternative 4 would not introduce activities that could impede or interfere with the Santa Barbara County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan or emergency evacuations on Hollister Avenue. Therefore, Alternative 4 operation would not result in impaired implementation or physical interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-29, 6-58.)

5. Wildland Fires

Threshold: Would the Project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-30 through 4.8-31, 6-58.)

Explanation: The project site is located within an LRA. The southeastern portion of the project site is within a Moderate FHSZ, and the western half of the project site is within a Moderate, High, and Very High FHSZ, ranging in severity from the center of the project site (Moderate) to the western boundary (Very High) (California Department of Forestry

and Fire Protection 2025). The northeastern and south central portions of the project site, totaling approximately 60 percent of the site, are not located within a FHSZ. Project components located within High or Very High FHSZs include the renovated clubhouse, golf course improvements south and west of the clubhouse, and improvements to Hollister Avenue north of the clubhouse. When compared to existing conditions, Alternative 4 would not add new components or intensified development within a FHSZ. No construction would occur in Bell Canyon, which is the largest area of the project site within a Very High FHSZ zone.

During construction, there would be a temporary increase in human activity and potential ignition sources, including equipment that could create sparks, be a source of heat, or leak flammable materials on the project site. In accordance with California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 4442, equipment including earth-moving and portable construction equipment with internal combustion engines would be equipped with spark arrestors to prevent the emission of flammable debris from exhaust, when operating on any forest-covered, brush-covered, or grass-covered land. In addition, PRC Sections 4427 and 4431 specify standards for conducting construction activities on days when a burning permit is required, and PRC Section 4428 requires construction contractors to maintain fire suppression equipment during the highest fire danger period (April 1 to December 1) when operating on or near any forest-covered, brush-covered, or grass-covered land. These measures are designed to prevent accidental ignition and facilitate rapid response in the event of a fire. Adherence to these regulatory requirements would minimize the risk of potential wildland fire during construction.

Proposed project design would be subject to the California Fire Code, which include safety measures to minimize the threat of fire, including ignition-resistant construction with exterior walls of noncombustible or ignition resistant material from the surface of the ground to the roof system and sealing any gaps around doors, windows, eaves and vents to prevent intrusion by flame or embers, automatic interior and exterior fire sprinklers, a robust water delivery system, fire apparatus access, and defensible space. Proposed project design would also be required to comply with Chapter 9, Fire Protection Systems, of the California Building Code, which includes specific standards related to exterior wildfire exposure, and CCR Title 14, which sets forth the minimum development standards for emergency access, fuel modification, setback, signage, and water supply, which help prevent loss of structures or life by reducing wildfire hazards. The project site would primarily consist of golf course turf, and the project would add native plants for landscaping

purposes, both of which would have a low fire risk. Additionally, the proposed undergrounding of the power lines would reduce fire risk when compared to existing conditions. Furthermore, project operation would not introduce new activities that could substantially increase the risk of wildfires. With adherence to regulatory requirements, Alternative 4's potential to expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-30 through 4.8-31, 6-58.)

J. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

1. **Water Quality Standards**

Threshold: Would the Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-14 through 4.9-19, 6-59 through 6-60.)

Explanation: **Operation.** The hazardous materials that would be utilized during operation of Alternative 4 would include fertilizers, pesticides, fuels, and engine oils which would be stored in the maintenance facility during operation. During operation, oil leaks from vehicles traveling to and from the project site, oil leaks from on-site vehicles, the use of pesticides or fertilizers for landscape maintenance, the leaching of metals from roof and drains, or litter could be carried off-site during storm events and could result in potential water quality impacts. Proposed permanent Source Control BMPs include design of landscaping to minimize irrigation and runoff, specification of plants that are tolerant of soil-saturated conditions in landscaped self-retaining areas, selection of plants appropriate to site soils and slopes, posting of signage by inlets that prohibits dumping, and regular sweeping of the parking lot and access roads.

Proposed LID BMPs include six bioretention basins which would capture and treat stormwater runoff from the areas surrounding the clubhouse and maintenance facility prior to discharge to the golf course. These bioretention basins would minimize the amount of sediments discharged in stormwater during operation, thereby minimizing the potential to contribute to the turbidity impairment in Devereaux Creek. Stormwater within the extended bicycle path area would flow to the City's storm drain system within Hollister Avenue. The rest of the project site would remain self-treating due to substantial existing on-site landscaping and the minimal introduction

of impervious surfaces onsite and therefore would continue to treat stormwater on-site prior to discharge to surface waters. Treated water and high-flow bypass from the basins would be discharged to the golf course rather than the storm drain system in Hollister Avenue that outlets to Bell Canyon Creek, which would minimize the amount of stormwater entering Bell Canyon Creek and would correspondingly minimize the potential to contribute to the E. coli impairments in Bell Canyon Creek compared to existing conditions. The turf areas of the golf course would be sand-capped, which would create natural filtration below the golf course and help further filter stormwater discharged to the golf course compared to existing conditions.

The septic systems that serves the existing clubhouse and comfort station would be abandoned in place in accordance with the requirements of the Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Services, which, upon completion, would reduce the potential for groundwater quality to be affected by sewage.

Alternative 4 would reduce the amount of irrigated turf from 125 acres to 62 acres, with a corresponding reduction in the amount of fertilizers and pesticides required for golf course maintenance. Golf course personnel would continue to manage turf to require the minimum amount of fertilizers and pesticides to maintain the golf course.

A project-specific Turf and Pest Management Plan would be implemented which includes an Integrated Pest Management approach to combat turf diseases and pest control based on weather patterns, seasonal observations, and historic data trends. This reduction in fertilizers and pesticide use would correspondingly minimize the amount of nitrate introduced to the project site during operation compared to existing conditions and therefore would reduce the potential for project operation to contribute to the nitrate impairment in Bell Canyon Creek compared to existing conditions. In addition, the introduction of irrigation and nitrogen to surface waters can result in reduced dissolved oxygen levels in waterways (SWRCB 2019). The reduction in irrigated turf and associated fertilizers and pesticide use would therefore also reduce the potential for nitrogen to enter Devereaux Creek and reduce dissolved oxygen levels.

Alternative 4 includes a new irrigation system that would allow for uniform distribution of irrigation which would minimize potential water quality impacts related to overwatering. During operation, soil moisture probes would be routinely utilized to assist in application of water to turf, resulting in less runoff of irrigation water. In addition,

Alternative 4 includes sand-capping the turf areas of the golf course which involves placing a layer of sand beneath the turf that acts as a natural filtration system. This filtration layer would further help to capture and filter stormwater before it can reach underlying soil. Drainage would be routed to the bioretention basins for further treatment, thereby further reducing the potential for water quality degradation during operation.

The proposed maintenance facility would include a fenced and covered trash and recycling area, a roofed materials and landscape amendment storage area, a roof cart wash utilizing biodegradable soaps and a recycled water system, and pump equipment on a concrete slab. The majority of hazardous materials utilized to operate the golf course would be stored at the maintenance facility. Hazardous materials would be stored in accordance with the requirements of the Santa Barbara Public Health Department's Consolidated Unified Program Agency Hazardous Material Division and the Santa Barbara County Agriculture Commissioner to reduce risk of leaks and spills. Both agencies conduct regular inspections, require ongoing reporting, annual employee training, and provide oversight regarding the proper storage of hazardous materials to minimize potential degradation of water quality. In addition, stormwater from the maintenance facility would be directed to one of the six proposed bioretention basins which would ensure treatment of runoff from the maintenance facility. Regulatory oversight and implementation of LID BMPs on-site would ensure operation of the proposed maintenance facility would minimize the potential to result in degraded water quality.

Project operation would comply with Central Coast RWQCB requirements, City Municipal Code requirements, County requirements related to fertilizer storage and implement Source Control and LID BMPs to reduce potential water quality impacts. With the implementation of Source Control and LID BMPs, operation of Alternative 4 would have a less than significant impact related to the violation of water quality standards or degradation of water quality. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-14 through 4.9-19, 6-59 through 6-60.)

2. Groundwater Supplies

Threshold: Would the Project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-19 through 4.9-20, 6-59.)

Explanation: Subsurface investigations were conducted for soils up to the anticipated depths of construction for the comfort station, the clubhouse, and the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. Subsurface investigations did not encounter groundwater underlying the existing clubhouse, Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, or comfort station. If groundwater or seasonal perched groundwater is encountered during excavation activities, temporary groundwater dewatering during construction may be required. Groundwater dewatering activities would be localized and temporary, lasting only during excavation activities, if groundwater is encountered. The anticipated duration and minimal amount of groundwater dewatering that would be required for excavation would not result in substantial groundwater losses in the Basin. Therefore, construction of Alternative 4 would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies.

The project site currently has 144,490 square feet of impervious surface area. Alternative 4 would increase the amount of impervious surface areas by 12,250 square feet, for a total of 156,740 square feet across the project site. Impervious surfaces would constitute 1.9 percent of the total project site, which represents an increase in impervious surfaces of 0.2 percent of the site. Due to the high runoff potential of on-site soils, there is a low potential for groundwater infiltration on the project site under existing conditions. Given the limited infiltration potential of on-site soils (under both existing and post-project conditions) and the minimal amount of impervious surface increase generated by project development, Alternative 4 would not substantially decrease groundwater infiltration rates on-site or result in substantial interference to groundwater recharge.

Operation of Alternative 4 would not require groundwater extraction on the project site. However, water demand from the project would be met by GWD which sources its water, in part, from groundwater in the Basin. Alternative 4 would reduce the on-site water demand compared to existing conditions, resulting primarily from a reduction in irrigated turf area on the project site. GWD is subject to the adjudication requirements of the Wright Judgement, and Alternative 4 would not interfere with the management of the Basin in accordance with the Wright Judgement due to its water demands because GWD is only permitted to extract water in accordance with the allocations determined by the Wright Judgement. In addition, based on the Preliminary Water Service Determination Letter issued for the proposed project, GWD has sufficient water available to support Alternative 4. Furthermore, GWD has anticipated adequate water supplies to be available through the year 2040 (GWD 2021). Finally, existing regulatory measures requiring water conservation during times of drought prevent the overdraft of the Basin that GWD

would use to supply water demand of Alternative 4. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not substantially decrease water supplies or conflict with or obstruct a sustainable groundwater management plan. This impact would be less than significant. . (Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-19 through 4.9-20, 6-59.)

3. Erosion or Siltation

Threshold: Would the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.9-20 through 4.9-21, 6-60 through 6-61.)

Explanation: **Construction.** Construction activities would increase the potential for erosion and sedimentation. Construction activities would be required to comply with the Construction Stormwater General Permit, the City Municipal Code, as well as implementation of the required SWPPP and construction BMPs would minimize sediment discharge in stormwater runoff. With implementation of the SWPPP and construction BMPs, project construction would minimize erosion and siltation, and this impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.9-20, 6-60 through 6-61.)

Operation. The project site currently has 144,490 square feet of impervious surface area. Alternative 4 would nominally increase the amount of impervious surface areas, including the extension of the bicycle path. The remainder of the project site would consist of turf and landscaping, which would include drought-tolerant turf and installation of native plants. The drought-tolerant turf and native plants would require less water compared to existing conditions. In addition, Alternative 4 includes a smart irrigation controller system supported by an on-site weather station to manage irrigation usage, which would minimize the potential for soil erosion to occur due to overwatering. Due to the minimal amount of impervious surface increase, increased landscaping area, and reduced on-site water use, Alternative 4 would not substantially increase on-site erosion due to the addition of impervious surfaces.

Alternative 4 would include six bioretention basins which would capture and treat stormwater runoff from the areas surrounding the clubhouse and maintenance facility. The rest of the project site is self-treating due to substantial existing on-site landscaping and the

general lack of impervious surfaces and therefore is able to treat stormwater on-site prior to discharge into Devereaux Creek or Bell Canyon Creek. Treated water and high-flow bypass from the basins would be discharged to the golf course. The proposed bioretention basins have been sized to reduce the post-project peak runoff to less than the pre-project peak runoff for a 2-year to 100-year flood event. Specifically, stormwater runoff would be reduced from 81.6 cubic feet per second to 80.9 cubic feet per second for a 2-year storm event and from 426.3 cubic feet per second to 424.0 cubic feet per second for a 100-year flood event. Accordingly, stormwater discharge to the golf course would be reduced, which would therefore not increase erosion on-site. Therefore, project operation would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. This impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.9-20 through 4.9-21, 6-60 through 6-61.)

Threshold: 3(ii) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-21 through 4.9-22, 6-60.)

Explanation: **Construction.** Construction would comply with the requirements of the Construction Stormwater General Permit, including the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP. The SWPPP would include construction BMPs to control and direct on-site surface runoff. Therefore, construction activities would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. This impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.9-21, 6-60 through 6-61.)

Operation. Alternative 4 would have a nominal increase of impervious surface areas as compared to existing conditions. The bioretention basins would reduce stormwater flows by 0.7 cubic feet per second and 2.3 cubic feet per second for the 2-year and 100-year flood events, respectively, as compared to existing conditions. Because stormwater runoff from the project site would be reduced to below that of existing conditions, Alternative 4 would not result in off-site flooding. Additionally, the stormwater LID BMPs would be sized to collect and convey stormwater runoff on the project site to the golf course such that an increase in on-site flooding compared to existing conditions would not occur.

Alternative 4 would include the removal of a culvert within Devereaux Creek, which would alter the drainage pattern of Devereaux Creek. However, the culvert removal would improve Devereaux Creek's flow conditions. Accordingly, the proposed culvert removal would not result in on or off-site flooding. In addition, Alternative 4 would include a free-standing wooden bridge with abutments; however, the free-standing wooden bridge with abutments would be located outside the top of the bank of Devereaux Creek and therefore would not result in changes to the drainage patterns of Devereaux Creek or on- or off-site flooding.

Overall, project operation would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. This impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-21 through 4.9-22, 6-60.)

4. Runoff

Threshold: Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-21 through 4.9-22, 6-60.)

Explanation: **Operation.** The proposed bioretention basins would reduce peak stormwater flows on-site compared to existing conditions. Because stormwater runoff from the project site would be reduced to below that of existing conditions, Alternative 4 would not result in an exceedance of the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. Furthermore, the proposed basins would treat stormwater prior to discharge, ensuring operation of Alternative 4 would not provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. In addition, Alternative 4 would reduce the amount of irrigated turf from 125 acres to 62 acres, with a corresponding reduction in the volume of fertilizers and pesticides required for golf course maintenance. This reduction in fertilizers and pesticide use would correspondingly minimize the amount of nitrate and chemicals introduced to the project site with the potential to enter stormwater runoff compared to existing conditions. Therefore, project operation would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. This impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-21 through 4.9-22, 6-60.)

5. Flooding

Threshold: Would the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would impede or redirect flood flows?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, 4.9-24 through 4.9-25, 6-60.)

Explanation: **Flooding.** The majority of the project site, including all developed areas, is located within Zone X, defined as an area of minimal flood hazard. The project site contains Zone AE flood zones and regulatory floodways along Bell Canyon Creek and Devereaux Creek. The coastline along the southern project site boundary is designated as Zone VE. All proposed structures would be located outside of designated special flood hazard areas. Therefore, proposed development would not impede or redirect flood flows onsite. Furthermore, because Alternative 4 would direct stormwater flows similar to existing conditions, the introduction of fill material for Alternative 4 would not substantially alter offsite flooding or drainage.

While Alternative 4 involves removal of a culvert within the Devereaux Creek floodway, these changes would not impede or redirect flood flows but improve Devereaux Creek's flow conditions. Pursuant to Section 15.10.210(a) of the City's Municipal Code, the project applicant would be required to provide certification from a registered professional engineer to the City Engineer or designee that Alternative 4 would not increase the flood levels of the base flood discharged to Devereaux Creek. Accordingly, the proposed culvert removal would not increase flood flows in Devereaux Creek. The proposed free-standing wooden bridge with abutments would be located outside the top of the bank of Devereaux Creek and thus would be located above the Devereaux Creek floodplain and floodway and would not impede or redirect the flood flows of Devereaux Creek.

Because no structures would be placed within designated special flood hazard areas and the proposed culvert removal within the Devereaux Creek floodway would improve Devereaux Creek's flow conditions, Alternative 4 would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would impede or redirect flood flows. This impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.9-24, 6-60 through 6-61.)

Sea Level Rise. As a result of the Supreme Court decision regarding the assessment of the environment's impacts on projects (*California Building Industry Association [CBIA] v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District [BAAQMD]*, 62 Cal. 4th 369 [No. S 213478] issued December 17, 2015), it is not considered the purview of the CEQA process to evaluate the impact of environmental conditions on a proposed project. CEQA is concerned with analyzing, disclosing, and minimizing through mitigation measures the potential environmental impacts caused by a proposed project, but does not mandate the analysis of the potential for existing or future environmental conditions to result in impacts on a proposed project. Sea level rise is an environmental condition; therefore, this discussion of sea level rise is provided solely for informational purposes.

It is unlikely that sea level rise would have a substantial influence within the floodplains and regulatory floodways on the project site, given that both Bell Canyon Creek and Devereaux Creek have relatively steep water surface profile gradients adjacent to the project site. With a sea level rise of 6.6 feet, coastal flooding would be limited to the Bell Canyon area and the southwestern portion of the golf course, as most of the project site is elevated on an existing bluff above existing and projected future wave limits. A 6.6-foot sea level rise is projected to result in bluff erosion and retreat that could move the existing bluffs north such that they align parallel, and in some areas encroach upon, the southern portions of fairways on the golf course. Bluff retreat is not projected to reach any proposed on-site structures. A 6.6-foot sea level rise is also projected to result in shoreline retreat and erosion at Bell Canyon wash and the southwestern portion of the golf course. The bluff-adjacent golf course holes can remain functional while accommodating bluff retreat, and there is room within the golf course to accommodate alterations to the course in response to bluff retreat.

Overall, the project site would not be subject to substantial flooding due to sea level rise, and the golf course could accommodate future bluff retreat. (Draft EIR, 4.9-24 through 4.9-25, 6-60.)

6. Flood Hazard

Threshold: In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the Project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-25 through 4.9-26, 6-60.)

Explanation: Due to the absence of a large body of water, such as a reservoir, in proximity to the project site, the project site is not subject to inundation from seiche. The project site is not located within a dam inundation area.

The majority of the project site, including all developed areas, is located within Zone X, defined as an area of minimal flood hazard. The project site contains Zone AE flood zones and regulatory floodways along Bell Canyon Creek and Devereaux Creek. An area of the western project site containing a putting green and the Bell Canyon open space area is designated as a Tsunami Hazard Area. All proposed structures would be located outside of designated special flood hazard areas and tsunami hazards area, including the maintenance facility, which would store the majority of hazardous materials onsite. Hazardous materials would be stored in accordance with the requirements of the Santa Barara Public Health Department's Consolidated Unified Program Agency Hazardous Material Division and the Santa Barbara County Agriculture Commissioner. Both agencies conduct regular inspections, require ongoing reporting, annual employee training, and provide oversight regarding the proper storage of hazardous materials to prevent the release of such materials. Adherence to storage requirements would minimize the risk of release of stored hazardous materials.

Because no structures are proposed within flood or tsunami hazard areas and because hazardous materials stored on-site would both be outside the inundation areas and stored in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements, Alternative 4 would not risk the release of pollutants from project structures due to inundation. This impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-25 through 4.9-26, 6-60.)

7. Water Quality Control Plan

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-26 through 4.9-27, 6-60.)

Explanation: **Operation.** Operation of Alternative 4 would not include activities that could release asbestos or lead-based materials or require groundwater dewatering or additional work within Devereaux Creek. Operation of Alternative 4 would include the use of six bioretention basins to capture and treat stormwater runoff, and the reduction in fertilizer and pesticide use during operation compared to existing conditions would correspondingly reduce the potential for pollutants

to enter Devereaux Creek, thereby resulting in less potential to result in pollutants in excess of water quality objective quantities identified in the Basin Plan and/or cause the beneficial uses of Devereaux Creek identified in the Basin Plan to be reduced. Therefore, impacts during operation would be less than significant.

The project site overlies the Goleta Basin, which is adjudicated and therefore not subject to the requirements of SGMA. GWD's Groundwater Management Plan Goleta Groundwater Basin (2022) serves as the guiding document for GWD to manage groundwater in accordance with the Wright Judgement (GWD 2023). Alternative 4 would not adversely impact groundwater supplies, and Alternative 4 would not interfere with the management of the Basin in accordance with the Wright Judgement. GWD has anticipated adequate water supplies to be available through the year 2040 (GWD 2021). Existing regulatory measures requiring water conservation during times of drought prevent the overdraft of groundwater that GWD would use to supply the demand induced by Alternative 4. Furthermore, Alternative 4 would reduce the current on-site water demand. Therefore, impacts related to conflicts with or obstruction of a sustainable groundwater management plan would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-26 through 4.9-27, 6-60.)

K. LAND USE AND PLANNING

1. Established Communities

Threshold: Would the Project physically divide an established community?

Finding: No impact. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.10-6, 6-61.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 would consist of renovation of the Sandpiper Golf Club and would not include new components, such as roads, that could physically divide an established community. Alternative 4 would improve local connectivity through the construction of sidewalks and bicycle path extension along Hollister Avenue. There would be no impact.

The project site is primarily surrounded by open space land uses, with the Pacific Ocean to the south, Haskell's Beach to the west, and Santa Barbara Shores Park to the east. Residential land uses are located across Hollister Avenue to the northeast and north, and are not directly adjacent to the project site.

Alternative 4 includes renovation of the Sandpiper Golf Club to provide an improved golf course, clubhouse, maintenance facility,

and comfort station, as well as adaptive reuse of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. Alternative 4 would construct a sidewalk east of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station to connect with an existing sidewalk at the northeast project site boundary that provides access to Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve; stripe a crosswalk across Hollister Avenue to provide coastal connectivity for residences on the north side of Hollister Avenue; and construct a Class I bicycle path within the Hollister Avenue right-of-way. Furthermore, the project includes the dedication of lateral access along the beach frontage on the sand and along Hollister Avenue, and the dedication of five acres of the project site, to the west in the Bell Canyon area, for open space, conservation, and coastal access. Therefore, Alternative 4 would improve connectivity within the local vicinity. Alternative 4 would renovate an existing golf course and does not include any new components (such as new roads) that could divide an established community. Renovation of the project site would not result in the physical division of an established community, and no impact would occur. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.10-6, 6-61.)

L. NOISE

1. Noise Standards

Threshold: Would the project generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.11-13 through 4.11-15, 6-63.)

Explanation: **Stationary.**

HVAC Units. Alternative 4 may include HVAC units on the new building, new café next to the restored Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, and comfort station. The HVAC noise level would be highest at the houses located off Sanderling Lane, with a noise level of 27 dBA. The noise levels would be well below the City's 65 dBA CNEL standard. Due to the large distances between the HVAC units (i.e. 1,900 feet or greater), the additional noise from each HVAC unit would be negligible compared to the closest unit shown in the table and therefore combined noise levels from multiple HVAC units are not displayed.

Pump Station. The pump station, which would be located in the maintenance yard area and near the comfort station, would have noise levels that would be highest at the houses located off

Sanderling Lane, with a noise level of 18 dBA. The noise levels would be well below the City's 65 dBA CNEL standard.

Conversational Noise. Existing conditions at the project site include users of the golf course. Alternative 4 would not decrease the number of golfers on-site, as Alternative 4 would reduce the rounds of golf by incrementally increasing the time between tee-offs. This reduction in rounds would lead to decreasing noise from golfers. However, Alternative 4 would add café users at the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, which may increase conversational noise in the area. Typically, a conversation between two people using a normal voice (not raised) at a distance of three feet is 60 dBA, and a raised voice at a distance of three feet is 66 dBA (Engineering ToolBox 2005). Conversational noise levels would be well below the City's 65 dBA CNEL standard.

Combined Operational Noise Levels. The combined noise levels from HVAC units at the clubhouse, comfort station, and restored Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, pump station equipment at the maintenance yard and comfort station, and conversational noise, would be well below the City's 65 dBA CNEL standard, and below the existing ambient noise levels. Therefore, operational noise from Alternative 4 would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.11-13 through 4.11-15, 6-61 through 6-63.)

Traffic.

Construction. Construction generates temporary worker, vendor, and soil import haul trips, and the number of trips vary by activity phase. Although the extended bike path may require more construction days than Alternative 4, the greatest number of construction vehicle trips would occur during the demolition phase, with 78 one-way trips between worker, vendor, and hauling trips. Noise levels related to Alternative 4's construction trips would increase by less than 0.1 dBA. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not result in a traffic noise increase of 3 dBA or more, and impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.11-16, 6-61 through 6-63.)

Operational Off-Site Traffic Noise.

Operation. Project operation would generate new vehicle trips that would increase noise levels on nearby roadways, such as Hollister Avenue and Cathedral Oaks Road. Noise levels related to the additional trips would increase by only 0.1 dBA. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not result in a traffic noise increase of 3 dBA or more, and impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.11-

16, 6-61 through 6-63.)

2. Vibration

Threshold: Would the project generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.11-17 through 4.11-18, 6-63.)

Explanation: **Construction.** Construction activities known to generate excessive ground-borne vibration, such as pile driving, would not be used for project construction as those activities typically occur when a foundation of a is needed to be at a greater depth than typical projects (e.g., for marine projects or building on unstable soil). The greatest anticipated source of vibration during general project construction activities would potentially be from a vibratory roller.

Construction of the extended bike path under Alternative 4 would move construction equipment closer to residences, with a vibratory roller being potentially used within 30 feet of the residential structures on Elderberry Drive and Pebble Beach Drive,. This would equal a vibration level of approximately 0.17 PPV in/sec. at a distance of 30 feet. This vibration level would be well below the Caltrans vibration damage potential threshold for older structures of 0.5 PPV in/sec for transient sources. Therefore, temporary impacts associated with the vibratory roller (and other potential equipment) to off-site residential structures would be less than significant.

Operation. Operational activities known to generate excessive ground-borne vibration include projects involving railroads and subways. Alternative 4 would not involve substantial vibration sources associated with operation such as this because operation of a golf course does not include these uses. Therefore, Alternative 4's operational groundborne vibration and noise impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.11-17 through 4.11-18, 6-63.)

3. Airport Noise

Threshold: For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.11-18, 6-63.)

Explanation: The project site is located outside the 60 to 65 CNEL noise contour from Santa Barbara Airport, which is approximately 2.6 miles to the west (SBCAG 2023). This would be within the City's "normally acceptable" recommendation for noise levels for golf course uses, which is up to 70 CNEL. Therefore, construction workers building Alternative 4 or workers of the golf course would not be exposed to excessive airport noise levels, and impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.11-18, 6-63.)

M. PUBLIC SERVICES

1. Fire Protection

Threshold: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, or the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.13-8 through 4.13-9, 6-64.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 would not directly or indirectly generate population growth because Alternative 4 does not include residential development and proposed utility extensions would serve only the Sandpiper Golf Club. Alternative 4 would result in approximately 21 additional employees, which could cause indirect growth; however, because these jobs would likely come from the local workforce, it is not expected that people would be required to relocate to Goleta. In a conservative scenario where all projected employees and their families were to relocate to Goleta, there would be a population growth of 55 people, which would raise Goleta's population to 32,570 people. With approximately 214 firefighters, SBCFD provides a ratio of approximately 2.77 firefighters per 2,000 persons within its service population, which is above the City goal of one firefighter on duty 24 hours a day for every 2,000 persons (SBCFD 2023). The addition of 55 people to Goleta would maintain the existing SBCFD ratio of approximately 2.77 firefighters per 2,000 persons and thus not substantially diminish fire protection services such that new fire protection facilities would be needed.

The project site is located approximately 1.7 miles from County Station 11 and thus firefighters would be able to readily respond to the demand for fire services at the project site. In addition, Fire Station 10 is planned to be constructed at 7952 Hollister Avenue, north of the project site. Alternative 4 would not change existing on-

site uses but would include a new clubhouse restaurant and the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, the operation of which could increase the demand for fire protection services in the unlikely event of a structure fire. However, proposed structures would be constructed in accordance with the requirements of the California Fire Code which would reduce the potential for fire to occur, thereby reducing the potential demand for fire services at the project site. Fire safety measures and equipment required by the California Fire Code, which would be incorporated into the project design, include use of fire-retardant building materials, inclusion of emergency water infrastructure (fire hydrants and sprinkler systems), and installation of smoke detectors and fire extinguishers.

The planned Fire Station 10, which has already undergone environmental review, would address existing service levels for fire protection facilities in Goleta and would help the SBCFD achieve their goal of 1 firefighter per 2,000 residents. Furthermore, SBCFD has indicated Alternative 4 would not pose a substantial constraint on fire department resources in the surrounding community (Tan 2025). Thus, the addition of Alternative 4 within the SBCFD service area would not result in substantial deficiencies to fire protection services. In addition, pursuant to Chapter 17.70 of the Municipal Code, the project applicant would be required to pay development impact fees which would provide funding for expanded fire protection facilities, including environmental compliance and permitting for new facilities. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not substantially increase the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts and impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.13-8 through 4.13-9, 6-64.)

2. Police Protection

Threshold: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities, or the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.13-9, 6-64.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 would require approximately 21 additional employees, which could cause indirect growth; however, because these jobs would likely come from the local workforce, it is not expected that people would be required to relocate to Goleta. In a conservative

scenario, Alternative 4 could result in a population growth of 55 people. This population growth represents less than one percent of Goleta's existing population, which is not anticipated to substantially alter the existing service ratios provided by the contracted Deputy Service Units such that an additional officer would be required in order to provide adequate public services. Furthermore, Alternative 4 does not include land use changes which would allow development such as housing that could require substantial additional police services. Alternative 4 would include a new clubhouse restaurant and the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, which may increase the need for police services at the project site. However, these features would marginally increase the use of the project site and would not require constant security. In addition, pursuant to Chapter 17.70 of the Municipal Code, the project applicant would be required to pay development impact fees which would provide funding for expanded police facilities, including environmental compliance and permitting for new facilities. Furthermore, the Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Office City has stated Alternative 4 would not require the addition of new or expanded police facilities to provide adequate services to Goleta (Rivas 2025). Thus, Alternative 4 would not be expected to result in substantial additional police services or the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Alternative 4 would have a less than significant impact on police protection services. (Draft EIR, p. 4.13-9, 6-64.)

3. Schools

Threshold: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered schools, or the need for new or physically altered schools, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.13-9 through 4.13-10, 6-64.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 would not directly generate population growth that would increase the number of students in GUSD or SBUSD because Alternative 4 does not include residential uses. Alternative 4 would require approximately 21 additional employees, which could cause indirect growth; however, because these jobs would likely come from the local workforce, it is not expected that people would be required to relocate to Goleta. In a conservative scenario, Alternative 4 could result in a population growth of 55 people which would require approximately 21 residential units based on the City's average persons per household of 2.59 (California Department of Finance

2024). Using a student generation factor of 0.2 students per residential unit per school district, Alternative 4 could generate approximately 4 students in GUSD and 4 students in SBUSD from indirect population growth (City of Goleta 2006a).

Alternative 4 would not cause GUSD or SBUSD schools to exceed capacity, thereby necessitating the construction of a new classroom. Regardless, Alternative 4 would be required to pay state-mandated developer fees to fund the construction of school facilities to accommodate students generated from new development projects. Pursuant to Section 65995(3)(h) of the California Government Code (Senate Bill 50, chaptered August 27, 1998), the payment of statutory fees pursuant to California Education Code 17620 "...is deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts of any legislative or adjudicative act, or both, involving, but not limited to, the planning, use, or development of real property, or any change in governmental organization or reorganization."

Because Alternative 4 would not substantially increase the amount of students in GUSD or SBUSD such that new or physically altered school facilities would be needed, impacts to schools would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.13-9 through 4.13-10, 6-64.)

4. Parks

Threshold: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered park facilities, need for new or physically altered park facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.12-5 through 4.12-6, 6-63.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 would not directly generate population growth because the Alternative 4 does not include residential development and proposed utility extensions would serve only the Sandpiper Golf Club. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not result in a need for additional parkland due to direct population growth. Construction workers may utilize adjacent parks and open space during break periods throughout construction of Alternative 4. However, construction would be temporary and the brief and periodic use of park facilities by construction workers would not result in long-term substantial increases in the accelerated deterioration of existing park facilities.

Employment opportunities associated with Alternative 4 may result

in an incremental increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. In a conservative scenario where the approximately 21 additional employees and their families relocated to Goleta, Alternative 4 could result in a population growth of 55 people. This population estimate is conservative as it assumes all additional employees and the families would relocate to Goleta and no existing Goleta residents would be included as part of the 21 additional employees. The addition of up to 55 people would result in a parkland ratio of 16.8 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, which would not be a substantial reduction in parkland available to the residents of Goleta.

Under existing conditions, nearby parks and trails such as Sperling Preserve, Santa Barbara Shores Park, and Haskell's Beach are used by the public. Alternative 4 would not result in substantial population increases such that substantial increased use of existing parks and recreational facilities would occur.

Alternative 4 would not increase the number of golfers or the number or size of special events held at the project site; however, Alternative 3 would increase the number of visitors at the clubhouse restaurant and Rio Grande Coffee Shop, which may increase the use of nearby parks and trails. Alternative 4's inclusion of a restaurant and coffee shop would result in increased visitors to the project site, which may result in increased use of nearby parks and trails. However, this increase in use would be minimal and would not result in a substantial physical deterioration of recreational uses surrounding the project site.

Ultimately Alternative 4 would expand recreational opportunities in Goleta such that residents have additional options for recreation through the dedication of a lateral access easement for beach access and includes construction of a Class I bicycle path along Hollister Avenue.

Alternative 4 would facilitate access to the Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve and the Pacific Ocean by allowing for a safe and wide path that connects users of the path to multiple vertical and lateral beach access points offsite. Alternative 4 would increase access to recreational facilities. Alternative 4 would not result in substantial deterioration of recreational facilities but more importantly, increase access to the Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve and the Pacific Ocean. Therefore, Alternative 4's impact related to recreational facilities would remain less than significant.

Alternative 4 would not substantially increase the use of existing park and recreational facilities such as Sperling Preserve, Santa Barbara Shores Park, or Haskell's Beach such that a need for new or physically altered park facilities would occur or physical deterioration of existing facilities would occur or be accelerated. Impacts to parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.12-5 through 4.12-6, 6-63 through 6-64.)

5. Other Public Facilities

Threshold: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered public facilities, or the need for new or physically altered public facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.13-11, 6-64.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 would not directly induce direct population growth, and Alternative 4's potential to indirectly result in population growth of approximately 55 people would not place substantial additional demand on library services or inhibit the ability for the Goleta Valley Library to maintain material circulation. Existing offsite library services during the temporary closure of Goleta Valley Library would be able to accommodate Alternative 4's indirect population growth. Once operations at the Goleta Valley Library facility restart, the renovated library facility would be sufficient to accommodate the potential incrementally increased use and circulation needs that may result from indirect population growth due to Alternative 4. In addition, pursuant to Chapter 17.70 of the Municipal Code, the project applicant would be required to pay development impact fees which would provide funding for expanded library facilities, including environmental compliance and permitting for new facilities. Therefore, Alternative 4's impact on the need for new or physically altered libraries would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.13-11, 6-64.)

N. MINERAL RESOURCES

1. Regional, Statewide, and Locally-Important Mineral Resources

Threshold: Would the Project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

Would the Project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

Finding: No impact. (Draft EIR, p. 4.17-2.)

Explanation: The California Geological Survey's Updated Mineral Land Classification Map for Concrete Grade Aggregates in the San Luis Obispo-Santa Barbara Production-Consumption Region, California – South Half indicates the project site is primarily within Mineral Resources Zone 3 (MRZ-3, California Geological Survey 2011). MRZ-3 indicates that mineral resources deposits could be present and further evaluation is required. However, no known mineral resources of value to the region and the residents of the state are present on the project site. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. No impacts to known mineral resources would occur.

The project site does not include any existing mineral extraction activities, and no mineral extraction activities are planned in the City of Goleta. According to the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, the historic Ellwood Oil Field, located west of the project site, is the only extractive industry within the City (City of Goleta 2006). However, this facility ceased operation in 2017. Alternative 4 would not interfere with any oil extraction activities located in the Ellwood Mesa area. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. No impacts to locally important mineral resource recovery sites would occur. (Draft EIR, p. 4.17-2.)

O. RECREATION

1. Increased Use

Threshold: Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.12-5 through 4.12-6, 6-63 through 6-64.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 would not directly generate population growth because Alternative 4 does not include residential development and proposed utility extensions would serve only the Sandpiper Golf Club.

Therefore, Alternative 4 would not result in a need for additional parkland due to direct population growth. Construction workers may utilize adjacent parks and open space during break periods throughout construction of Alternative 4. However, construction would be temporary and the brief and periodic use of park facilities by construction workers would not result in long-term substantial increases in the accelerated deterioration of existing park facilities.

Employment opportunities associated with Alternative 4 may result in an incremental increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. In a conservative scenario where the approximately 21 additional employees and their families relocated to Goleta, Alternative 4 could result in a population growth of 55 people. This population estimate is conservative as it assumes all additional employees and the families would relocate to Goleta and no existing Goleta residents would be included as part of the 21 additional employees. The addition of up to 55 people would result in a parkland ratio of 16.8 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, which would not be a substantial reduction in parkland available to the residents of Goleta.

Under existing conditions, nearby parks and trails such as Sperling Preserve, Santa Barbara Shores Park, and Haskell's Beach are used by the public. Alternative 4 would not result in substantial population increases such that substantial increased use of existing parks and recreational facilities would occur.

Alternative 4 would not increase the number of golfers or the number or size of special events held at the project site; however, Alternative 4 would increase the number of visitors at the clubhouse restaurant and Rio Grande Coffee Shop, which may increase the use of nearby parks and trails. Alternative 4's inclusion of a restaurant and coffee shop would result in increased visitors to the project site, which may result in increased use of nearby parks and trails. However, this increase in use would be minimal and would not result in a substantial physical deterioration of recreational uses surrounding the project site.

Ultimately Alternative 4 would expand recreational opportunities in Goleta such that residents have additional options for recreation through the dedication of a lateral access easement for beach access and includes construction of a Class I bicycle path along Hollister Avenue.

Based on the discussion above, Alternative 4 would not substantially increase the use of existing park and recreational facilities such as

Sperling Preserve, Santa Barbara Shores Park, or Haskell's Beach such that a need for new or physically altered park facilities would occur or physical deterioration of existing facilities would occur or be accelerated. Impacts to parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.12-5 through 4.12-6, 6-63 through 6-64.)

2. Construction and Expansion

Threshold: Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.12-6, 6-63 through 6-64.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 involves modifications and routing revisions to an existing 18-hole golf course, as well as modifications to on-site facilities. Alternative 4 also includes construction of sidewalks along Hollister Avenue to improve access to Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve, construction of a Class I bicycle path along Hollister Avenue, and dedication of lateral access along beach frontage on the sand and along Hollister Avenue to improve coastal access to Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve and Haskell's Beach. Alternative 4 would not result in substantial deterioration of recreational facilities and furthermore would not necessitate new or expanded recreational facilities in addition to Alternative 4's proposed recreational improvements. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not result in adverse physical effects on the environment due to new or expanded recreational facilities beyond the recreational improvements evaluated throughout this EIR. This impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.12-6, 6-63 through 6-64.)

P. POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. Population Growth and Displacement of Housing

Threshold: Would the Project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of road or other infrastructure)?

Would the Project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; and displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Finding: No impact. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.17-2 through 4.17-3.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 would not construct new housing or extend roads. While Alternative 4 would extend utility infrastructure to the new clubhouse, comfort station, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop, these extensions would serve only Alternative 4. Accordingly, Alternative 4 would not lead to direct growth due to residential development or indirect growth due to road or infrastructure extensions into undeveloped portions of Goleta. Alternative 4 would result in approximately 21 additional employees, which could cause indirect growth; however, given the size of the city workforce and the relatively small number of jobs being created, these jobs would likely come from the local workforce. As such, it is not expected that people would relocate to Goleta because of Alternative 4. However, in a conservative scenario where all projected employees and their families were assumed to relocate to Goleta, there would be a population growth of 55 people,¹ which would raise Goleta's population to approximately 32,570 people (California Department of Finance 2024). This population growth would account for approximately 2.5 percent of the total anticipated growth in Goleta by 2050. This growth would not exceed the Santa Barbara County Association of Government's 2050 population forecast of 34,700 (Santa Barbara County Association of Government 2019). Therefore, Alternative 4's potential to result in population growth is accounted for in regional growth forecasts, and Alternative 4 would not result in substantial unplanned population growth. Impacts related to population growth would be less than significant.

In addition, the project site is currently developed with the Sandpiper Golf Club, which does not include residential uses. Construction of Alternative 4 would not displace people or housing. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing. No impacts related to displacement of people or housing would occur. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.17-2 through 4.17-3.)

Q. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC

1. Plans, Policies, and Ordinances

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 6-64.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 would not include elements that would conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Alternative 4 would add the proposed bicycle parking spaces and bicycle entrance to the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, and would include an extended bicycle path from Cathedral Oaks Road to Pebble Beach Drive, and would therefore provide additional facilities for bicycle and pedestrian travel. Alternative 4 would directly further the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, which identifies a need for the proposed multi-use pathway (City of Goleta 2018), and would thus result in full consistency with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan's goals and policies when compared to the proposed project. Furthermore, through the extension of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure that connects to an existing region-serving Class I bicycle path, Alternative 4 would further Policies VH 3.5 (Pedestrian-Oriented Design), TE 1.1 (Alternative Modes), TE 2.3 (Diversion of Automobile Trips to Alternative Modes), and TE 10.4 (Pedestrian Facilities in New Development) to a greater extent than the proposed project because Alternative 4 would encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation, such as walking and bicycles. The design for Alternative 4's proposed driveways would be subject to review and approval by the City and SBCFD which would minimize the potential for vehicle to pedestrian and vehicle to cyclist conflicts. Alternative 4 would result in temporary lane, bicycle route, or sidewalk closures on Hollister Avenue and would include roadway impediments on Hollister Avenue during construction. Alternative 4 would require the same amount of employees as the proposed project, which would not substantially interfere with Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District operations. Accordingly, Alternative 4's construction impact related to conflicts with transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 6-64.)

2. VMT

Threshold: Would the Project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines sections 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-64 through 6-65.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 would reduce golf rounds from an average of 35,368 rounds per year to approximately 32,000 rounds per year (a reduction of approximately 3,368 rounds, or 9.5 percent) due to an increase in the time between tee-offs, which would reduce the amount of vehicle trips and associated VMT generated by golfers to get to and from the project site to utilize the golf course and pro shop

compared to existing conditions. The Sandpiper Golf Course currently hosts approximately 40 special events per year, and Alternative 4 would only provide upgraded facilities for these events, but would not affect the size or number of events currently held at the golf course and special events would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Accordingly, Alternative 4 would not result in any VMT increases related to special events. The City's VMT Guidelines state that the threshold of significance for VMT impacts for non-residential and non-work projects is any net increase in City VMT. The baseline City VMT metrics utilized as defaults within the City's VMT analysis tools is based, in part, on existing VMT at Sandpiper Golf Course. Given that the overall use of the golf course, a recreational use, would decrease, the continued use of the golf course would not contribute to an increase in VMT.

Retail units on the project site would include the proposed restaurant in the clubhouse and the proposed Rio Grande Coffee Shop. These are appropriate for use in evaluating Alternative 4's potential VMT impacts as these facilities would serve the public in addition to golfers and therefore are representative of the proposed facilities which have potential to result in VMT increases. The proposed clubhouse would result in a net increase of 5,433 square feet in restaurant space and the proposed Rio Grande Coffee Shop would result in a net increase of 1,905 square feet in restaurant space. The total net increase in retail space would be 7,338 square feet, which is less than the 10,000 square foot threshold for screening potential VMT impacts. The clubhouse restaurant and Rio Grande Coffee Shop would be accessible to the public in addition to golfers and therefore would serve the local community. These facilities are not large national restaurant chains, are not located in major commercial centers that attract regional clientele, and are not sized to serve a customer base that extends beyond the local community. Thus, these facilities are considered locally serving to the residents in the Goleta area.

Because Alternative 4 would decrease the number of golf rounds per year available for golfers, the use of the golf course and pro shop would not contribute to an increase in VMT. Because the proposed retail components of the project (clubhouse restaurant and Rio Grande Coffee Shop) would be both locally serving and be less than 10,000 square feet, Alternative 4 would result in a less than significant VMT impact in accordance with the City VMT Guidelines. Therefore, Alternative 4 would have a less than significant impact on VMT and would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b). (Draft EIR, pp. 6-64 through 6-65.)

3. Design Hazards

Threshold: Would the Project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.14-12, 6-65.)

Explanation: During construction of Alternative 4, equipment staging would occur on-site and construction personnel would park on-site, which would minimize the potential for construction related vehicles and equipment to disrupt the immediate area. Alternative 4 would include construction in the right-of-way of Hollister Avenue and therefore would result in roadway impediments on Hollister Avenue. Alternative 4 would include the same driveway configuration as the proposed project which would be designed in accordance with all applicable SBCFD standards to minimize line-of-sight disruptions and hazards between vehicles and pedestrians and vehicles and cyclists. Alternative 4 would not introduce new incompatible uses, such as farm equipment, to roadways, and Alternative 4's uses would be the same as existing on-site uses. Accordingly, Alternative 4's impacts to increased hazards would be less than significant.

Operation of Alternative 4 would not introduce new incompatible uses, such as farm equipment, to roadways, and Alternative 4's uses would be the same as existing on-site uses. Alternative 4's driveway would be designed such that vehicles would have clear line-of-sight entering and exiting the project site which would minimize the potential for vehicle collisions with pedestrians or cyclists. Accordingly, project design would ensure Alternative 4's impacts to increased hazards would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.14-12, 6-65.)

4. Emergency Access

Threshold: Would the Project result in inadequate emergency access?

Finding: No impact. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.14-13 through 4.14-14, 6-65.)

Explanation: During construction, equipment staging would occur on-site and construction personnel would park on-site, which would minimize the potential for construction related vehicles and equipment to result in inadequate emergency access in the immediate area. The proposed improvements on Hollister Avenue would require encroachment into the right-of-way and temporary partial lane closures on Hollister Avenue, which could result in temporary disruptions to access on

Hollister Avenue. Temporary disruptions to access on Hollister Avenue could lead to delays in emergency access to the project site or other areas on Hollister Avenue where emergency services are needed.

In accordance with Chapter 12.02 of the City's Municipal Code, the project applicant would be required to maintain at least one safe crossing for vehicles and must implement measures to minimize disruption to existing traffic conditions. Furthermore, implementation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan would require implementation of traffic control measures and minimization of disruptions to critical access points at the project site for emergency service vehicles during construction on Hollister Avenue, which would be reviewed for potential safety concerns and approved by SBCFD and the Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Office. With implementation of the Construction Traffic Management Plan, proposed construction on Hollister Avenue would not result in inadequate emergency access.

Operation of Alternative 4 would be comparable to existing conditions, which would not result in inadequate emergency access on Hollister Avenue. Furthermore, SBCFD indicated that Alternative 4 would not result in substantial impacts related to access (Tan 2025). Alternative 4 would be required to be designed in accordance with applicable SBCFD standards, including those that address minimum driveway width, signage and addressing, fire hydrants, fire sprinklers, and emergency access. SBCFD and the City would review and approve Alternative 4 design, which would ensure Alternative 4 would provide adequate egress for emergency access. Compliance with applicable development standards would ensure Alternative 4's impacts to inadequate emergency access would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.14-13 through 4.14-14, 6-65.)

R. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Tribal Cultural Resources

Threshold: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or b) A resource determined by the lead agency,

in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.15-7 through 4.15-10, 6-65.)

Explanation: **Operation.** Pursuant to the requirements of AB 52, the City conducted Native American consultation for the proposed project to identify potential concerns or issues associated with Native American cultural resources within the project vicinity. As part of the AB 52 consultation process, the City sent AB 52 consultation request letters to the Barbareño Band of Chumash Indians, the Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians, the Chumash Council of Bakersfield, the Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation, the Northern Chumash Tribal Council, and the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians on February 28, 2024, shortly after the project application was deemed complete. The City received requests from the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians, the Barbareño Band of Chumash Indians, and the Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation, all of which requested to visit the project site. Following a visit to the project site on March 18, 2025, the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians requested that tribal cultural resources mitigation measures be applied to the project requiring that a Chumash representative participate in ground disturbance monitoring, and that project-related construction workers receive Workers Environmental Awareness Program training. Following a visit to the project site on September 5, 2024, the Barbareño Band of Chumash Indians confirmed they are comfortable with the level of the archaeological investigation and the mitigation measures proposed for tribal cultural resources. Multiple efforts to contact the Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation were conducted between August and November 2024, and in May 2025, the City concluded consultation efforts. During the AB 52 consultation process, no tribal cultural resources were identified by the Tribes on the project site.

The City conducted a Sacred Lands File search through the Native American Heritage Commission; results were received on February 13, 2024 and were positive, indicating there is a potential sacred site in the vicinity of the project site. Five prehistoric archaeological sites and one prehistoric isolate were recorded within the project site as part of the Phase I and Extended Phase I Archaeological Resources Assessment Report and determined to be ineligible for the CRHR (Langan 2025). Operation of Alternative 4 would be similar to the

proposed project and existing conditions and impacts would be Class III, less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.15-7 through 4.15-10, 6-65.)

S. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

1. Wastewater Treatment Requirements

Threshold: Would the Project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.16-11 through 4.16-13, 6-66.)

Explanation: **Water.** Proposed water infrastructure improvements include the following:

- Installation of a 4-inch fire water service with backflow that would connect existing GWD infrastructure in Hollister Avenue to the proposed clubhouse;
- Relocation of a 2-inch potable water meter from the maintenance yard to serve the clubhouse;
- Connection of the new comfort station's restroom water service to potable water lines;
- Installation of a new, 1-inch water service that would connect existing GWD infrastructure in Hollister Avenue to the Rio Grande Coffee Shop; and
- Relocation of an existing 6-inch recycled water meter for golf course irrigation in front of the maintenance facility.

The aging irrigation system associated with the existing golf course would be removed and replaced, which would improve the efficiency of the irrigation system and reduce water usage. Additionally, a smart irrigation controller system would be implemented to manage irrigation usage, supported by an on-site weather station.

Alternative 4's water demand would be 150.7 AFY less than the water demand under existing conditions. Accordingly, Alternative 4 would not generate substantial water demand that would necessitate new or expanded water facilities in order to meet the demand anticipated by Alternative 4. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not

require new or expanded water facilities beyond the improvements evaluated throughout the Draft EIR. This impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.6-11, 6-66.)

Wastewater. Proposed wastewater infrastructure improvements include the following:

- Installation of a private, 6-inch gravity sewer lateral that would connect the proposed clubhouse to existing GWSD infrastructure in Hollister Avenue;
- Installation of a grinder pump station and 1.25-inch force main lateral that would connect the new golf course comfort station to existing GWSD infrastructure along the eastern boundary of the property;
- Installation of a private, 6-inch sewer lateral that would connect the Rio Grande Coffee Shop to existing GWSD infrastructure in Hollister Avenue;
- Utilize and extend the existing private, 6-inch sewer lateral to serve the proposed cart wash and maintenance facilities; and
- Abandonment of the existing septic systems that serve the clubhouse and comfort station.

Alternative 4 would require a change to GWSD's Sphere of Influence to include the clubhouse, Rio Grande Coffee Shop, and comfort station. This change would not necessitate additional wastewater conveyance infrastructure beyond what is proposed and evaluated throughout the Draft EIR.

GWSD has sufficient available capacity at the GSD WWTP to treat the anticipated wastewater generated by Alternative 4. Accordingly, new wastewater treatment facilities would not be required to accommodate Alternative 4's anticipated wastewater demand. Alternative 4 would not require new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities beyond the wastewater infrastructure improvements evaluated throughout the Draft EIR. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.6-12, 6-66.)

Stormwater. Most of the project site is self-treating, due to substantial existing on-site landscaping and the minimal amount of impervious surfaces. Alternative 4 would include the development of six bioretention basins which would treat and discharge water onto the golf course. The proposed stormwater drainage facilities would

be sized such that post-project peak runoff would be less than pre-project peak runoff for the 100-year flood event. Because the proposed stormwater drainage facilities would allow for stormwater filtration and onsite infiltration, no additional stormwater infrastructure would be needed beyond the stormwater infrastructure included as part of Alternative 4. As a result, Alternative 4 would not require upgrades to stormwater infrastructure beyond what is evaluated within the Draft EIR. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.6-12, 6-66.)

Electric, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications Facilities. Alternative 4 includes the undergrounding of overhead power and telecommunications lines via a joint trench that would run parallel to Hollister Avenue across the northern project site boundary. SCE and SCG would have sufficient electricity and natural gas supplies for Alternative 4, and Alternative 4 would not place a substantial demand on electricity and natural gas supplies due to wasteful energy consumption such that new or expanded off-site electrical or natural gas infrastructure would be needed. Similarly, Alternative 4 would use existing telecommunications facilities during operation and would not require upgrades to existing facilities or create a demand for service unable to be met by existing providers. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.16-13, 6-66.)

2. Water Supplies

Threshold: Would the Project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Finding: No impact. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.16-13 through 4.16-14, 6-66.)

Explanation: The project site, under existing conditions, has a gross water demand of approximately 302.3 AFY. Alternative 4 would result in a gross water demand of approximately 151.6 AFY, or 150.7 AFY less than the gross water demand under existing conditions (a 49 percent reduction). This reduction in demand is primarily a result of the 63-acre reduction in irrigated turf on-site. Furthermore, the aging irrigation system would be removed and replaced, which would improve the efficiency of the irrigation system and reduce water usage. Similar to the existing irrigation system, the new irrigation system would continue to use recycled water and would consist of a combination of drip, rotor, or drip/rotor irrigation. Additionally, a smart irrigation controller system would be implemented to manage irrigation usage, supported by an on-site weather station. New turf installed would be drought-tolerant and landscaping on-site would

consist of native and coastal appropriate plants, which would reduce water usage. Under existing conditions, approximately 86 percent of irrigation used for the golf course is recycled water. Alternative 4 would continue to use a mix of recycled water and potable water for irrigation to minimize the demand of potable water for golf course irrigation. In addition, Alternative 4 includes a recycled water system at the maintenance facility. To minimize water use in restroom facilities, Alternative 4 would install low-flow fixtures and toilets consistent with the California Plumbing Code. These features would further reduce water use at the project site.

Furthermore, Alternative 4's water demand from on-site structures (i.e., proposed clubhouse, maintenance building, comfort station, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop) would be approximately 2.8 AFY, which is within the potable historic water credit of 3.3 AFY for the project site as determined by GWD. GWD reviewed Alternative 4 and issued a Preliminary Water Service Determination Letter, stating that GWD has sufficient water available to support Alternative 4. In addition, when required by the GWD Board of Directors or District General Manager, the project applicant would be required to adhere to the water shortage restrictions during stages of drought, as set forth in Goleta Water District Code Chapter 6.21.

Given that Alternative 4 would result in an overall reduction in water use at the project site, Alternative 4 would have sufficient water supplies available in normal, dry, and multiple dry years. No impact would occur. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.16-13 through 4.16-14, 6-66.)

3. Wastewater Capacity

Threshold: Would the Project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.16-14 through 4.16-15, 6-66.)

Explanation: Employees and visitors at the project site would generate wastewater that would flow into GWSD's conveyance system and be treated at the WWTP. Currently, the wastewater inflow to the WWTP is approximately 5.01 MGD, leaving approximately 2.63 MGD of capacity available until the WWTP's permitted capacity is reached. GWSD is entitled to receive approximately 0.93 MGD more wastewater flows than what GWSD customers currently produce (McCarthy 2025). Alternative 4's anticipated wastewater generation is calculated consistent with the

wastewater generation factor of 100 gallons per day per 1,000 square feet of habitable space used in the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Final EIR (City of Goleta 2006).

Under existing conditions, employees at the maintenance facility generate approximately 0.0008 MGD (760 gallons per day) of wastewater collected and treated by GWSD. Alternative 4 would generate approximately 0.005 MGD (4,603 gallons per day) of wastewater. Therefore, Alternative 4 would result in a 0.005 MGD net increase in wastewater flows compared to existing conditions. A 0.005 MGD increase in wastewater flows represents approximately 0.5 percent of the 0.93 MGD capacity available for GWSD customers. The existing WWTP capacity would be sufficient to accept wastewater generated by Alternative 4. Therefore, Alternative 4 would be adequately served by the existing capacity of the GSD WWTP, and this impact would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.16-14 through 4.16-15, 6-66.)

4. Solid Waste and Solid Waste Laws

Threshold: (i) Would the Project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

(ii) Will the Project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.16-15 through 4.16-18, 6-66.)

Explanation: **Operation.** The generation of solid waste from operation of project components are calculated with the following generation rates from the County's 2024 Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual:

- Golf clubhouse restaurant, comfort station, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop: Eating and Drinking Establishment (0.0115 multiplied by the square footage of a project)
- Golf clubhouse (excluding the restaurant): General Retail and Miscellaneous Services (0.0057 multiplied by the square footage of a project).
- Maintenance facility: Warehouse (0.0016 multiplied by the square footage of a project).

Based on these factors, under existing conditions, the project site generates approximately 75 tons of solid waste per year. Alternative

4 would result in gross 286 tons of solid waste generated per year. 2 Therefore, Alternative 4 would increase solid waste generation at the project site by 211 tons annually compared to existing conditions, which would be reduced to 105.5 tons per year with a 50 percent solid waste diversion rate. This amount of solid waste does not exceed the City's project-specific threshold of 196 tons per year. As a result, operation of Alternative 4 would not result in excessive solid waste generation and would comply with solid waste management and reduction statutes. Therefore, Alternative 4's impacts related to solid waste from operation would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.16-15 through 4.16-18, 6-66.)

T. WILDFIRE

1. Response Plans, Exacerbation of Wildfire Risks, Infrastructure Risks

Threshold: If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the Project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Would the project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, or thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuelbreak, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risks or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding, landslides, mud flows, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Finding: Less than significant. (Draft EIR, pages 4.17-3 through 4.17-5, 6-66)

Explanation: The project site would primarily consist of golf course turf, and the project would add native plants for landscaping purposes, both of which would have a low fire risk. Alternative 4 would not substantially change the slope, winds, or other factors such that wildfire risks would be exacerbated. Alternative 4 would maintain the current land use of the site (golf course) and would not add new ignition sources such as campsites or overhead power lines. Alternative 4 would

underground the existing power lines, which would reduce fire risk when compared to existing conditions.

Project components located within High or Very High fire hazard severity zones include the renovated clubhouse, golf course improvements south and west of the clubhouse, and improvements to Hollister Avenue north of the clubhouse. When compared to existing conditions, Alternative 4 would not add new components or intensified development within a fire hazard severity zone. No construction would occur in Bell Canyon, which is the largest area of the project site within a Very High fire hazard severity zone.

During construction, there would be a temporary increase in human activity and potential ignition sources, including equipment that could create sparks, be a source of heat, or leak flammable materials on the project site. In accordance with California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 4442, equipment including earth-moving and portable construction equipment with internal combustion engines would be equipped with spark arrestors to prevent the emission of flammable debris from exhaust, when operating on any forest-covered, brush-covered, or grass-covered land. In addition, PRC Sections 4427 and 4431 specify standards for conducting construction activities on days when a burning permit is required, and PRC Section 4428 requires construction contractors to maintain fire suppression equipment during the highest fire danger period (April 1 to December 1) when operating on or near any forest-covered, brush-covered, or grass-covered land. These measures are designed to prevent accidental ignition and facilitate rapid response in the event of a fire. Adherence to these regulatory requirements would minimize the risk of potential wildland fire during construction.

Project design would be subject to the California Fire Code, which includes safety measures to minimize the threat of fire, including ignition-resistant construction with exterior walls of noncombustible or ignition resistant material from the surface of the ground to the roof system and sealing any gaps around doors, windows, eaves and vents to prevent intrusion by flame or embers, automatic interior and exterior fire sprinklers, a water delivery system, fire apparatus access, and defensible space. Project design would also be required to comply with Chapter 9, Fire Protection Systems, of the California Building Code, which includes specific standards related to exterior wildfire exposure, and California Code of Regulations Title 14, which sets forth the minimum development standards for emergency access, fuel modification, setback, signage, and water supply, which help prevent loss of structures or life by reducing wildfire hazards. In addition, Alternative 4 would be constructed in accordance with the

Santa Barbara County Fire Department's development standards which includes requirements for egress on private driveways, fire hydrant spacing and flow rates, automatic fire sprinkler systems, and automatic alarm systems (Santa Barbara County Fire Department 2022). Adherence to State and local regulations would ensure the installation of infrastructure associated with Alternative 4 would not substantially exacerbate fire risk.

The proposed improvements on Hollister Avenue (identified as an evacuation route under the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan) would require encroachment into the right-of-way and temporary partial lane closures on Hollister Avenue, which could result in temporary disruptions to emergency access through Hollister Avenue. However, in accordance with Chapter 12.02 of the City's Municipal Code, the project applicant would be required to maintain at least one safe crossing for vehicles and must implement measures to minimize disruption to existing traffic conditions. In addition, the project applicant's construction contractor would be required to implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan during construction on Hollister Avenue. The Construction Traffic Management Plan would require implementation of traffic control measures and minimization of disruptions to critical access points at the project site for emergency service vehicles during construction on Hollister Avenue, which would be reviewed for potential safety concerns and approved by SBCFD and the Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Office. Furthermore, adherence to applicable guidance documents such as the City's Emergency Operations Plan (City of Goleta 2021) and the County's Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (County of Santa Barbara 2017) would minimize the potential for Alternative 4 to substantially impair emergency response and emergency evacuation. These documents provide direction for traffic control and management in emergency situations, and Alternative 4 would not preclude implementation of these plans (City of Goleta 2021; County of Santa Barbara 2017). During operation, Alternative 4 would add 21 employees to the project site, and a conservative estimate of 55 people to the city of Goleta. This population growth is accounted for in regional growth forecasts, and thus Alternative 4 would not add substantial, unplanned congestion to local roadways in the event of an evacuation during a wildfire. As a result, Alternative 4 would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan within an SRA or VHFHSZ.

The project site and adjacent areas are relatively flat and do not contain the steep topography necessary to induce substantial landslides or mudflows that would have the potential to result in significant impacts on the project site. In addition, runoff and

drainage changes would be minimized during construction and operation as Alternative 4 would be required to adhere to regulatory requirements which mandate implementation of erosion control measures. Alternative 4 must obtain coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit and implement the provisions of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, including BMPs related to erosion control and sediment release. Alternative 4 must comply with the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board Post-Construction Requirements for Development Projects in the Central Coast Region, which entails submittal of a Stormwater Control Plan. The Stormwater Control Plan would be reviewed and approved by the City which would ensure erosion control measures are implemented during operation (City of Goleta n.d.). As a result, Alternative 4 would not result in substantial runoff, slope-instability, or drainage changes which could lead to post-wildfire flooding, landslides, or mud flows. Impacts related to wildfire would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.17-3 through 4.17-5, 6-66.)

SECTION III.
IMPACTS THAT ARE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION
INCORPORATED

The City Council hereby finds that Mitigation Measures have been identified in the EIR and these Findings that will avoid or substantially lessen the following potentially significant environmental impacts to a less than significant level. The potentially significant impacts, and the Mitigation Measures that will reduce them to a less than significant level, are as follows:

A. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Sensitive Species

Threshold: Would the Project 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-36 through 4.3-51, 6-52.)

Explanation: Construction of Alternative 4 has the potential to result in direct and indirect impacts to special-status plant and wildlife species. No special-status plant species have been documented within or adjacent to the extended bicycle path area, and the potential for their

occurrence is considered low due to the developed nature of the Hollister Avenue right-of-way and the dominance of ornamental and eucalyptus vegetation. However, there remains a limited possibility that previously undetected individuals could occur in small undeveloped patches at the southern edge of the roadway. If present, these could be subject to direct impacts from construction activities or indirect effects such as dust, chemical spills, or changes in water quality. Special-status wildlife species with potential to occur include monarch butterflies, California red-legged frogs, raptors such as Cooper's hawk and white-tailed kite, yellow warblers, and other nesting birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code. While no roosts or nests have been documented within the extended bicycle path area, suitable habitat exists to the south, particularly within eucalyptus groves designated as ESHA. Construction activities could result in temporary disturbances such as noise and human presence, but the alignment of Alternative 4 would avoid core habitat areas and would be confined to previously disturbed edges, reducing the likelihood of significant impacts. Alternative 4 would result in similar direct and indirect impacts to special-status species related to habitat removal and degradation, when compared to the proposed project, and would require Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-10 to reduce potential impacts to special-status plant and wildlife species to a less than significant level.

Special-Status Plant Species

The following special-status plant species were observed on the project site: cliff malacothrix, red sand verbena, Santa Barbara honeysuckle, southern California black walnut, and woolly seablite.

Direct Impacts.

Alternative 4 would involve landscaping and ongoing landscaping maintenance within coyote brush scrub occupied by cliff malacothrix, along the coastal bluffs. Additionally, habitat destruction for Santa Barbara honeysuckle may occur, as the honeysuckle is located adjacent to the proposed water main along the project site's eastern boundary. Potential damage to or removal of cliff malacothrix and Santa Barbara honeysuckle would constitute a potentially significant impact to special-status plant species.

As special-status plant surveys were last conducted in 2022, there is the potential for special-status plant species, such as cliff malacothrix, woolly seablite, and Santa Barbara honeysuckle, to occur in locations where not previously detected at the time of

construction. Ground disturbance or vegetation removal during construction, as well as trenching for the proposed water main from the comfort station to existing water infrastructure along the project site's eastern boundary (where Santa Barbara honeysuckle is located), could consequently result in a potentially significant impact to special-status plants, if such plants have expanded into the proposed disturbance areas.

No special-status plant species have been documented within or adjacent to the extended bicycle path area, and the potential for their occurrence is considered low due to the developed nature of the Hollister Avenue right-of-way and the dominance of ornamental and eucalyptus vegetation. However, there remains a limited possibility that previously undetected individuals could occur in small undeveloped patches at the southern edge of the roadway. If present, these could be subject to direct impacts from construction activities or indirect effects such as dust, chemical spills, or changes in water quality. Special-status wildlife species with potential to occur include monarch butterflies, California red-legged frogs, raptors such as Cooper's hawk and white-tailed kite, yellow warblers, and other nesting birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code. While no roosts or nests have been documented within the extended bicycle path area, suitable habitat exists to the south, particularly within eucalyptus groves designated as ESHA. Construction activities could result in temporary disturbances such as noise and human presence, but the alignment of Alternative 4 would avoid core habitat areas and would be confined to previously disturbed edges, reducing the likelihood of significant impacts. Alternative 4 would result in similar direct and indirect impacts to special-status species related to habitat removal and degradation, when compared to the proposed project, and would require Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-10 to reduce potential impacts to special-status plant and wildlife species to a less than significant level. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-36, 6-51 through 6-52.)

Indirect Impacts

Indirect impacts to special-status plant species may occur during project construction. Indirect impacts would include water quality effects, chemical spills or vehicle leaks near special-status plants, or dust. These impacts would be potentially significant as there is the potential that water quality effects, chemical spills or vehicle leaks, and dust could degrade special-status plant species' habitats such that mortality of special-status plant species occurs. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-37, 6-51 through 6-52.)

Special-Status Wildlife Species

Crotch's Bumble Bee. Focused surveys conducted on the project site in June and July 2025 did not result in the identification of Crotch's bumble bee. If Crotch's bumble bee is present during ground disturbance or vegetation removal during the active season (typically spring to summer), it would likely be able to fly and escape harm. Outside of the active season, the Crotch's bumble bee nests underground, where it would not be seen and at a greater risk of injury or mortality during ground-disturbing activities. Therefore, the possibility of inadvertently damaging a Crotch's bumble bee during project construction activities is present. Grading, trenching, or vegetation removal during project construction could result in loss of individual bees or a nesting Crotch's bumble bee colony and these direct impacts would be potentially significant.

Indirect impacts to Crotch's bumble bee could occur through vehicle maintenance and the potential for chemical leaks or spills outside developed areas to result in contamination that could affect individual Crotch's bumble bees or their habitats. These impacts would be potentially significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-37, 6-51 through 6-52.)**Monarch Butterfly.** Grading, construction of the replacement cart path that leads to a free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek, and sandcapping would occur within the 100-foot Monarch Butterfly Roosting Habitat ESHA buffer. Grading within the ESHA buffer would occur in two areas: a northern area, near the Hole 4 green and a southern area, near the Hole 5 fairway, which is closer to the historic roosting location. Grading and other proposed activities within the buffer are not anticipated to alter the surface hydrology or remove native vegetation that sustains the Monarch Butterfly Roosting Habitat ESHA eucalyptus stands. Proposed activities within the buffer would not introduce new development, but instead would recontour the existing golf course, install new plantings within existing maintained areas, and replace the existing cart pathway and structures. As Alternative 4 would involve trenching adjacent to eucalyptus trees in the Monarch Butterfly Roosting Habitat ESHA, Alternative 4 would have a potentially significant direct impact on monarch butterfly.

Alternative 4 would include construction activities within and adjacent to monarch butterfly/raptor roosting habitat ESHA and riparian/marsh/vernal pool ESHA (as well as their associated 100-foot buffers) along the southern edge of Hollister Avenue. These activities would include grading, paving, and installation of landscaping adjacent to eucalyptus groves designated as ESHA. Although Alternative 4 would not introduce new development into

undisturbed habitat, it would result in minor encroachments into ESHA buffers and potential root zone disturbance. Alternative 4's impacts to ESHA are not anticipated to be greater than those of Alternative 4, because the bike path alignment is confined to previously disturbed areas and involves a low-impact use. While minor encroachment and temporary construction-related effects may occur, they are limited in scale and duration and do not introduce substantial new development into undisturbed habitat. Additionally, Alternative 4 would avoid removal of protected trees and significant impacts to Monarch Butterfly Roosting ESHA where feasible through project design. Furthermore, Alternative 4 would require Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, and BIO-11 to reduce potential impacts related to riparian habitat, ESHA, and wetlands to a less than significant level. Alternative 4's impact related to riparian habitat, ESHA, and aquatic resources would be similar to Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Indirect impacts to monarch butterfly could occur through vehicle maintenance and the potential for chemical leaks or spills outside developed areas to result in contamination that could affect individual monarch butterflies or their habitats. These impacts would be potentially significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-38 through 4.3-39, 6-51 through 6-52.) **Tidewater Goby.** Tidewater goby occurs on the project site within Bell Canyon Creek. Habitat for tidewater goby is absent elsewhere on the project site. Construction-related indirect impacts could include water quality effects in Bell Canyon Creek due to chemical spills or sedimentation from construction activities. These indirect impacts would be potentially significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-39, 6-51 through 6-52.)

California Red-legged Frog. Grading activities have the potential to result in injury or mortality to California red-legged frog should individuals disperse across the golf course during project construction. Additionally, construction-related indirect impacts could include water quality effects, chemical spills in sensitive areas, dust, noise and vibration and construction worker presence, 2 if individual frogs are located on the golf course during project construction. External lighting during project operation would be downcast, low-level lighting outside of ESHA buffers and distant from aquatic habitats. However, construction-related direct impacts and indirect impacts (including water quality effects, chemical spills, dust, and noise or vibration) would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 would reduce potential impacts to special-status plant species by requiring pre-construction

special-status plant surveys and fencing around special-status plant habitat that would ensure avoidance of such habitat during construction activities. Specifically, Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 would reduce potential impacts to special-status plant species, including cliff malacothrix, woolly seablite, and Santa Barbara honeysuckle. Mitigation Measures BIO-3 and BIO-4 would reduce potential impacts to special-status species, both plant and wildlife, by requiring biological monitoring during construction, construction worker environmental awareness training, and implementation of best management practices that would minimize potential impacts to biological resources during construction. Mitigation Measures BIO-3 and BIO-4 would reduce potential impacts to all special-status species included in the analysis above. Mitigation Measures BIO-5 through BIO-10 would reduce potential impacts to special-status wildlife species, including nesting birds, by requiring pre-construction surveys and avoidance measures; monarch butterfly roost protection; and tree protection measures. Mitigation Measure BIO-5 would reduce potential impacts to Crotch's bumble bee. Mitigation Measures BIO-6 and BIO-7 would reduce potential impacts to monarch butterfly. Mitigation Measure BIO-9 would reduce potential impacts to California red-legged frog and southwestern pond turtle. Mitigation Measures BIO-8 and BIO-10 would reduce potential impacts to Cooper's hawk, white-tailed kite, yellow warbler, and other raptor or nesting bird species.

Following the implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-10, Alternative 4's impact involving a substantial adverse effect on special-status species or their habitat would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-39, 6-51 through 6-52.)

Southwestern Pond Turtle. Southwestern pond turtle may occur in Bell Canyon Creek, upland habitat in Bell Canyon, or the golf course while dispersing to nest or take temporary shelter during winter. The golf course pond provides suitable aquatic habitat; however, the relatively steep slopes at the edge of the golf course and impenetrable emergent vegetation near the mouth of Bell Canyon Creek may deter southwestern pond turtle from entering the golf course. Nevertheless, there is a possibility that southwestern pond turtle may be present on the golf course at the time of construction, and consequently could suffer injury or mortality from construction vehicles or equipment during proposed grading activities. Indirect impacts to southwestern pond turtle, should it occur on or adjacent to the golf course during project construction, could include water quality effects, chemical spills in sensitive areas, inadvertent destruction of habitats from construction equipment,

dust, and noise and vibration. Therefore, construction-related direct impacts and indirect impacts (including water quality effects, chemical spills, dust, and noise or vibration) would be potentially significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-39 through 4.3-40, 6-51 through 6-52)

Cooper's Hawk, White-Tailed Kite, and Other Raptor Species.

Cooper's hawk and white-tailed kite have been observed on the project site, and American peregrine falcon has been observed from the project site. Nests of these species, as well as nests of common raptor species such as red-tailed hawk, are considered ESHA pursuant to the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 8.1 (City of Goleta 2006). Alternative 4 would not include activities within 200 feet of historic nests for either Cooper's hawk and white-tailed kite, and would avoid impacts involving ESHA or ESHA buffers for special-status raptor nest sites. The proposed replacement cart path would occur near recent nesting locations for red-tailed hawk, and construction associated with the replacement cart path could result in red-tailed hawk nest disturbance due to noise, vibration, and human presence during construction if it occurs within the nesting bird season. If raptor species are nesting on the project site at the time of grading or other project-related construction activities, disturbance to nesting, including nest abandonment and mortality of fledglings, could occur due to noise, vibration, and human presence during construction. Therefore, construction-related impacts would be potentially significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-40, 6-51 through 6-52.)

Yellow Warbler and Other Special-Status Bird Species. Yellow warbler has been detected on the project site and suitable habitat for this special-status species occurs along Bell Canyon Creek and Devereux Creek. However, the suitable habitat along Bell Canyon Creek does not occur within 400 feet of grading, construction activities, or other project activities that could result in disturbance to yellow warblers, and no direct impacts would occur. Grading would occur within approximately 50 feet of suitable habitat at Devereux Creek; if grading occurs during the nesting season when yellow warblers are present, it could result in disturbance to nesting yellow warblers due to noise, vibration, and human presence during construction. Other special-status bird species with potential to occur on the project site, including American white pelican, California brown pelican, redhead, and yellow-headed blackbird, could also undergo nest disturbance should construction activities occur near active nests for these species. Therefore, construction-related indirect impacts would be potentially significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-49, 6-51 through 6-52)

MM BIO-1

Pre-Construction Special-Status Plant Survey and Avoidance

Prior to the start of construction activities, a City-approved, qualified biologist (retained by the project applicant) shall conduct a pre-construction special-status plant survey within 50-feet of the areas of proposed ground disturbance (including landscaping activities). The survey shall be conducted at the appropriate season, and in appropriate habitat, for identifying potentially occurring special-status plant species, including cliff malacothrix, woolly seablite, and Santa Barbara honeysuckle. The special-status plant survey shall be conducted in conformance with the California Native Plant Society Botanical Survey Guidelines (CNPS 2001), Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities (CDFW 2018), and the USFWS's General Rare Plant Survey Guidelines (Cypher 2002). Reference sites shall be visited to document if target species are detectable prior to the special-status plant survey. If special-status plant species are encountered within 50 feet of project activities, the qualified biologist shall flag a minimum 50-foot buffer around all known locations to avoid potential impacts to seed banks and microhabitats that support the species. The buffers shall be flagged for avoidance prior to the start of construction activities. Any habitat area supporting special-status plants shall be considered ESHA, and appropriate setbacks shall be established within which no construction activities may occur and no landscaping may occur that will result in removal of or harm to rare plants. If construction has not commenced within two years of the most recent plant survey, the special-status plant survey shall be repeated prior to the start of construction. The qualified biologist shall submit a summary of the survey results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to initiation of construction activities, including landscaping activities.

If ground disturbing activities must occur within the established buffer, the topsoil (top 6 inches) in the disturbance areas shall be salvaged for any plant species with a California Rare Plant Rank of 1A to 2B. Salvaged topsoil shall be stored in temporary stockpiles and replaced in the same location following ground disturbance completion. If replacement in the same location is not feasible, the stockpiles shall be placed in the same vegetation community that currently supports the special-status plant species.

Plan Requirements and Timing. The qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction special-status plant survey and submit a

summary of the pre-construction special-status plant survey results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, within two years prior to the start of construction activities, including landscaping activities. If special-status plant species are detected, the qualified biologist shall flag an appropriate avoidance buffer prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.

Monitoring: The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the survey results and keep the results on file with the City. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall conduct periodic spot checks to ensure that construction does not occur within the buffer during construction.

MM BIO-2

Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Fencing and Protection

Prior to initiation of construction activities, the project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to delineate all ESHA, aquatic resources, and required setbacks with temporary construction fencing and/or flagging and signage. The fencing shall serve as a visual boundary for construction personnel and be maintained throughout the duration of construction. The construction contractor shall ensure that construction personnel and equipment do not enter the setback areas during the duration of construction activities. No non-native or invasive plant species that have a potential to displace or alter sensitive vegetation communities or vegetation communities supporting sensitive species shall be planted within ESHA or ESHA buffers. Areas protected under this measure shall include sensitive coastal sage scrub and coastal bluff scrub communities, riparian habitats associated with Devereux Creek, coastal wetlands, native grasslands, open water associated with the golf course pond, areas supporting special-status plant species, and aquatic resources. Unless otherwise authorized, the setbacks shall be as follows:

- Sensitive scrub communities: 25 feet
- Riparian vegetation: 100 feet unless otherwise authorized
- Coastal wetlands: 100 feet
- Native grasslands: 10 feet
- Monarch roost: 100 feet
- Aquatic resources and open water: 100 feet unless otherwise authorized

No grading, vehicles or heavy machinery, or construction shall be permitted within the setbacks, unless reduced setbacks are approved by the City for specific activities and locations. No grading, sand capping, vehicles, heavy machinery, or construction activities shall be permitted within any ESHA at any time, unless these activities are covered under compensatory mitigation described in Mitigation Measure BIO-11.

Plan Requirements and Timing. The project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to delineate all ESHA and required setbacks with temporary construction fencing and/or flagging and signage prior to the start of construction activities.

Monitoring: The qualified biologist and construction contractor shall provide evidence of ESHA delineation and BMP installation to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to the start of construction. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall conduct periodic spot checks to ensure that construction does not occur within the buffer during construction.

MM BIO-3

Biological Monitoring and Worker Education

Prior to initiation of construction activities, the project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist familiar with special-status plant and wildlife species with the potential to occur in the project work area. The qualified biologist shall be present on-site daily during grading and vegetation removal. The monitor shall be responsible for the following:

- Ensure that procedures for verifying compliance with biological resource mitigation measures are followed.
- Lines of communication and reporting methods.
- Guiding the construction contractor in marking/flagging construction area limits.
- Conducting construction crew Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training.
- Authority to stop non-emergency work.
- Action to be taken in the event of non-compliance.

- Conducting daily wildlife clearance surveys prior to any grading, turf removal, other vegetation removal.
- Inspecting ESHA fencing around sensitive habitats.
- Preparing monitoring summaries of special-status species' presence, or the lack thereof, on the project site during grading or vegetation removal.

All construction personnel shall attend a WEAP training conducted by the qualified biologist prior to commencement of construction activities. The construction contractor(s) shall be responsible for ensuring that all new personnel receive the training after construction is initiated. The WEAP shall include a description of a special-status species potentially present in the area, jurisdictional habitats present proximate to the Project site, information on sensitive habitats to be avoided, and specific measures that shall be implemented to protect special-status species. Special-status plant species addressed in the WEAP training shall include, at a minimum, cliff malacothrix, red sand verbena, Santa Barbara honeysuckle, Southern California black walnut, and woolly seablite. Species-status wildlife species addressed in the WEAP, at a minimum, shall include California red-legged frog, tidewater goby, monarch butterfly, Crotch's bumble bee, Cooper's hawk, southwestern pond turtle, yellow warbler, and white-tailed kite.

Plan Requirements and Timing. The qualified biologist shall be present on-site daily during grading and vegetation removal. This measure shall be incorporated into the grading plans and the WEAP shall be available on-site during construction. The qualified biologist shall submit a monitoring summary to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director within 30 days after completing each phase of construction.

Monitoring: Records of construction worker WEAP participation shall be kept on file with the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director for the duration of construction. Monitoring summaries shall be kept on file with the City for the duration of construction.

MM BIO-4

General Best Management Practices

The construction contractor shall ensure that all construction

personnel are informed of and adhere to the general requirements listed below prior to the start of construction activities. This measure shall be incorporated into the construction plans, including demolition, grading, building, and landscaping plans. The project applicant shall submit the construction plans to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the construction plans to ensure the below measures are included.

- Best management practices, such as silt fending or straw wattles, shall be installed prior to conducting any project activity within 100 feet of any aquatic resource, including sand capping, grading, cart path construction, or bridge construction. Implementation of BMPs shall be consistent with any requirements from the approved Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the Project.
- Project-related vehicles shall observe a 5-mile-per-hour speed limit within the unpaved limits of construction.
- All open trenches shall be fenced and sloped to prevent entrapment of wildlife species.
- All hollow posts and pipes shall be capped, and metal fence stakes shall be plugged with bolts or other plugging materials to prevent wildlife entrapment and mortality.
- All food-related trash items such as wrappers, cans, bottles, and food scraps generated during proposed project construction shall be disposed of in closed containers and removed daily from the project site.
- No deliberate feeding of wildlife shall be allowed.
- No pets shall be allowed on the project site.
- No firearms shall be allowed on the project site.
- If vehicle or equipment maintenance is necessary, it shall be performed in the designated staging areas.

- During construction, heavy equipment shall be operated in accordance with standard BMPs. All equipment used on-site shall be properly maintained to avoid leaks of oil, fuel, or residues. The construction contractor shall prevent oil, petroleum products, or any other pollutants from contaminating the soil or entering a watercourse (dry or otherwise). When vehicles or equipment are stationary, mats or drip pans shall be placed below vehicles to contain fluid leaks. Provisions shall be in place to remediate any accidental spills.
- Refueling of any equipment shall only occur in designated staging areas. Designated areas shall not be located near any storm drain inlets, drainage swales, or surface waterways. When refueling gas powered equipment or mixing herbicide, workers shall refuel or mix over drip pan which is appropriately sized to catch any spillage. The designated refueling area shall be inspected frequently to ensure no spill of hazardous materials have occurred and could contaminate the ground or water. The construction contractor shall advise workers to clean and report spills immediately.
- Standard dust control measures shall be implemented to reduce impacts on nearby plants and wildlife. This includes a variety of options to reduce dust including replacing ground cover in disturbed areas as quickly as possible, watering active sites regularly, and suspending all excavating and grading operations during periods of high winds.

Plan Requirements and Timing. This measure shall be incorporated into the construction plans, including demolition, grading, building, and landscaping plans. The project applicant shall submit the construction plans to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The construction contractor shall ensure that all construction personnel are informed of and adhere to the general requirements listed above prior to the start of construction activities.

Monitoring: The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the construction plans to ensure this measure is included.

**MM BIO-5
Avoidance**

Crotch's Bumble Bee Pre-construction Survey and

Should ground-disturbing activities, including grading, trenching, and vegetation removal such as grubbing, be scheduled to occur during the Crotch's bumble bee colony active period (typically spring to late summer), a qualified biologist shall conduct a habitat assessment prior to ground-disturbing activities to identify areas containing suitable habitat for Crotch's bumble bee. The habitat assessment shall be conducted in areas supporting suitable vegetation communities and land covers and shall focus on presence of suitable floral resources and potential nest sites, and shall be conducted within areas of proposed ground disturbance that meet the preceding criteria. The qualified biologist shall submit the habitat assessment results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director for review and approval within five days of completing the habitat assessment.

Following completion of the habitat assessment, if suitable habitat is present, the qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for Crotch's bumble bee in the areas identified as suitable, using a methodology (including number of surveys, timing of surveys, suitable survey conditions, and time of day) accepted by CDFW. The pre-construction surveys shall be conducted prior to grounddisturbing activities. The qualified biologist shall submit the pre-construction survey resultsto the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director for review and approval within five days of completing the pre-construction surveys.

If Crotch's bumble bees are not detected during the pre-construction surveys but suitable habitat is present, a qualified biologist shall be present during ground-disturbing project activities that occur during the Crotch's bumble bee colony active period, to ensure that no impacts occur to a previously unidentified Crotch's bumble bee nest. No additional work restrictions with regard to Crotch's bumble bee shall be implemented for the remainder of the colony active period. If Crotch's bumble bees are detected, ground-disturbing activities shall be prohibited within 100 feet of any known, occupied Crotch's bumble bee nest, or as determined by the qualified biologist, who shall demarcate the 100- foot buffer via flagging. Work shall not resume in this area for the duration of the Crotch's bumble bee colony active period, unless the

qualified biologist determines the nest is inactive, with concurrence from CDFW.

If Crotch's bumble bee remains a State candidate species or is listed as endangered or threatened under the California Endangered Species Act, and should ground-disturbing activities in areas potentially supporting habitat extend into one or more subsequent years, the habitat assessment and, if necessary, the surveys, shall be repeated in areas where ground disturbance may occur that year. Prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities, should the California Fish and Game Commission remove the candidate status of Crotch's bumble bee and determine the species shall not be listed, then no measures protecting Crotch's bumble bee shall be required.

Plan Requirements and Timing. The qualified biologist shall conduct a habitat assessment prior to any ground-disturbing activities during the Crotch's bumble bee colony active period. Following the habitat assessment, the qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys in the identified suitable areas. If Crotch's bumble bees are detected, prior to ground-disturbing activities, the qualified biologist shall demarcate a 100-foot buffer for any known, occupied nest via flagging. If Crotch's bumble bees are not detected, a qualified biologist shall be present during ground-disturbing activities. The qualified biologist shall submit the habitat assessment results and pre-construction survey results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to ground-disturbing activities. The qualified biologist shall submit monitoring results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, following the completion of ground-disturbing activities.

Monitoring: The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the habitat assessment results, pre-construction survey results, and monitoring results. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall conduct periodic spot checks to ensure that construction does not occur within the buffer during construction.

MM BIO-6

Monarch Butterfly Roost Protection

Construction activities (including grading and sand capping) within 200 feet of monarch butterfly ESHA shall be scheduled

by the construction contractor to occur between April 1 and September 30 where feasible, to avoid overwintering monarch butterflies. Monarch butterfly ESHA designation shall be based on the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 4.1 and the most current site boundaries from the Xerces Map of Overwintering Sites, as confirmed by a monarch specialist or qualified biologist.

If construction activities within 200 feet of monarch butterfly ESHA cannot feasibly be scheduled to avoid the overwintering season, the project applicant shall ensure the following measures are implemented prior to construction activities:

- A monarch specialist or qualified biologist shall conduct a survey for roosting monarchs prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities, including vegetation removal, and confirm the absence of roosting monarchs before the work can commence. Roosting monarch surveys must follow the Xerces Society Protocol (2022). Surveys shall be conducted in the early morning while temperatures are low enough that monarch butterflies remain clustered from the evening before (usually when temperatures are below 13 °C or 55 °F).
- Surveys shall be spaced sufficiently apart to capture roosting individuals during this timeframe and conducted during a time when monarchs are present at a local reference site as feasible. Depending on the observed monarch behavior, more than two site visits may be necessary to conclude the presence/absence of roosting monarchs throughout the season.
- During the overwintering season and during construction activities, roosting monarch surveys shall be conducted routinely to confirm continued absence or to identify, map, and describe roost locations if presence of roosting monarchs is confirmed. Mapped roosting locations may be adjusted as needed under the guidance of a monarch specialist or qualified biologist.
- Any construction activities within 200 ft of roosting monarchs within the monarch butterfly ESHA shall be prohibited (consistent with CE 4.5 and CE 4.6d).

- A monarch specialist or qualified biologist shall be present during ground-disturbing activities, including vegetation removal, to document monarch butterfly protection. The monarch monitor shall document that roosting monarchs are not disturbed by ground-disturbing activities. The monarch monitor shall have authority to stop ground-disturbing activities if monarchs show signs of unnatural disturbance.

Plan Requirements and Timing: If construction activities within 200 feet of monarch butterfly ESHA cannot feasibly be scheduled to avoid the overwintering season, the project applicant shall retain a monarch specialist or qualified biologist to conduct surveys for roosting monarchs prior to the start of construction activities. The monarch specialist or qualified biologist shall submit survey results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, within five days of completing the pre-construction survey. The monarch specialist or qualified biologist shall monitor ground-disturbing activities, including vegetation removal, during construction. The monarch specialist or qualified biologist shall submit monitoring results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director following the completion of construction activities within 200 feet of monarch butterfly ESHA.

Monitoring. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the survey and monitoring results.

MM BIO-7

Implementation of Monarch Roost Protection Plan

The project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to prepare a Monarch Roost Protection Plan prior to the start of construction activities. The Monarch Roost Protection Plan shall include the following.

- Trees majorly impacted by construction, grading, and trenching of the project improvement elements within the monarch butterfly ESHA shall be replaced at a 3:1 ratio within the ESHA and as close to the removed tree as is reasonably feasible.
- If understory vegetation that supports overwintering habitat is removed within monarch butterfly ESHA, as determined by a monarch specialist, the vegetation

shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio as close to the removed vegetation as is feasible.

- Grading or other activities that could alter the surface hydrology that sustains the groves of trees within monarch butterfly ESHA are prohibited within the ESHA buffer (50- or 100- feet depending on whether the site is transitory or overwintering habitat).
- The qualified biologist shall submit the Monarch Roost Protection Plan to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to the start of construction activities. The construction contractor shall implement the Monarch Roost Protection Plan for the duration of construction.

Plan Requirements: The qualified biologist shall prepare a Monarch Roost Protection Plan, which shall be submitted to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.

Monitoring and Reporting: The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the Monarch Roost Protection Plan prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.

MM BIO-8

Tree Protection Measures

The construction contractor shall implement the following tree protection measures to ensure that impacts to protected trees are minimized to the extent feasible or avoided, consistent with the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 4 and CE 9, prior to the start of project construction. The following tree protection measures shall be included within the project construction plans, including the grading and landscaping plans. All measures below shall be conducted by or under the direct supervision of an International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) certified arborist retained by the project applicant

Prior to Construction

- A certified arborist or qualified biologist under the supervision of the certified arborist shall monitor any ground disturbance or vegetation removal activities that have a potential to impact protected trees.
- Temporary fencing such as snow fencing, not less than 3 feet high with tree protection signs shall be erected around all protected trees (or tree groups) to be preserved that have a potential to be impacted during construction. The protective fence shall be installed at the protected zone boundary of each tree (or tree group), which is defined as the critical root zone. The contractor shall maintain the fence to keep it upright, taut and aligned during active construction. Fencing shall be in place and inspected by a City approved biologist prior to the start of activities with the potential to impact protected trees. Fencing shall be removed only after all construction activities with the potential to impact protected trees are complete.
- A pre-construction meeting shall be held between all contractors (including grading, tree removal/pruning, builders, etc.) and the project arborist. The meeting shall focus on instructing the contractors on tree protection practices. All equipment operators and spotters, assistants, or those directing operators from the ground shall provide written acknowledgement of their receiving tree protection training. This training shall include information on the location and marking of protected trees, the necessity of preventing damage, and the discussion of work practices that will accomplish such.

Protection and Maintenance During Construction

- Contractors shall avoid heavy equipment operations, grade changes, ponding water, and fill or compaction within the protected tree zone unless where specifically approved and under the supervision of a Certified Arborist or qualified biologist in direct communication with the Certified Arborist.

- Contractors shall ensure that damage to the tree be avoided to the extent feasible when transporting or moving construction materials and working within or adjacent to the protected zone). If contact with the tree crown is unavoidable, affected branches may be pruned by a qualified arborist under supervision of a Certified Arborist and shall adhere to industry standards.
- Except where specifically approved in writing beforehand, all trenching shall be done outside of the fenced protected zone. Where trenching is necessary in areas that contain roots from retained trees, contractors should use trenching techniques that include the use of either a root pruner or an Air-Spade to limit root impacts. A Certified Arborist or qualified biologist in direct communication with the Certified Arborist shall ensure that all pruning cuts be clean and sharp to minimize ripping, tearing, and fracturing of the root system. Use of both root-pruning and AirSpade equipment shall be accompanied only by hand tools to remove soil from trench locations. The trench should be made no deeper than necessary, and when possible, alternatives to trenching should be utilized.
- The contractor shall be responsible for irrigating (deep watering) the trees in the summer and fall irrigation as necessary and determined by a Certified Arborist. One irrigation cycle shall thoroughly soak the root zones of the trees to a depth of two feet. The soil shall be allowed to dry out between watering to avoid keeping a consistently wet soil.. Soil moisture shall be checked with a soil probe before irrigating. The area within three feet of the trunk shall never be soaked, especially in summer months.
- If any protected trees are damaged to the point where continued viability is threatened, as determined by a certified arborist, the tree shall be replaced at a 3:1 ratio with like species grown from locally obtained seed. Replacement shall occur on site as feasible, or off site (within the same watershed) if on site replacement is not feasible. Replacement trees shall be monitored for a period

of 5 years.

Maintenance After Construction

- The contractors shall ensure that the mulch is kept a minimum one foot away from the trunk base and no more than 8 inches deep to avoid creating conditions favorable to the establishment and growth of decay-causing fungal pathogens.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The project applicant shall submit the construction plans that include the tree protection measures to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director for review and approval prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.

Monitoring: The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the construction plans to ensure this measure is included. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall approve the arborist prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.

MM BIO-9

Preconstruction Semi-Aquatic Species Survey, Avoidance, and Relocation

Prior to the start of construction activities, a qualified biologist (retained by the project applicant) shall conduct a pre-construction survey for semi-aquatic species (e.g., California red-legged frog, southwestern pond turtle) within areas of proposed ground disturbance. The survey shall be completed seven days prior to ground disturbance in dry conditions or 48 hours prior to ground disturbance in favorable conditions for upland amphibian migration (e.g., during or immediately after heavy rain events, heavy fog, or high humidity). The qualified biologist shall survey for California red-legged frog adhering to survey techniques described in *Revised Guidance on Site Assessment and Field Surveys for the California Red-legged Frog* (USFWS 2005). Additionally, the qualified biologist shall survey for southwestern pond turtle adhering to the survey techniques described in USGS Western Pond Turtle (*Emys marmorata*) *Visual Encounter Survey Protocol for Western Pond Turtles* (Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife 2020). The qualified biologist shall submit a summary of the survey results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to

initiation of ground disturbance.

If a special status species is identified during construction, the construction contractor shall halt construction activities within 100 feet of the location and contact the qualified biologist. If identified during pre-construction surveys or during construction, individual special-status species in the work area shall be allowed to move out of the work area of their own volition. If special-status species are detected and do not move out of the work area, a Species Relocation and Exclusion Plan shall be prepared by the qualified biologist and submitted to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for approval prior to relocation. The Species Relocation and Exclusion Plan shall specify that if relocation by humans is required, the animal shall be captured by a qualified biologist and relocated out of harm's way to the nearest suitable habitat, a minimum of 100 feet from the project work area where it was found. Species listed as threatened or endangered (e.g., California red-legged frog) shall only be handled as authorized by United States Fish and Wildlife Service. The qualified biologist shall document observations of special-status species on California Natural Diversity Database forms and submit the documentation to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife upon project completion. If one or more special status semi-aquatic species are detected, surveys are required each day prior to construction activities until the species has moved out of the work area or the qualified biologist has determined that construction may resume. Construction can commence when the semi-aquatic species moves or is relocated out of the work area and when approved by the qualified biologist. If construction ceases for more than 30 days, a new special status survey is required.

Plan Requirements and Timing: Prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit, the qualified biologist shall submit a summary of the survey results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director. If no special-status species are found, grading activities can commence and no further reporting is required.

If species are detected and do not move out of the work area, a Species Relocation and Exclusion Plan shall be prepared by the qualified biologist and submitted to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for approval prior to relocation and commencing construction. If

construction ceases for more than 30 days, a new special status survey is required.

Monitoring: The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review any biological survey, relocation, or exclusion reports in consultation with CDFW or USFWS. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall conduct periodic site inspections to verify compliance with survey recommendations in the field. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall conduct periodic spot checks to ensure that construction does not occur within the buffer during construction.

MM BIO-10

Pre-construction Nesting Bird Surveys and Avoidance

To avoid construction impacts to nesting birds and raptors, the construction contractor shall conduct vegetation removal and initial ground disturbance outside the bird and raptor breeding season, which is typically February 1 through September 1 but can vary based on local and annual climatic conditions. If construction begins within the breeding season, then not more than seven days before demolition, ground disturbance, and/or vegetation removal commences, a bird and raptor preconstruction survey shall be conducted by a City-approved biologist (retained by the project applicant) within the disturbance footprint, plus a 300-foot buffer. The survey shall be conducted by a biologist familiar with the identification of bird species known to occur in southern California.

The City-approved biologist shall conduct the preconstruction nesting bird and raptor surveys during the time of day when bird species are active and for a sufficient duration to reliably conclude presence/absence of nesting birds and raptors within the 300-foot buffer. The City-approved biologist shall submit a summary of the nesting bird and raptor survey results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee. Survey conclusions shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to initiation of construction. If no bird nests are observed no further mitigation is required.

If an active nest of species protected by the California Fish and Game Code (§ 3503) or Migratory Bird Treaty Act are found within 300 feet of the disturbance footprint, the City-

approved biologist shall flag their locations and map their locations on an aerial photograph of the disturbance footprint at a scale no less than 1"=200' and/or recorded with the use of a Global Positioning System (GPS) unit. If active raptor nests are detected, the map shall include topographic lines, parcel boundaries, adjacent roads, known historical nests for protected nesting species, and known roosting or foraging areas, as required by the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 8.3. The buffer shall be 300 feet in compliance with the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 8.4. If the 300-foot buffer is infeasible, the City-approved biologist may reduce the buffer distance as appropriate, depending upon the species and the proposed work activities. If any active non-raptor bird nests are found, the City-approved biologist shall establish a suitable buffer area (varying from 25 to 300 feet), depending on the species. The construction contractor shall ensure that no ground disturbance occurs within the buffer until the City-approved biologist confirms that the breeding/nesting is completed and all the young have fledged, and removes the buffer. If work within the buffer is necessary, a City-contracted biological monitor (funded by the project applicant) shall monitor the active nest full-time during construction activities within the buffer to ensure project activities are not indirectly impacting protected nesting birds and raptors. If work ceases for more than 30 days, a new nesting bird survey shall be conducted in accordance with this measure.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The survey shall be conducted no more than seven (7) days prior to commencement of any demolition, grading, and/or vegetation removal activities. Survey conclusions shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to the commencement of construction activities that could disturb suitable nesting habitat, such as demolition, grading, and/or vegetation removal. This measure, and any buffer requirements, shall be incorporated into the grading plans.

Monitoring: The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review any biological survey reports and conduct periodic site inspections to verify compliance with survey recommendations in the field. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall conduct periodic spot checks to ensure that

construction does not occur within the buffer during construction.

2. Riparian Habitat

Threshold: Would the Project 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?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-51 through 4.3-55, p. 6-52.)

Explanation: Construction of Alternative 4 has the potential to result in direct and indirect impacts to arroyo willow thickets, Devereux Creek and associated riparian habitat, coastal bluff scrub/coastal sage scrub, and Monarch Butterfly Roosting Habitat. Following implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, and BIO-11, Alternative 4's construction impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation.

Indirect Impacts on ESHA and ESHA Buffers. Indirect impacts to riparian habitat types or sensitive natural communities designated as ESHA would include water quality effects, chemical spills or vehicle leaks near and within ESHA, and dust. These impacts would be potentially significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-51, 6-51 through 6-52)

Direct Impacts on ESHA and ESHA Buffers. Direct impacts to riparian habitat types or sensitive natural communities designated as ESHA and ESHA buffers would include the construction and operation of new structures or facilities within ESHA or ESHA buffers. However, the proposed clubhouse, comfort station, maintenance facility, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop would be located within currently developed areas. Construction of new features that could result in direct impacts to ESHA or ESHA buffers include the installation of the decomposed granite path and underground utility trenching on Hollister Avenue, storm drain outlet, cart path, and a sewer line, as well as proposed grading, sandcapping, and landscaping activities, as discussed in the following subsections.

Extended Bicycle Path. Alternative 4 would include construction activities within and adjacent to monarch butterfly/raptor roosting habitat ESHA and riparian/marsh/vernal pool ESHA (as well as their associated 100-foot buffers) along the southern edge of Hollister Avenue. These activities would include grading, paving, and installation of landscaping adjacent to eucalyptus groves designated

as ESHA. Although Alternative 4 would not introduce new development into undisturbed habitat, it would result in minor encroachments into ESHA buffers and potential root zone disturbance. Alternative 4's impacts to ESHA are not anticipated to be greater than those of Alternative 4, because the bike path alignment is confined to previously disturbed areas and involves a low-impact use. While minor encroachment and temporary construction-related effects may occur, they are limited in scale and duration and do not introduce substantial new development into undisturbed habitat. Additionally, Alternative 4 would avoid removal of protected trees and significant impacts to Monarch Butterfly Roosting ESHA where feasible through project design. Furthermore, as with Alternative 4, Alternative 4 would require Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, and BIO-11 to reduce potential impacts related to riparian habitat, ESHA, and wetlands to a less than significant level. Alternative 4's impact related to riparian habitat, ESHA, and aquatic resources would be similar to Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant with mitigation. (Draft EIR, 6-51 through 6-52.)

Storm Drains. The proposed installation of a storm drain and associated outlet within arroyo willow thickets along Devereux Creek in the eastern portion of the project site would temporarily impact, via trenching, 0.005 acre of arroyo willow thickets; and of the 0.005 acre, approximately 0.002 acre consists of non-wetland waters under the jurisdiction of USACE. Temporary impacts would constitute disturbances, such as vegetation removal and soil disruption during construction, to this sensitive natural community. The proposed storm drain installation would also permanently impact 0.002 acre of arroyo willow thickets through habitat loss. This impact would be a significant impact. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-52, 6-51 through 6-52)

Cart Paths. A proposed replacement cart path extends from just south of the maintenance facility, crosses Devereux Creek at a proposed free-span bridge, and terminates south of Devereux Creek. A portion of the path and the bridge located southwest of proposed Hole 4 and Hole 5, would occur within the ESHA buffer for arroyo willow thickets. The northern portion of the path would occur within Monarch Butterfly Roosting Habitat ESHA and ESHA buffer. However, the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 1.6 and Goleta Municipal Code Section 17.30.040, which provide protection for ESHA and ESHA buffers against development, allow for resource-dependent uses (including public accessways and trails) that are sited to avoid or minimize impacts on the resource to the maximum extent feasible. As designed, the proposed cart path and free-span bridge would minimize impacts to habitat values or

sensitive species to the maximum extent feasible from the existing configuration through site design. Furthermore, the new cart path and free-span bridge would replace an existing cart path and Arizona-style concrete crossing that are currently within Devereux Creek riparian ESHA and Monarch Butterfly Roosting Habitat ESHA, along the eastern boundary of the project site. Alternative 4 would remove 5,134 square feet of cart path within the Devereux Creek ESHA (which would decrease impervious hardscape by nearly 50 percent [for a total of 2,607 square feet of hardscape]), remove the existing 10- to 12-inch concrete culvert, and restore approximately 2,831 square feet of Devereux Creek riparian ESHA and Monarch Butterfly Roosting Habitat ESHA. The portion of the path within Monarch Butterfly Roosting Habitat ESHA and ESHA buffer would replace the existing cart path and would not result in additional impacts as the location would remain consistent.

Construction of the free-span bridge would occur within Devereux Creek, which could temporarily affect water quality and consequently riparian ESHA associated with the creek. The construction contractor would implement construction BMPs and stormwater monitoring to reduce the potential to introduce sediment and pollutants and degrade water quality in Devereux Creek. However, construction work inside Devereux Creek during periods of high flows could result in the degradation of water quality from increased erosion. Therefore, impacts to ESHA from construction of the free-span bridge would be potentially significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-51, 6-52 through 6-53, 6-51 through 6-52)

Utility Trenches. The proposed utility trench (for undergrounding of existing utilities) crosses over a culvert south of Hollister Avenue and above Devereux Creek, and is located within the minimum ESHA and SPA buffers for Devereux Creek. Trenching activities may require removal of unhealthy eucalyptus trees that may contribute to habitat based on jurisdictional water agency (e.g., CDFW, RWQCB, USACE) determination, but impacts would not extend further than the proposed decomposed granite path. Trenching may also have the potential to result in degradation of riparian ESHA associated with Devereux Creek through chemical spills or sedimentation from construction activities. Trenching would be a potentially significant impact to ESHA.

Alternative 4 would involve the installation of a sewer line within the eastern portion of the project site that connects to the comfort station. Construction of the proposed sewer line would temporarily, directly impact 0.04 acre of riparian habitat under the jurisdiction of CDFW, the Central Coast RWQCB, and CCC. Temporary impacts would

constitute disturbances, such as vegetation removal and soil disruption during construction. This impact would be potentially significant. The proposed sewer line trench is not anticipated to require removal of or major impacts to trees within the Monarch Butterfly Roosting Habitat ESHA, however accidental damage to trees through construction accidents could occur that would be a potentially significant impact to ESHA. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-53, 6-51 through 6-52)

Grading, Landscaping and Sandcapping. Alternative 4 would involve grading for recontouring and sand capping within the 100-foot ESHA and SPA buffers for Devereux Creek, where nonnative grasses (wild oats and annual brome grassland) would be replaced with the recontoured golf course. However, the existing nonnative grasses within the buffer are currently part of the golf course. Furthermore, the proposed daylighting of downstream portions of Devereux Creek, via removal of an underground culvert, would improve the overall biotic quality of Devereux Creek.

Grading and sand-capping would occur within Monarch Butterfly Roosting Habitat ESHA and ESHA buffer along the eastern boundary of the site. These activities are not anticipated to result in removal or major impacts to trees within the ESHA or alter the surface hydrology or remove native vegetation within the ESHA buffer, as the proposed activities would be limited to surface-level modifications that avoid tree root zones and alterations to drainage patterns.

Grading and sand-capping would also occur near the coastal bluffs and within the ESHA buffers for quailbush scrub and California brittle bush – ashy buckwheat scrub alliance, both of which are considered coastal bluff scrub/coastal sage scrub ESHA under the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. However, the grading (recontouring) and sand-capping would promote infiltration of water, reduced waterlogging, and better root growth. Proposed activities would be consistent with the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 5.3 and would avoid ESHA and occur within the ESHA buffer only in areas that are already existing golf course, and would remain turf or playable areas of the golf course. Alternative 4 would involve the installation of native plants in all graded and sand capped areas that are not playable, pursuant to the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 5.3. Therefore, proposed grading, landscaping and sand-capping activities would have a less than significant impact on ESHA. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-53 through 54, 6-52 through 6-53, 6-51 through 6-52)

Summary of Impacts on ESHA

Alternative 4 would result in both indirect and direct impacts to riparian habitat types or sensitive natural communities designated as ESHA. Indirect impacts would include water quality effects, chemical spills or vehicle leaks near and within ESHA, dust, and inadvertent habitat destruction during construction. Direct impacts would include permanent impacts to 0.002 acre and temporary impacts to 0.005 acre of arroyo willow thickets and additional impacts to eucalyptus vegetation associated with riparian ESHA in Devereux Creek. The overall project-related impact on riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure HYD-1 and Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, and BIO-11 are required.

Mitigation Measure HYD-1 would require culvert removal and bridge installation at Devereux Creek to occur within the dry season to minimize the potential for construction pollutants to enter water within Devereux Creek. Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, and BIO-4 would reduce potential indirect impacts to riparian habitat or sensitive vegetation communities during project construction by requiring fencing around ESHA, biological monitoring during construction, construction worker environmental awareness training, and implementation of best management practices that would minimize potential impacts to biological resources during construction. Mitigation Measure BIO-11 would reduce potential permanent impacts to riparian habitat or sensitive vegetation communities by requiring compensatory mitigation for habitat loss due to project development. Following the implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, and BIO-11, Alternative 4's impact involving a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or sensitive vegetation communities would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-51 through 4.3-55, p. 6-52.)

MM BIO-11

Compensatory Mitigation for Impacts on Sensitive Communities and Riparian Habitat

Onsite mitigation shall be provided to compensate for the permanent loss of arroyo willow thickets/riparian habitat (0.002 acre) at a ratio of 5:1. Temporary impacts to arroyo willow thickets/riparian habitat (0.005 acre), eucalyptus woodland/riparian habitat (0.04 acre), and nonwetland waters of the United States and State (0.002 acre) shall be restored at a 1:1 ratio. Details of the mitigation program

requirements shall be described in a Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Program (HMMP). A qualified biologist, retained by the project applicant, shall prepare the HMMP.

Final landscape plans for the project shall not include removal of sensitive vegetation or aquatic resources in areas for landscaping purposes only (where no construction ground disturbances, including grading, trenching, excavation for bioretention basins or other drainage or utility features, is proposed).

Requirements described in the HMMP shall include:

- Specification that mitigation shall be on-site and shall occur adjacent, or as near as possible, to any removed habitat area. Mitigation for loss of arroyo willow/riparian habitat associated with Devereux Creek shall occur only along Devereux Creek, and near the area of impacts to the extent possible.
- Mitigation for the loss of riparian habitat and non-wetland waters of the United States and State shall conform with any requirements included within a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement provided by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, a Clean Water Act 401 Certification issued by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, or USACE Clean Water Act Section 404 permit.
- The mitigation program shall conform with all requirements of the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan and the City of Goleta Creeks and Watershed Management Plan.
- Specification of a 5-year monitoring period for all restoration areas.
- Development of a plant palette for each restoration area (arroyo willow thicket/riparian, eucalyptus woodland, non-wetland waters of the United States and State) in keeping with the character and plant composition of the native community being restored.
- Restoration for temporary impacts within monarch butterfly winter roosting habitat shall conform with requirements of the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan.

- Defined attainable and measurable goals and objectives to be achieved through implementation of the HMMP.
- A restoration work plan that details methodologies, a restoration schedule, plant materials(seed), and implementation strategies. Performance standards for the restoration work plan shall include achievement of vegetation cover, species diversity, and soil stability standards.
- A detailed maintenance plan to include removal of invasive non-native species.
- A monitoring plan that includes methods and analysis of results, goals for success or failure, and an adaptive management plan and suggestions for failed restoration efforts.
- Restoration activities using native species from locally collected stock.

The qualified biologist shall submit the HMPP to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to initiation of construction activities. Plan Requirements and Timing: The project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to prepare an HMMP prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The qualified biologist shall submit the HMMP to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. Monitoring: The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the HMMP prior to the start of construction activities. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall ensure compliance with the onsite mitigation requirements and monitor the restoration efforts throughout the 5-year monitoring period.

3. Wetlands

Threshold: Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (Draft EIR, pp.4.3-56 through 4.3-57)

Explanation: Project construction has the potential to result in direct and indirect substantial adverse effects to aquatic resources, including Devereux Creek and the Golf Course Pond. Operation of Alternative 4 would be similar to existing conditions and would have a less than significant impact to aquatic resources. Following implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, and BIO-11, the project's construction impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation.

Alternative 4 would involve the installation of a storm drain and associated outlet, which would include permanent removal of 0.002 acre of riparian and streambed habitat associated with Devereux Creek (Aquatic Resource B), which is under the jurisdiction of CDFW, the Central Coast RWQCB, and the CCC; and of the 0.002 acre, approximately 0.001 acre consists of non-wetland waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of USACE. Additionally, trenching for construction of the storm drain would result in temporary impacts to 0.005 acre of riparian and streambed habitat under the jurisdiction of CDFW, the Central Coast RWQCB, and the CCC; and of the 0.005 acre, approximately 0.002 acre consists of non-wetland waters under the jurisdiction of USACE. The proposed installation of the storm drain and associated outlet would not impact wetlands.

Alternative 4 would involve the installation of a water line within the eastern portion of the project site. Trenching for the water line would occur within the minimum 100-foot SPA buffer for non-wetland waters of the State and United States associated with Devereux Creek (Aquatic Resource B). Construction of the proposed water line would temporarily impact 0.04 acre of riparian habitat under the jurisdiction of CDFW, the Central Coast RWQCB, and CCC; and of the 0.04 acre, approximately 0.003 acre consists of non-wetland waters under the jurisdiction of USACE. Trenching would occur at a depth of 4 feet, which could potentially result in damage to existing eucalyptus trees within the riparian habitat. The proposed installation of the water main would not result in the direct, permanent removal of riparian habitat and would not impact wetlands.

Alternative 4 would involve utility trenching and the installation of a decomposed granite path along Hollister Avenue within the minimum 100-foot SPA buffer of Devereux Creek (Aquatic Resource B). This may result in temporary and permanent impacts to CDFW, RWQCB, CCC, and USACE jurisdiction, particularly to eucalyptus trees within the riparian habitat. The proposed activities along Hollister Avenue would not result in impacts to wetlands.

Alternative 4 would involve the filling and grading of Aquatic Resource E, which is an anthropogenic stormwater drainage feature within the northwestern portion of the project site. Alternative 4 would replace this feature with an on-site stormwater treatment basin, which would result in the removal of 0.01 acre of potential CDFW streambed and potential non-wetland waters of the State under the jurisdiction of the Central Coast RWQCB.

Alternative 4 would involve grading, for recontouring of the golf course, within the 100-foot SPA buffer for the Golf Course Pond (Aquatic Resource C) and for Devereux Creek (Aquatic Resource B). The proposed grading activities would not have a direct effect on streamside vegetation, as grading activities would occur more than 25 feet from riparian habitat, and would not result in permanent development that could directly or indirectly affect the biotic quality of the Golf Course Pond or Devereux Creek.

Indirect impacts to aquatic resources, including Devereux Creek and the Golf Course Pond, could occur during construction and operation of Alternative 4. Indirect construction impacts could include increased erosion, sedimentation, or the leakage of chemicals, liquid products, petroleum products, and concrete-related waste to aquatic resources within the project site. These indirect construction impacts would be potentially significant.

Operation and maintenance of Alternative 4 would be similar to existing conditions at the project site. Indirect operational impacts could include oil leaks from vehicles traveling to and from the project site, oil leaks from on-site vehicles, pesticide or fertilizer spillage, leaching of metals from roof and drains, or transport of litter during storm events to aquatic resources within the project site. With the implementation of Source Control and Low Impact Development BMPs, operation of Alternative 4 would have a less than significant impact to aquatic resources.

Mitigation Measure HYD-1, and Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, and BIO-11, are required. Mitigation Measure HYD-1 would require culvert removal and bridge installation at Devereux Creek to occur within the dry season to minimize the potential for construction pollutants to enter water within Devereux Creek. Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, and BIO-4 would reduce potential indirect impacts to wetlands during project construction by requiring fencing around aquatic resources, biological monitoring during construction, construction worker environmental awareness training, and implementation of best management practices that would minimize potential impacts to biological resources during construction.

Mitigation Measure BIO-11 would reduce potential permanent impacts to wetlands by requiring compensatory mitigation for habitat loss due to project development. Following the implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, and BIO-11, Alternative 4's impact involving a substantial adverse effect on wetlands would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-56 through 57, 6-52 through 6-53)

4. **Wildlife Movement**

Threshold: Would the Project 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?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Explanation: Construction of Alternative 4 could indirectly affect wildlife movement through the introduction of noise, light, and increased human presence, all of which could affect essential behavioral activities and physiology of wildlife.

Noise. Construction activities would adhere to typical working hours, and construction noise would not affect nocturnal terrestrial wildlife movement. Impacts on wildlife movement from construction-related noise would be potentially significant, and mitigation would be required.

Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would reduce potential indirect impacts to wildlife movement during project construction by minimizing construction noise in compliance with existing City noise standards, which are set to a threshold below noise levels known to produce adverse physiological effects in wildlife (Fletcher 1971). Following the implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, Alternative 4's impact to wildlife movement would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-57 through 4.3-59, p. 6-52.)

5. **Local Policies and Ordinances**

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-59 through 4.3-61, 6-52.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 would include installation of a storm drain and associated outlet within arroyo willow thickets ESHA along Devereux Creek, sand capping and grading within the 100-foot Streamside Protection Area, and trenching for underground utilities within riparian ESHA along Devereux Creek and along the eastern project site boundary within riparian and monarch butterfly roosting habitat ESHA. Additionally, Alternative 4 would include construction activities within and adjacent to monarch butterfly/raptor roosting habitat ESHA and riparian/marsh/vernal pool ESHA (as well as their associated 100-foot buffers) along the southern edge of Hollister Avenue, due to the extension of the bicycle path.

Alternative 4 would be potentially inconsistent with the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policies CE 1.6, CE 2.2, CE 4.4, and CE 9.5. Alternative 4 may result in direct impacts, such as root and/or canopy pruning or compaction or accidental damage during excavation and grading, to 27 trees due to the extension of the bicycle path. However, removal of and major impacts to protected trees are anticipated to be avoided (and reduced to less than significant) through implementation of project design measures such as root bridging or shaving, shifting the alignment, or eliminating sections of curb/gutter. The extended bicycle path under Alternative 4 is an allowed use (public accessway/trail) pursuant to General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 1.6.

Alternative 4 would require implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, and BIO-11, which would result in consistency with General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policies CE 1.6, CE 2.2, CE 4.4, and CE 9.5, and reduce this impact to a less than significant level, which would be the same as the proposed project.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2 would reduce potential impacts to ESHA by requiring fencing around special-status plant habitat that would ensure avoidance of such habitat during construction activities. Mitigation Measures BIO-3 and BIO-4 would reduce potential impacts to ESHA by requiring biological monitoring during construction, construction worker environmental awareness training, and implementation of best management practices that would minimize potential impacts to biological resources during construction. Mitigation Measure BIO-6 would reduce potential impacts to Monarch Butterfly Roosting Habitat ESHA. Mitigation Measures BIO-7 and BIO-8 would reduce potential impacts to protected trees by requiring preparation of a Monarch Roost Protection Plan, as well as implementation of tree protection

measures during project construction activities. Specifically, Mitigation Measure BIO-8 would require replacement of protected trees at a 3:1 ratio. Mitigation Measure BIO-11 would reduce potential permanent impacts to ESHA by requiring compensatory mitigation for habitat loss due to project development. Following the implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, and BIO-11, Alternative 4 would be consistent with the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policies CE 1.6, 2.2, 4.4 and CE 9.5, and Alternative 4's impact involving conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-59 through 4.3-61, 6-52.)

B. CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Historical Resources

Threshold: Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines, section 15064.5?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.4-14 through 4.4-18, p. 6-53.)

Explanation: The Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, located at 7825 Hollister Avenue (Assessor's Parcel Number 079- 210-059), is a designated City of Goleta Landmark pursuant to Goleta City Council Resolution 22-10 and is designated County of Santa Barbara Landmark #29. Therefore, it is a historical resource as defined by CEQA 15064.5(a)(2) because it is "included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code".

Alternative 4 would include the restoration and adaptive reuse of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station as a new quick stop café, renamed the Rio Grande Coffee Shop. The Rio Grande Coffee Shop would consist of two parts: the restored existing 349 square foot Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station to serve as seating for the café and a new 695 square foot café building designed to resemble a 1920s gas station service bay, located to the east of the existing gas station building. New wooden trellises would be located to the west of the existing gas station building, and on the eastern and western sides of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop.

Proposed renovations to the existing gas station building include remodeling the interior to function as an extension of seating for the

new coffee shop. The proposed improvements to the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station would be consistent with all of the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and thus the City of Goleta Historic Preservation Ordinance. However, construction activities associated with the Rio Grande Coffee Shop would result in vibration near the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. Vibration damage, such as through structural damage or material fatigue, to the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station as a result of construction activities would result in a potentially significant impact on the historic building.

While Alternative 4 plans comply with the Standards for Rehabilitation, it is possible during project implementation that repairs, replacements, materials, finishes, designs, colors, textures, and other visual qualities may not be implemented with the intent of the Standards for Rehabilitation. If the wrong materials are used during project construction, a potentially significant impact to the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station's historical integrity would occur. To reduce the possibility of inappropriate treatments and protect the historic integrity of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station Alternative 4 would comply with Mitigation Measure CUL-1, which requires coordination and monitoring by the City and/or architectural historian.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would ensure project-related groundborne vibration during construction activities at the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station would be less than the significance threshold of 0.08 inches per second peak particle velocity. With implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2, project impacts involving a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical building due to vibration-related impacts would be less than significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would ensure that repairs, replacements, materials, finishes, designs, colors, textures, and other visual qualities inconsistent with the Standards for Rehabilitation would be avoided during project implementation and the historic integrity of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station is retained. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 project impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.4-14 through 4.4-18, p. 6-53.)

MM CUL-1

Architectural Monitoring for Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station

The project applicant shall retain a Secretary of Interior's Professionally Qualified architectural historian and/or the City's Urban Historian (qualified historian) to ensure the project implementation utilizes the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and guidelines from the National Park Service

including:

- Preservation Brief #9, The Repair of Historic Wood Windows
- Preservation Brief #10, Exterior Paint Problems on Historic Woodwork
- Preservation Brief #32, The Preservation and Repair of Historic Stuccowork
- Preservation Brief #45, Preserving Historic Wood Porches

The project applicant shall provide proof of retainment of the qualified historian to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the building permit for the renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. The requirement shall be referenced in the construction plans for the Rio Grande Coffee Shop intended for use by the construction contractor(s).

Prior to the start of renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, the qualified historian shall review the replacements, materials, finishes, designs, colors, textures, and other visual qualities for consistency with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. During renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, the qualified historian shall conduct weekly spot checks to monitor construction progress for consistency with the Standards for Rehabilitation. Monitoring may be increased or reduced as deemed necessary by the qualified historian with approval by the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee. The qualified historian shall have the authority to halt work if inconsistent with the Standards for Rehabilitation and develop a plan to revise the work for consistency with the Standards for Rehabilitation in consultation with the City and contractor(s).

Throughout the renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, the qualified historian shall submit a weekly update to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director to document compliance. The update shall include date of monitoring, project progress, compliance or non-compliance with the Standards for Rehabilitation, and necessary actions to ensure compliance with the Standards for Rehabilitation.

Plan Requirements and Timing. Prior to renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, the project applicant shall retain a qualified historian. The qualified historian shall review project plans for replacements, materials, finishes, designs, colors, textures, and other visual qualities for consistency with the Secretary of Interior's

Standards for Rehabilitation prior to and during renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station.

Proof of retainment shall be provided to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the building permit for the renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station.

Monitoring. Throughout the renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, the qualified historian shall submit a weekly update to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director to document compliance. The update shall include date of monitoring, project progress, and compliance or non-compliance with the Standards for Rehabilitation, and necessary actions to ensure compliance with the Standards for Rehabilitation. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review the weekly updates.

2. Archaeological Resources

Threshold: Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines, section 15064.5?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.4-18 through 4.4-22, p. 6-53.)

Explanation: **Construction.** Project-related ground disturbance would extend up to 6 feet below the current ground surface for installation of landscaping and paving; up to 4 feet below the current ground surface within the golf course for utility installation; and up to 25 feet below the current ground surface for construction of the new clubhouse. Although the project site has been subject to previous ground disturbance, the proposed depths of disturbance necessary for utility and clubhouse construction would likely extend deeper than previously disturbed soils. Given the cultural sensitivity of the area (as inferred by archival documents and existing cultural resources located within and surrounding the project site), and the presence of potentially intact native soils, unknown or previously unrecorded archaeological materials may exist within the project site. If these materials constitute unique archaeological resources under CEQA, disturbance of these resources could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource and impacts would be potentially significant.

Construction of Alternative 4 would slightly increase the amount of ground disturbance compared to the proposed project 4 as

Alternative 4 would extend the bicycle path to Pebble Beach Drive. However, this increase would be nominal given the overall scale of ground disturbance. Under Alternative 4, approximately 0.49 acre of additional ground disturbance would occur, which is approximately 0.28 percent of the total anticipated ground disturbance of 174.43 acres under the proposed project. No known archaeological resources are located within the extended bicycle path area. The increase in ground disturbance would be nominal given the overall scale of ground disturbance that would occur. In addition, the extended bicycle path area is located within the disturbed right-of-way of Hollister Avenue, which would have a reduced potential to contain unknown archaeological resources due to the amount of previous disturbance. However, because ground disturbance would occur, Alternative 4 has potential to encounter unknown cultural resources and Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4 would continue to be required.

Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4 would minimize potential impacts to unanticipated discoveries of archaeological resources by requiring archaeological monitoring, a cultural resources sensitivity meeting for construction personnel, and implementation of appropriate procedures for evaluation and treatment of any discoveries made during construction. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4 would reduce impacts to archaeological resources to a less than significant level. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.4-18 through 4.4-22, p. 6-53.)

MM CUL-2

Archaeological Monitoring

Prior to ground disturbance activities, the project applicant shall retain an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (qualified archaeologist) and has experience in California prehistoric and historic resources (experience within City of Goleta or Santa Barbara County preferred). The project applicant shall provide proof of retainment of the qualified archaeologist to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The qualified archaeologist shall prepare a Cultural Resource Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan (Plan), conduct archaeological monitoring, and address any inadvertent discoveries identified during project implementation (refer to Mitigation Measure CUL-4). The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the Plan prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The Plan shall outline archaeological and Native American resource monitoring protocols,

as well as a program for treatment and mitigation in the case of an inadvertent discovery of cultural resources during project-related ground-disturbance. The Plan shall also provide for the proper identification, evaluation, treatment, and protection of any cultural resources in accordance with CEQA throughout the duration of the project. The Plan shall be incorporated and referenced in all grading and construction plans intended for use by the construction contractor(s).

The qualified archaeologist shall manage archaeological monitoring during initial ground disturbance activities, defined as construction-related earth moving of sediments from their place of deposition. This definition excludes movement of sediments after they have been initially disturbed or displaced by project-related construction. The qualified archaeologist shall oversee and establish monitoring efforts as needed (increase, decrease, or discontinue monitoring frequency) based on the observed potential for construction activities to encounter cultural deposits or material. The qualified archaeologist shall ensure all daily monitoring logs are maintained. The requirement for archaeological monitoring shall be noted on all demolition and grading plans. The qualified archaeologist shall prepare an archaeological monitoring report within 60 days following completion of ground disturbance, and shall submit the archaeological monitoring report to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review. The archaeological monitoring report shall document compliance with approved cultural resource mitigation measures, include all monitoring efforts, and include an appendix with the daily monitoring logs. The qualified archaeologist shall submit the final archaeological monitoring report to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director and the Central Coast Information Center.

Plan Requirements and Timing. Prior to ground disturbance, the project applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist. The qualified archaeologist shall create a Plan, conduct monitoring, and address any discoveries during project construction. Proof of retainment shall be provided to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The Plan shall outline monitoring protocols and treatment for any discovered cultural resources, ensuring compliance with CEQA. The Plan shall be referenced in all grading and construction plans. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the Plan prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.

Monitoring. The qualified archaeologist shall manage monitoring during initial ground disturbance, adjusting efforts based on the potential to encounter cultural deposits. Daily monitoring logs shall be maintained. The qualified archaeologist shall prepare an archaeological monitoring report, documenting compliance and monitoring efforts, and shall submit the archaeological monitoring report to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review, within 60 days following completion of ground disturbance. The qualified archaeological shall submit the final archaeological monitoring report to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director and the Central Coast Information Center.

MM CUL-3

Workers Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) Training

All construction personnel and monitors who are not trained archaeologists shall be briefed regarding unanticipated discoveries of archaeological resources prior to the start of construction activities. A basic presentation shall be prepared and presented by the qualified archaeologist, or their designee, to inform all construction personnel working on the project about the archaeological sensitivity of the area. The purpose of the WEAP training is to provide specific details on the kinds of archaeological materials that may be identified during construction and explain the importance of and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. Each worker shall also learn the proper procedures to follow in the event archaeological resources or human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities. These procedures include work curtailment or redirection, and the immediate contact of the qualified archaeologist and if appropriate, Native American representative. If new construction personnel are added to the project, the crew foreman shall ensure the new personnel receive the WEAP training before starting work. The necessity of training attendance shall be stated on all demolition, grading, or construction plans and the project applicant shall maintain records demonstrating construction worker WEAP participation. The project applicant shall submit the records of construction worker WEAP participation to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to construction activities and as-needed after the addition of new personnel.

Plan Requirements and Timing. This measure shall be incorporated into the grading, demolition, and construction plans and the WEAP shall be available on-site during construction.

Monitoring. Records of construction worker WEAP participation

shall be kept on file with the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director for the duration of construction.

MM CUL-4

Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources

If unanticipated cultural resources are discovered during project-related ground disturbance activities, the following procedures shall be implemented:

- In the event that archaeological resources are unexpectedly encountered during ground disturbing activities, the construction contractor(s) shall halt work within 50 feet of the find and contact the qualified archaeologist. The qualified archaeologist retained pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-2 shall immediately evaluate the resource.
- If the resource is determined to be potentially significant, then the qualified archaeologist, project applicant, Native American monitor (if resources are Native American in origin), and City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall meet to discuss the significance of the find. At the meeting, a decision shall be made, with the concurrence by the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc.) for the cultural resource.
- Treatment and avoidance of the newly discovered resource(s) shall be consistent with the Plan prepared pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-2. This may include avoidance of the cultural resources through project design, in-place preservation of cultural resources located in native soils, and/or re-burial within the immediate vicinity so they are not subject to further disturbance in perpetuity. If avoidance is infeasible, then treatment shall be implemented pursuant to the Plan. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall make the final determination based on the provisions of CEQA with respect to archaeological resources and recommendations of the qualified archaeologist.
- Further ground disturbance, including but not limited to grading and trenching, shall not resume within the area of the discovery until the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, has determined the appropriate mitigation has been implemented pursuant to

the Plan and the qualified archaeologist has notified the construction contractor(s) to resume work. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the 50-foot buffer area and shall be monitored by additional archaeological monitors, if necessary.

- If the resource proves to be eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources and significant impacts to the resource cannot be avoided via project redesign, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare a data recovery plan tailored to the physical nature and characteristics of the resource, pursuant to the requirements of the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C). The data recovery plan shall identify data recovery excavation methods, measurable objectives, and data thresholds to reduce any significant impacts to cultural resources related to the resource. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the treatment plan and archaeological testing as appropriate. The qualified archaeologist shall submit the resulting documentation to the regional repository of the California Historical Resources Information System pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C).
- The qualified archaeologist shall provide evidence of compliance with this mitigation measure, if a significant archaeological resource is found, to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director and the appropriate California Historical Resources Information System Information Center upon completion of the data recovery plan detailing the significance of the resource and treatment findings.

Plan Requirements and Timing. If unanticipated cultural resources are discovered during ground disturbance, the construction contractor(s) shall halt work within 50 feet of the find and contact the qualified archaeologist. The qualified archaeologist shall evaluate the resource immediately. If the resource is potentially significant, the qualified archaeologist, project applicant, Native American monitor (if applicable), and City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall meet to decide on appropriate mitigation. Treatment and avoidance shall follow the Plan from Mitigation Measure CUL-2. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall make the final determination based on CEQA provisions. Ground disturbance shall not resume in the area until the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental

Review Director, or designee, has verified that mitigation is implemented. Work outside the 50-foot buffer shall continue with additional monitoring if necessary.

Monitoring. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the data recovery plan (if applicable). The qualified archaeologist shall submit documentation to the California Historical Resources Information System. The qualified archaeologist shall provide evidence of compliance to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director and the California Historical Resources Information System upon completion.

C. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

1. Fault Rupture

Threshold: 1(b) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.6-10 through 4.6-19, 6-56.)

Explanation: The project site is located in a seismically active area and seismic activity could affect structures on the project site. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would require incorporation of seismic design recommendations from geotechnical reports prepared for project structures into the project's structural design, which would reduce impacts involving seismic ground shaking. Construction and operational impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

The project site is located in a region of high seismic activity, with the potential for large seismic events that could generate strong ground shaking. Primary seismic risks at the project site would be earthquakes generated by local faults, as well as larger regional faults, such as the San Andreas Fault. The design of Alternative 4's structural elements (i.e., the proposed clubhouse, Rio Grande Coffee Shop, and comfort station) would be designed to withstand seismic loads, as required by the CBC; however, in the event of an earthquake these proposed structures could result in substantial adverse effects involving strong seismic ground shaking. Therefore, this impact would be potentially significant, and mitigation is required.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce potential

impacts due to ground-shaking on the project site to a less than significant level through incorporation of structural integrity recommendations into the project, which would ultimately minimize the potential for the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.6-10 through 4.6-19, 6-56.)

MM GEO-1

Geotechnical Design

The applicant's project design engineer shall incorporate the recommendations listed below from the Site-Specific Hazards Study and Preliminary Foundation Investigation (Appendix F-1), Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed Club House (Appendix F-2), and the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed Comfort Station (Appendix F-3) into the project's grading and building plans. The applicant shall submit the grading and building plans to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee for review and approval prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for the grading and building permits for the project. The applicant shall also retain a licensed geotechnical professional approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee prior to the start of construction. The licensed geotechnical professional shall be responsible for ensuring proper implementation of the recommendations below and providing a report to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee certifying the recommendations below have been incorporated into project design and throughout construction prior to the issuance of a certification of occupancy.

GRADING (GENERAL)

1. The area to be graded shall be cleared of surface vegetation, including roots and root structures.
2. If, during the removal and scarification process, excessive root structures are encountered, these areas shall be deep ripped in two directions to the depth of the root structure, after which the disturbed soils and the roots shall be completely removed, and the resulting cavities shall be scarified and processed to receive fill in accordance with recommendations contained in this section.
3. If, during the grading operations, previously placed undocumented fill material is encountered, this fill material shall be removed under the direction of the project design engineer prior to commencement of the filling operations.

4. Removed surface soils and/or imported approved fill will be placed in loose lifts of approximately 6 inches, thoroughly mixed, moistened or dried to near optimum moisture content, and compacted to a minimum of 90 percent relative compaction.
5. Rocks greater than 6 inches in size shall be removed from the soil being spread for compaction.
6. Import soils, if required for compacted fill, shall be granular, non-expansive soils which are equal to, or superior in quality to, the on-site soils as determined by the project design engineer prior to importation of the fill material to the site.
7. The compaction standard shall be the latest adoption of the ASTM D-1557 method of compaction.
8. Positive surface drainage shall direct water away from all slopes and away from the foundation system of the proposed structure

GRADING (CLUBHOUSE)

1. In areas where compacted fill soil is to be placed, the area to receive the fill soil shall be prepared. In the area to be prepared, the loose topsoil and compressible surface soils shall be removed and observed by the project design engineer. Upon approval of excavation, the exposed ground surface shall be scarified an additional 6 to 8 inches, moistened or dried to near the optimum moisture content, and compacted to 90 percent of the relative compaction.
2. The footings of the proposed structures shall be supported completely on firm undisturbed original ground. The structures shall not be supported over a cut/fill transition unless the foundation is engineered to account for the transition.
3. All fill slopes which are created during the grading operation shall be properly shaped to a maximum slope angle of 2 horizontal to 1 vertical, and compacted by rolling the sheepsfoot roller or similar compaction equipment over the slope face at vertical lift intervals of 30 inches or less.

GRADING (COMFORT STATION)

1. The footings of the proposed structures shall be supported completely by a uniform thickness of non-expansive compacted soil. The structures shall not be supported over a cut/fill transition.

2. Beneath the proposed structures and for a minimum distance of 5 feet beyond the exterior perimeters, the loose topsoil and compressible surface soils shall be removed and observed by a representative of our firm. Upon approval of excavation, the exposed ground surface shall be scarified an additional 6 to 8 inches, moistened or dried to near the optimum moisture content, and compacted to 90 percent of the relative compaction. The minimum depth of removal shall be at least 12 inches below the bottom of the proposed footings.

GRADING (RIO GRANDE COFFEE SHOP)

1. It should be noted gas tanks that were buried on the property have been removed and the resulting void was backfilled with an imported yellow sand. If these backfilled areas are located below the proposed structures, backfill soil shall be removed and replaced at 95 percent compaction.

2. The footings of the proposed structures shall either be supported completely by a uniform thickness of non-expansive compacted fill or the foundations shall be designed to penetrate the fill and compressible topsoil such that the structure is supported either completely over fill or completely on firm original ground. The structures shall not be supported over a cut/fill transition unless the foundation is engineered to account for the transition.

3. Beneath the proposed structures and for a minimum distance of 5 feet beyond the exterior perimeters, the loose topsoil and compressible surface soils shall be removed and observed by the project design engineer. Upon approval of excavation, the exposed ground surface shall be scarified an additional 6 to 8 inches, moistened or dried to near the optimum moisture content, and compacted to 90 percent of the relative compaction. The minimum depth of removal shall be at least 12 inches below the bottom of the proposed footings.

FOUNDATIONS (GENERAL)

1. All footings shall contain a minimum of two No. 4 horizontal rebar; one placed in the base and one in the stem of the footing. The project design engineer shall specify the foundation steel reinforcement.

2. Concrete slab-on-grade floors shall be placed over a subgrade soil conforming to the Grading recommendations of this mitigation measure.

3. As a minimum, concrete slabs on grade shall be a full 4 inches thick and shall contain No. 3 rebar spaced 24 inches on center each way. The steel reinforcement shall be placed near the center of the slab. Concrete slabs on grade shall be doweled into all adjacent footings using No. 3 rebar spaced 24 inches on center. The traditional or conventional subgrade preparation below a concrete slab-on-grade floor is some variation of the following: A minimum 4-inch coarse, washed concrete sand layer is placed over the soil subgrade. A 10- mil or heavier impervious membrane is placed over the sand layer. These concrete slab-on-grade and sand layer recommendations shall be modified and/or eliminated as needed by the designers for surcharge loads, wheel loads, concentrated loads, or for moisture control. The floor covering supplier or manufacturer will be contacted for their specifications for design features, which will result in a successful bond between the concrete slab and floor covering. Floor flatness and shrinkage crack control must be addressed by a competent contractor experienced in the skill of concrete placement. The owners or their agents shall inform those designing, building, and installing the concrete slab on grade and flooring of the performance and aesthetics expected.

4. The licensed geotechnical engineer shall be requested to inspect the footing excavation prior to placement of reinforcing steel and timber form boards.

5. Floor elevations located lower than the surrounding exterior grades are recommended to be protected from moisture intrusion. The project design engineer shall consider installation of features, such as waterproofing and French drains.

FOUNDATIONS (CLUBHOUSE)

1. These recommendations assume the undisturbed native soil will support the proposed footings. If the final graded conditions positions part of the building over the compacted fill soil, extended footings and/or a pile and grade beam foundation may be required over the fill sections. The footing depth below the lowest adjacent grade shall be minimum of 24 inches. The soil encountered at this depth must be firm, non-porous, undisturbed native soil and the footing excavation must penetrate at least 12 inches into the firm soil. An allowable soil bearing value of 2,000 pounds per square foot may be assumed for the 24 inch deep footing described above with a one-third increase for wind or seismic forces.

2. Specification No. 1 shall apply at the basement foundation elevation and at the basement level a 20% increase in allowable soil

bearing is allowed for each additional 6 inches of depth below the lowest adjacent grade, up to maximum allowable soil bearing value of 3,000 pounds per square foot.

3. Isolated piers may be utilized and shall extend a minimum of 24 inches below the lowest adjacent ground surface.

4. If footings are to be located on, adjacent to, or within 10 feet of the top of a slope, these footings shall extend to such a depth so that the horizontal distance between the bottom outside edge of the footing and the face of the adjacent slope is a minimum distance of 10 feet. The slope setback required by the CBC, Figure 1808.7.1, shall also apply.

FOUNDATIONS (COMFORT STATION)

1. These recommendations assume a uniform thickness of compacted soil will support the proposed footings.

2. Isolated piers may be utilized and shall extend a minimum of 18 inches below compacted ground surface.

3. Based upon compliance with these recommendations, an allowable soil bearing value for compacted soil of 1,500 pounds per square foot for 12-inch-deep footings and 2,000 pounds per square foot for 18-inch-deep footings, with a one-third increase when considering wind or seismic forces, may be assumed.

FOUNDATIONS (RIO GRANDE COFFEE SHOP)

1. These recommendations assume a uniform thickness of compacted soil will support the proposed footings.

2. Footings below two-story portions of the structure shall extend 18 inches below compacted ground surface.

3. Isolated piers may be utilized and shall extend a minimum of 18 inches below compacted ground surface.

4. Based upon compliance with the above recommendations, an allowable soil bearing value for compacted soil of 1,300 pounds per square foot for 12-inch-deep footings and 1,500 pounds per square foot for 18-inch-deep footings, with a one-third increase when considering wind or seismic forces, may be assumed.

PAVEMENT (CLUBHOUSE)

1. In the areas to be paved, the top loose surface soils shall be removed from below the proposed final soil subgrade elevation, moistened or dried to at or near the optimum moisture content, and compacted to 90 percent relative compaction with the top 9 inches being compacted to 95 percent relative compaction where pavement will be subject to vehicle travel or parking. The subgrade area shall be check rolled in order to detect isolated soft spots. Any areas found to be yielding under the wheel loads of the equipment shall be stabilized by removal and compaction.
2. The Class 2 aggregate base shall be recompacted to a minimum of 95 percent relative compaction in accordance with the ASTM D-1557 test method. Asphalt concrete shall be placed only after the Class 2 aggregate base has been demonstrated to be firm and unyielding.
3. If asphalt pavement is selected for the finished pavement surface, an R-Value of the subgrade soil shall be performed by a licensed geotechnical professional in order to provide appropriate thickness of Class 2 aggregate base and asphalt concrete.
4. Maintenance to assist in reducing the potential for rapid deterioration of the asphalt paved areas shall include surface treatment approximately six months to one year after construction and approximately three years from the first treatment. Pavement conditions shall be reviewed at least once a year for cracks, puddling of surface water, and overall appearance. This review should be done in the fall such that cracks may be repaired which may otherwise allow moisture to pass through the pavement and weaken the subgrade.
5. For concrete slab on grade pavements the slab shall be a minimum of 5.5 inches thick and be placed over a 4 inch thick layer of compacted Class 2 base (at 95 percent relative compaction) and shall be reinforced with No. 3 rebar at 24 inches on center each way and placed at the mid-height of the slab thickness.

PAVEMENT (RIO GRANDE COFFEE SHOP)

1. In the areas to be paved, the top loose surface soils shall be removed from below the proposed final soil subgrade elevation, moistened or dried to at or near the optimum moisture content, and compacted to 90 percent relative compaction with the top 9 inches being compacted to 95 percent relative compaction where pavement will be subject to vehicle travel or parking. The subgrade area shall be check rolled in order to detect isolated soft spots. Any areas found

to be yielding under the wheel loads of the equipment shall be stabilized by removal and compaction.

2. The Class 2 aggregate base shall be recompacted to a minimum of 95 percent relative compaction in accordance with the ASTM D-1557 test method. Asphalt concrete shall be placed only after the Class 2 aggregate base has been demonstrated to be firm and unyielding.

3. If asphalt pavement is selected for the finished pavement surface, an R-Value of the subgrade soil shall be performed by a licensed geotechnical professional in order to provide appropriate thickness of Class 2 aggregate base and asphalt concrete.

4. Maintenance to assist in reducing the potential for rapid deterioration of the asphalt paved areas shall include surface treatment approximately six months to one year after construction and approximately three years from the first treatment. Pavement conditions shall be reviewed at least once a year for cracks, puddling of surface water, and overall appearance. This review should be done in the fall such that cracks may be repaired which may otherwise allow moisture to pass through the pavement and weaken the subgrade.

RETAINING WALLS (CLUBHOUSE)

The following retaining wall recommendations assume a single wall on level ground or a slope of less than 25 degrees. If there is more than one retaining wall, creating a multilevel terraced condition, the upper footing must be at a depth that passes below a 50 percent sloping line projected up from the top of the footing of the retaining wall below.

Cantilevered: For cantilevered retaining walls, such as site walls and garden walls, which do not form part of the structure, the following shall apply:

1. The cantilevered retaining wall shall be designed assuming an active soil pressure equivalent to a fluid (EFP) whose weight is 35 pounds per cubic foot for level backfill conditions and 52 pounds per cubic foot for backfill slopes, which are constructed at an angle of up to 27 degrees. These values are based on Coulomb's Equation and the following assumed backfill soil values: internal angle of friction equal to 34 degrees, cohesion equal to 0, and a total unit weight of soil equal to 125 pounds per cubic foot. The EFP value does not include surcharge loads and is based on a free-draining condition.

The free-draining condition must be created by placing the backfill specified in the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed Club House.

2. Retaining walls may be designed using pseudostatic analyses based on a modified Seed Whitman (1970) approach. The need to apply the lateral seismic load is to be determined by the project design engineer or by the building code. The seismic earth force was estimated using the modified Seed Whitman (1970) method, assuming a horizontal peak ground acceleration of 1.142g, and assuming drained backfill conditions. The peak horizontal ground acceleration (PGAm) was determined in accordance with Section 1803.5.12 of the 2019 CBC, Paragraph 2.2. The seismic earth resultant force (ΔP_{ae}), acting on the stem of the retaining wall, may be estimated as $\Delta P_{ae} = 34.4H^2$. The resultant force (ΔP_{ae}) may be assumed to act at 0.33H above the base of the wall². $K_h = 0.765$.

3. The bottom of the retaining wall footing shall extend a minimum distance of 24 inches below the lowest adjacent undisturbed natural grade or 12 inches into firm, undisturbed original ground (whichever is deeper) and shall be designed assuming an allowable soil bearing value of 2,000 pounds per square foot. For footings placed on slopes, the base of the toe or keyway placed at the toe shall extend to such a depth that there exists 10 horizontal feet between the bottom of the footing and the daylight line of the adjacent slope. The key may be placed adjacent to the downhill edge of the retaining wall footing in order to attain the recommended downhill grade footing embedment. The slope setback required by the CBC, Figure 1808.7.1, shall also apply.

4. A passive soil pressure equivalent to a fluid whose weight is 350 pounds per cubic foot and a coefficient of friction against sliding of 0.35 may be assumed for the footing excavation described in the recommendation above.

5. The use of equipment to compact soil within the wedge of backfill defined by a 1:1 line projected up from behind the retaining wall to the surface shall be limited to handheld rammer plate compactors, such as a Wacker BS 45Y. A string line shall be placed along the top of the wall to monitor possible rotation of the wall due to the compaction surcharge. If the wall begins to bow or lean away from the backfilling operations, the compaction process shall stop and the licensed geotechnical professional shall be notified immediately such that modified compaction recommendations can be given at that time.

6. The finish covering on the face of the wall, such as stucco or paint, may be adversely affected by moisture intrusion from the backfill through the back of the wall. To prevent this, the back of the wall and footing shall be waterproofed. All waterproofing and application of waterproofing shall be in accordance with the specifications of the product supplier.

7. Retaining wall backfill shall be a clean, coarse sand or gravel wrapped in a filter fabric. The gravel shall be separated from adjacent native soil by a filter fabric. The retaining wall shall be serviced by appropriately placed weep holes or a perforated drain. This drainage feature must include at least 2 cubic feet of gravel wrapped in filter fabric. Lower quality native backfill material may be utilized outside the triangular wedge, which extends upwards from the inside edge of the retaining wall and is a minimum width of 60 percent of the wall height at ground surface. The sand between the wall and native soil shall have a Sand Equivalent of 20 or greater and an Expansion Index equal to 0. To avoid excessive amounts of sand and gravel backfill, the construction contractor is prohibited to cut a vertical excavation 2 to 4 feet beyond the back of the retaining wall footing or stem. Cuts shall only occur to the point needed to install the drainpipe and slope the excavation back as specified.

8. It is assumed that the rough grade excavation behind the retaining wall is to be cut at a temporary slope angle of 1 horizontal to 1 vertical in order to comply with Cal-OSHA safety requirements.

9. All soil backfill shall be compacted to a minimum of 90 percent relative compaction. It should be noted, retaining walls designed assuming active soil conditions are anticipated to deflect seasonally. In addition, surface features which obtain their support from retaining wall backfill materials are anticipated to express differential movement with respect to the retaining wall as the wall may be resting upon a thinner depth of fill or undisturbed original ground, and the surface features may be resting upon a considerable thickness of compacted fill, which has settlement characteristics differing from that of original ground. The differential movement between the wall and slab patio may be undesirable. In order to hide or prevent such differential movement, an alternate design may be required, such as, but not limited to, placing a planter between the wall and slab, or connecting the slab to the wall, creating a retaining wall which is pinned at the top, not cantilevered.

Partially Restrained: For restrained or partially restrained retaining walls or cantilevered retaining walls which form a portion of the foundation system of the structure, the wall shall be designed as a

braced wall utilizing at-rest pressures in accordance with the following recommendations:

1. The retaining wall shall be designed assuming an at-rest soil pressure equivalent to a fluid (EFP) whose weight is 60 pounds per cubic foot for level backfill conditions and 73 pounds per cubic foot for backfill slopes, which are constructed at an angle of up to 27 degrees. These values are based on the same assumed conditions stated in Recommendation No. 1 under the Cantilevered section. The at-rest condition for a level backfill is based on the following equation: $EFP = K_o \gamma$ where $K_o = 1 - \sin \phi$, γ is the total unit weight of soil, and ϕ is the internal angle of friction.
2. The retaining wall footing shall conform to the Foundations recommendations and may be designed assuming an allowable soil bearing value of 2,000 pounds per square foot. For footings placed on or adjacent to slopes, the base of the toe or keyway placed at the toe shall extend to such a depth that there exists 10 horizontal feet between the bottom of the footing and the daylight line of the adjacent slope.
3. A passive soil pressure equivalent to a fluid whose weight is 350 pounds per cubic foot and a coefficient of friction against sliding of 0.35 may be assumed for the footing excavation described in the recommendation above.
4. The retaining wall shall be serviced by a perforated drain which is located a minimum of 12 inches below top of the adjacent interior concrete slab-on-grade floor.
5. Walls, foundations, and connections between walls and foundations forming interior finished rooms of the structure shall be waterproofed by the proper application of a moisture barrier. All waterproofing products shall be applied in strict conformance with the manufacturer's recommendations.
6. It is assumed that the rough grade excavation behind the retaining wall is to be cut at a temporary slope angle of 1 horizontal to 1 vertical in order to comply with Cal-OSHA safety requirements.
7. Footings located near the retaining wall stem and in the zone of the granular backfill material shall extend through the retaining wall backfill, shall be supported on the firm underlying undisturbed ground, and below a 1 horizontal to 1 vertical line projected upward from the base of the wall; whichever is deeper. As an alternative, the footing can be designed to span across the backfill area and be

supported by footings able to receive the reaction load of the spanning member. This may include tying into the retaining wall for support, if that portion of the retaining wall has been designed to receive the additional load.

8. Retaining wall backfill shall include 2 cubic feet per linear foot of wall of 3/8- to 1- inch gravel placed around a 4-inch perforated rigid PVC drainpipe. The perforations of the pipe shall be placed down at the positions of 5 and 7 o'clock. A filter fabric shall separate the gravel from the other backfill soils.

9. Retaining wall backfill above the drainpipe shall be a clean, coarse sand or gravel, creating an inverted triangular wedge. Lower quality native backfill material may be utilized outside the triangular wedge which extends upwards from the outside edge of the pipe/gravel at the base of the retaining wall and is a minimum width of 60 percent of the wall height at ground surface. Clean, coarse sand is acceptable when the Sand Equivalent is greater than 20 and the Expansion Index equals 0. To avoid excessive amounts of sand and gravel backfill, do not allow the excavation contractor to cut a vertical excavation 2 to 4 feet beyond the back of the retaining wall footing or stem. Cut only to the point needed to install the drainpipe and slope the excavation back as specified.

10. The use of equipment to compact soil within the wedge of backfill defined by a 1:1 line projected up from behind the retaining wall to the surface shall be limited to handheld rammer plate compactors, such as a Wacker BS 45Y. A string line shall be placed along the top of the wall to monitor possible rotation of the wall due to the compaction surcharge. If the wall begins to bow or lean away from the backfilling operations, the compaction process shall stop and the licensed geotechnical professional shall be notified immediately such that modified compaction recommendations can be given at that time.

11. The project design engineer designing the retaining wall shall address the following conditions:

- a. When a retaining wall is backfilled without a top restraint, such as a wood floor diaphragm, the stem of the retaining wall acts as a cantilever.
- b. Depending on the rigidity of the top restraint, the wall may act as a beam spanning between the top and bottom points, reversing the tension side of the stem to the front of the wall

as opposed to the back as in the case of a cantilever condition.

c. Structure members deflect when loaded. The users guide to the widely used computer program RetainPro recommends the deflection of the wall be checked because the program does not calculate deflection. Refer to Section 9 titled "Related Design Considerations" in the manual titled "Basics of Retaining Wall Design", Page 50. As an estimate, the Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute (CRSI) manual estimates concrete reinforced stems of cantilevered retaining walls will deflect a horizontal distance at the top of the wall equal to the height of the wall divided by 240. The appropriate deflection equation and values corresponding to load, condition, and material shall be employed to determine the deflection corresponding to the lateral loads recommended herein such that appropriate connections, tiebacks, bracing, or construction joints can be placed within the structural design to properly account for the deflection. The total deflection may not occur during the backfilling operation, but rather sometime after the frame structure is built over and adjacent to the retaining wall.

ADJACENT LOADS (GENERAL)

1. Where footings are placed at varying elevations, the effect of adjacent loads will be calculated using the widely published Formulas for Stresses in Semi-infinite Elastic Foundations or the Boussinesq figures and equations for both vertical and horizontal surcharge loads.

SETTLEMENT (GENERAL)

1. It is the intent of the recommendations contained in this report to achieve angular distortions of approximately $1/480$. A total settlement of approximately 1 inch or less is anticipated for foundations supported on the undisturbed native soil and approximately 1 percent to 1.5 percent of the fill height is the anticipated total settlement at areas where compacted fill soil is placed in accordance with the Grading measures provided in this mitigation measure. The soil bearing values and estimated settlements contained in this report are preliminary and can be modified after the foundation and grading plans are substantially complete.

Plan Requirements and Timing. Grading and building plans shall be submitted for review and approval by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee before the City issues a Zoning Clearance for the grading and building permits. The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall approve the licensed geotechnical professional prior to the start of construction. The licensed geotechnical professional shall submit the report to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee certifying the recommendations have been incorporated prior to the issuance of a certification of occupancy.

Monitoring. Once during the grading phase of construction, the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall visit the project site to confirm with the licensed geotechnical professional that the construction contractor is implementing the applicable geotechnical recommendations.

2. Paleontological Resources

Threshold: Would the Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.6-23 through 4.6-25, 6-56.)

Explanation: There are no documented paleontological resources on the project site; however, there have been eight recorded paleontological resources within 1.5 miles of the project site, and seven of these paleontological resources were discovered in the same geologic units as those underlying the project site. Based on the high sensitivities of geologic units underlying the project site and the presence of paleontological resources in proximity to the project site, paleontological resources have a high potential to be present within the project site.

Project-related ground disturbance would extend up to 6 feet below the current ground surface for installation of landscaping and paving; up to 4 feet below the current ground surface within the golf course for utility installation; and up to 25 feet below the current ground surface for construction of the new clubhouse. Although the project site has been subject to previous ground disturbance, the proposed depths of disturbance necessary for utility and clubhouse construction would likely extend deeper than previously disturbed soils. If intact paleontological resources are discovered on the project site during ground-disturbing activities, such activities could potentially destroy such paleontological resources, resulting in a

potentially significant impact. Therefore, mitigation is required.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-2 would reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources and unique geologic features to a less than significant level by requiring WEAP training, monitoring, and setting forth procedures for the recovery, identification, and curation of fossils discovered during construction. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.6-23 through 4.6-25, 6-56.)

MM GEO-2

Paleontological Resources Impact Plan and Monitoring

Prior to the commencement of any grading activities, the project applicant shall retain a qualified professional paleontologist as defined in the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources (2010). The qualified professional paleontologist shall prepare a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program consistent with the guidance provided in the Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources. The Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program shall be reviewed and approved by the City's Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee prior to the issuance of a Zoning Clearance for a grading permit. The Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- **Worker Environmental Awareness Program Training.** The qualified professional paleontologist shall conduct WEAP training for construction personnel regarding the appearance of fossils and the procedures for notifying paleontological staff should fossils be discovered by construction staff. A basic presentation shall be prepared and presented by the qualified professional paleontologist to inform all construction personnel working on the project about the paleontological sensitivity of the area. Each worker shall also learn the proper procedures to follow in the event paleontological resources or unique geologic features are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities. These procedures include halting construction and resource assessment. If new construction personnel are added to the project, the construction contractor shall ensure the new personnel receive the training before starting work. The qualified professional paleontologist shall ensure construction personnel sign a form affirming they received WEAP training. The qualified professional paleontologist shall submit this form to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee.

- Monitoring. The qualified professional paleontologist shall identify the locations on the project site where paleontological monitoring is required. The qualified professional paleontologist, or a paleontological resource monitor designated by the qualified professional paleontologist, shall observe initial grading and drilling activities on-site in areas underlain by late Pleistocene marine terrace deposits, the Siquoc Formation, and the Monterey Formation. No monitoring is required for ground disturbing activities in areas of artificial fill, subject to the discretion of the qualified professional paleontologist.
- Discovery of Paleontological Resources. In the event that fossils are unearthed during grading, the qualified professional paleontologist or designated paleontological resource monitor will temporarily halt and/or divert grading activity within a 50-foot radius of the find to allow for recovery of the resource.
 - Fossil Salvage. The qualified professional paleontologist shall salvage (i.e., excavate and recover) the fossil to protect it from damage/destruction. Bulk matrix sampling may be necessary to recover small invertebrates or micro vertebrates from paleontologically sensitive deposits. After the fossil(s) is (are) salvaged, construction activity may resume.
 - Fossil Preparation and Curation. Fossils shall be identified to the lowest (i.e., most-specific) possible taxonomic level, prepared to a curation-ready condition, and curated in a scientific institution with a permanent paleontological collection along with all pertinent field notes, photos, maps, and data required by the curating institution. Fossils of undetermined significance at the time of collection may also warrant curation at the discretion of the qualified professional paleontologist.
 - Final Paleontological Mitigation Report. Upon completion of ground-disturbing activities (or laboratory preparation and curation of fossils, if necessary), the qualified professional paleontologist shall prepare a final report describing the results of the paleontological monitoring efforts. The report shall include a summary of the field and laboratory methods employed; an

overview of project geology; and, if fossils were discovered, an analysis of the fossils, including physical description, taxonomic identification, and scientific significance. The report shall be submitted to the City's Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee and, if fossil curation occurred, the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History.

Plan Requirements and Timing. The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall approve the Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program prior to the issuance of a Zoning Clearance for a grading permit. The qualified professional paleontologist shall conduct WEAP training prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities and submit the signed form to the Planning and Environmental Review Director within 24 hours following the completion of WEAP training. The qualified professional paleontologist or designated paleontological resource monitor shall observe initial grading and drilling activities throughout construction on-site in areas underlain by late Pleistocene marine terrace deposits, the Sisquoc Formation, and the Monterey Formation. If a fossil is discovered, the qualified professional paleontologist shall submit the Final Paleontological Mitigation Report to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee within 90 days of completion of salvage and preparation. If curation occurred, the qualified professional paleontologist shall also submit the Final Paleontological Mitigation Report to the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History.

Monitoring. The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall review and approve the form provided by the qualified professional paleontologist certifying WEAP training was completed. The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall confirm the qualified professional paleontologist or designated paleontological resource monitor observed grading and drilling activities. The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall review and approve the Final Paleontological Mitigation Report, if applicable.

D. HAZARDOUS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

1. Accident or Upset

Threshold: Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-57 through 6-58.)

Explanation: Alternative 4 would include demolition of the existing clubhouse, portions of the existing maintenance facility, and comfort station, and restoration of the Barnsdall Rio Gas Station, which have the potential to contain ACM, LBP, mercury, and PCB. Alternative 4 would result in the same potential impact regarding the release of ACM, LBP, mercury, and PCB from demolition of existing buildings. Alternative 4 would require slightly more ground disturbance than the proposed project and therefore would a small increase in potential to result in release of hazardous materials. However, the increase would be nominal given the overall scale of construction activities. Grading could potentially disturb hazardous materials in soil, leading to an accidental release of hazardous materials. Construction of Alternative 4 could also encounter perched groundwater which, if contaminated, could result in the accidental release of hazardous materials. In addition, operation of Alternative 4 could result in exposure to volatile organic compounds in the soil similar to the proposed project. Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6 would continue to be required, which would reduce potential hazardous material impacts associated with accidental releases of hazardous materials during demolition of the existing clubhouse, and grading of potentially contaminated soil, soil vapor, or groundwater to a less than significant level. Operation of Alternative 4 would result in the same reduction in fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course as the proposed project due to the same reduction of irrigated turf. Accordingly, Alternative 4's impact related to the accidental release of hazardous materials would be similar compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-57 through 6-58.)

MM HAZ-1

Asbestos-Containing Materials Abatement

Prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance associated with the demolition permit, the project applicant shall prepare an asbestos abatement plan addressing the items/topics listed below. The asbestos abatement plan shall be reviewed and approved by SBCAPCD. Proof of SBCAPCD approval shall be provided to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee. During project construction and demolition activities, the project applicant shall follow the measures outlined in the asbestos abatement plan, which shall be undertaken by properly trained and licensed asbestos contractors currently registered with Cal/OSHA and/or OSHA (herein referred to as "abatement contractors"). Abatement contractors shall be selected and vetted by the project

applicant and reviewed by SBCAPCD ten working days prior to starting demolition as part of the Notification for Renovation and Demolition Form ENF-28 submittal. Project-specific requirements to be addressed in the asbestos abatement plan include the following:

- Disturbance activities shall be performed only by abatement contractors using appropriate controls to prevent fiber emissions during the removal process. This may include, but is not limited to, the use of wet methods (water mist), negative pressure containment, high efficiency particulate air filtration, and other engineering controls, as deemed appropriate, to keep fibers from being dispersed in accordance with current federal, State, and local regulations. Presumed asbestos containing roofing materials shall be sampled by abatement contractors prior to demolition to determine proper handling and disposal requirements.
- Windows with trace (defined as less than 1 percent) asbestos in putty shall be removed intact to avoid disturbance of the putty, if possible. Other materials with trace asbestos shall be point counted to determine the asbestos concentrations; if asbestos concentrations are not determined, these materials shall be managed as ACMs.
- Workers performing removal shall be properly protected to prevent exposure, including the use of respiratory protection with high efficiency particulate air filtration, protective suits, or other protective equipment deemed necessary by abatement contractors. Disturbance of greater than 100 square feet of any ACMs or asbestos-containing construction materials must be performed by trained and licensed abatement contractors.
- Asbestos containing waste materials must be properly contained and transported for off-site disposal at a permitted landfill or disposal facility. Friable asbestos with greater than 1 percent asbestos content is considered hazardous waste per current federal and State regulations and must be transported and disposed of using proper manifest documentation. Non-friable asbestos is categorized as non-hazardous, asbestos containing waste and can typically be disposed to the local Class III landfill with prior approval from landfill operators. As noted, materials with less than 1 percent total asbestos can be disposed of as construction debris if proper lab analysis is provided.
- Proper removal techniques must be followed to prevent the

dissemination of asbestos fibers. All required notification and permitting shall be administered by the abatement contractor, and proper completion shall be verified by the City's Director of Planning and Environmental Review.

- If suspect materials are found during site work, the area shall be isolated, and any suspect materials tested to confirm or deny the presence of asbestos, lead, or other hazards, as determined appropriate by the abatement contractor.

Plan Requirements and Timing. The project applicant shall prepare the asbestos abatement plan, obtain SBCAPCD's approval, and contract with an abatement contractor prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance associated with the demolition permit.

Monitoring. The City of Goleta's Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, shall verify SBCAPCD has approved the asbestos abatement plan prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance. The City of Goleta's Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, shall spot-check compliance with the asbestos abatement plan during demolition activities and verify compliance documentation following Alternative 4's demolition activities.

MM HAZ-2

Lead-Based Paint Abatement

Prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance associated with the demolition permit, the project applicant shall prepare an LBP abatement plan. This plan can be combined with the plan required in Mitigation Measure HAZ-1. The LBP abatement plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee. During proposed project construction and demolition activities, the project applicant shall follow the measures outlined in the LBP abatement plan. These requirements shall be undertaken by properly trained contractors that utilize lead-safe work practices (or "abatement contractors"). Abatement contractors shall be selected and vetted by the project applicant and reviewed by the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director. Prior to abatement, the applicant shall notify CDPH of lead-based abatement activities through submittal of CDPH Form 8551, and provide evidence of the notification to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee. Project-specific requirements of the LBP abatement plan include the following:

- Any disturbance by abatement contractors that might

generate dust or create a lead exposure hazard shall be performed by lead-trained workers using lead-safe work practices. Lead safe work practices include appropriate containment, wet methods, and use of hand tools or similar methods that will minimize the generation of airborne dust emissions and potential lead hazards.

- To prevent lead exposure hazard due to the generation of lead dust and debris, lead-painted components (e.g., windows, doors, baseboards) or similar lead-containing items shall be removed intact and segregated from the overall waste stream by abatement contractors.
- Lead-containing waste is classified as hazardous waste if total lead concentration exceeds 1,000 milligrams per kilogram (or parts per million) or if soluble lead concentration exceeds 5.0 milligrams per liter. Proper waste characterization testing or waste profiling shall be conducted prior to disposal of lead containing waste. If practicable, lead wastes shall be segregated to minimize the volume of possible hazardous waste. If lead-containing and non-lead waste materials are comingled during demolition, composite samples of representative waste shall be analyzed by a certified lab to determine proper disposal requirements.

Plan Requirements and Timing. The project applicant shall prepare the LBP abatement plan, notify CDPH, and contract with an abatement contractor prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance associated with the demolition permit.

Monitoring. The City of Goleta's Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, shall approve the LBP abatement plan and verify CDPH has been notified prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance. The City of Goleta's Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, shall check the abatement contractor's monitoring log to ensure project-specific recommendations are enacted during proposed project demolition activities.

MM HAZ-3

Corrective Action Plan/Soil and Groundwater Management Plan Revision

Prior to commencement of grading activities at the project site, the project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant approved by Santa Barbara County EHS to revise the existing CAP/SGMP prepared for the project site such that the CAP/SGMP

addresses potential contamination in the maintenance yard, and addresses Santa Barbara County EHS's comments on the CAP/SGMP. The revised CAP/SGMP shall address:

1. On-site handling and management of impacted soils or other impacted wastes (e.g., stained soil, and soil or groundwater with solvent or chemical odors) if such soils or impacted materials are encountered;
2. The notification process if an unknown well or leaking well is discovered (e.g., notification of the Santa Barbara County Petroleum Unit, as well as the California Department of Conservation Geologic Energy Management Division); and,
3. Specific actions to reduce hazards to construction workers and off-site receptors during the construction phase.

The CAP/SGMP must establish engineering controls and soil management practices to ensure construction worker safety, ensure the health of future workers and visitors, and prevent the off-site migration of contaminants from Alternative 4. These measures and practices shall include, but are not limited to:

- Stockpile management, including stormwater pollution prevention and the installation of best management practices.
- Proper disposal procedures of contaminated materials.
- Investigation procedures for encountering known and unexpected odorous or visually stained soils, other indications of hydrocarbon piping or equipment, and/or debris during ground disturbing activities.
- Monitoring and reporting
- An environmental health and safety plan for contractors working at the project site that addresses the safety and health hazards of each phase of site construction activities with the requirements and procedures for employee protection.
- The environmental health and safety plan shall outline proper soil handling procedures and health and safety requirements to minimize worker and public exposure to hazardous materials during construction.

The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review the CAP/SGMP and have the authority to propose and include modifications prior to submittal to Santa Barbara County EHS. Santa Barbara County EHS shall review and approve the CAP/SGMP prior to construction (demolition and grading) activities at the project site. The project applicant shall submit proof of Santa Barbara County EHS's approval of the CAP/SGMP to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to construction activities. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall verify Santa Barbara County EHS's approval of the CAP/SGMP and shall review the final CAP/SGMP prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The project applicant shall implement the CAP/SGMP during demolition, grading, and construction at the project site.

Plan Requirements and Timing. Prior to commencement of construction and grading activities at the project site, the project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant approved by Santa Barbara County EHS to revise the existing CAP/SGMP prepared for Alternative 4. The project applicant shall submit proof of Santa Barbara County EHS' approval of the CAP/SGMP to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to construction activities. The project applicant shall implement the CAP/SGMP during demolition, grading, and construction at the project site.

Monitoring. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review the CAP/SGMP and have the authority to propose and include modifications prior to submittal to Santa Barbara County EHS. Once Santa Barbara County EHS has reviewed the CAP/SGMP, the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall verify Santa Barbara County EHS' approval of the CAP/SGMP and that Santa Barbara County EHS's comments on the CAP/SGMP have been appropriately addressed by the qualified environmental consultant. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review the final CAP/SGMP prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance of construction or grading permits, and shall review project construction plans to ensure applicable recommendations from the CAP/SGMP are integrated into construction plans.

MM HAZ-4

Sub-slab Vapor Mitigation System

Where soil vapor is known and is identified to be present at chemical

concentrations exceeding regulatory screening thresholds for sub-slab/soil vapor intrusion, the project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant (PG or PE) or other qualified person to prepare a Sub-slab Vapor Mitigation System Design for Alternative 4. The plan shall include, but is not limited to, design specifications, material specifications, installation requirements, and monitoring requirements.

Santa Barbara County EHS shall review and approve the Sub-slab Vapor Mitigation System Design prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for building permits. The project applicant shall incorporate a sub-slab vapor barrier into the project's building plans, the implementation of which shall prevent the potential for soil vapor VOCs from migrating to indoor air. The project's building plans, which shall include engineering measures or institutional controls, shall be submitted by the qualified environmental consultant to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for building permits.

Plan Requirements and Timing. The project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant (PG or PE) or other qualified person to prepare a Sub-slab Vapor Mitigation System Design for Alternative 4 prior to construction. The project applicant shall incorporate a sub-slab vapor barrier during construction.

Monitoring. Santa Barbara County EHS shall review and approve the Sub-slab Vapor Mitigation System Design prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for building permits. The qualified environmental consultant shall submit the project's building plans, which shall include engineering measures or institutional controls, to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for building permits.

MM HAZ-5

Groundwater Disposal

If disposal of contaminated groundwater is required during construction of Alternative 4, Santa Barbara County EHS shall be consulted to determine if the treated groundwater can be disposed of through one of their waste discharge permit options. Based on the concentrations of chemical constituents of contaminated groundwater, an individual NPDES permit and/or waste discharge requirements may be required to be obtained for dewatering activities. If disposal of contaminated groundwater is required, proof of consultation with Santa Barbara County EHS and compliance with Santa Barbara County EHS's disposal requirements shall be submitted to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review

Director.

Plan Requirements and Timing. If dewatering is required, the project applicant shall consult with Santa Barbara County EHS and provide proof of consultation and compliance with EHS's disposal requirements to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance.

Monitoring. If disposal of contaminated groundwater is required, the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall verify consultation with Santa Barbara County EHS and compliance with Santa Barbara County EHS's disposal requirements has occurred prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance.

MM HAZ-6

Oil Well Access

The property owner shall grant access to all wells located on the project site to any public agency or legal inheritor of the wells for the purposes of inspection, maintenance, service, or re-abandonment such that future remediation or abandonment of existing wells is not impeded by project-related redevelopment. This access shall be maintained in perpetuity and shall not be restricted by any physical or legal barriers resulting from project construction or operation.

Plan Requirements and Timing. Prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit, the project applicant shall provide documentation to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director demonstrating that the property owner has agreed to grant access to all wells on the project site to any public agency or legal inheritor of the wells for the purposes of inspection, maintenance, service, or re-abandonment. This documentation shall also reference the indemnification provisions outlined in the Condition of Approval.

Monitoring. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall verify that the required documentation has been submitted and that it includes provisions for both access and indemnification prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.

2. Hazards Near Schools

Threshold: Would the Project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-24 through 4.8-25, 6-58.)

Explanation: **Construction.** Construction of Alternative 4 would occur approximately 80 feet from the Ellwood School due to the extension of the bicycle path beyond the project site's eastern boundary, which is closer to the school than Alternative 4. During construction, equipment would require the use of diesel fuel, gasoline, motor oil, and similar materials. The amount of fuel and oil to power construction equipment would be typical of similar construction projects. Such materials would be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations including OSHA Standard 1917.156, which designates fueling locations, regulates liquid fuel, and specifies standards for fueling operation and storage. Construction personnel would be required to have the necessary training and/or certifications to operate construction equipment, minimizing the risk of accidental release of hazardous materials due to equipment failure. construction activities would have the potential to create a significant hazard involving the release of ACMs, LBP, mercury, or PCBs into the environment, or through exposure and transport of on-site contaminated soil or groundwater.

Alternative 4's construction activities would have the potential to create a significant hazard involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, or through exposure and transport of on-site contaminated soil or groundwater, which would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6. Therefore, Alternative 4's impact related to handling hazardous materials within 0.25-mile of a school would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6 would reduce potential hazardous material impacts associated with the handling of hazardous materials within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school during construction to a less-than-significant level. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-24 through 4.8-25, 6-58.)

3. Waste Sites

Threshold: Would the Project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-25 through 4.8-28, 6-59.)

Explanation: Based on review of the databases maintained pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, there are two hazardous materials sites located within the project site: a Santa Barbara County EHS Cleanup Program Site case (#375) for the Sandpiper Golf Club with an “Open – Inactive” status as of June 2, 2023 and a LUST Cleanup Site case (EHS case #51238, Central Coast RWQCB case #213) for the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station with a “Completed – Case Closed” status as of April 24, 1997 (SWRCB 2025a).

According to the 1997 Case Closure Summary available on GeoTracker for the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station LUST Cleanup Site case, soil impacted with TPH-g and VOCs was left in place at the time of case closure (SWRCB 2025a). Based on a review of the applicant-provided documents and documents available on GeoTracker for the Sandpiper Golf Club Cleanup Program Site case, site assessments conducted at the Sandpiper Golf Club since 2002 have identified contaminants of concern as TPH-g, TPH-d, TPH-o, VOCs, PAHs, and metals in soil and groundwater at the clubhouse and golf course areas of the project site, and VOCs in soil vapor at the clubhouse area of project site (SWRCB 2025a, CGI 2025b).

Construction. Groundwater at the project site is known to be impacted with TPH-g, TPH-d, TPH-o, VOCs, PAHs, and metals. Although groundwater at the project site has reportedly not been encountered in soil borings advanced as deep as 50 feet (CGI 2025b), there is the potential for seasonal perched groundwater to be encountered at shallower depths. Based on the depth of excavation for Alternative 4 (anticipated to be up to 25 feet below ground surface), groundwater may be encountered during construction activities at the project site and would require special handling and/or dewatering.

Additionally, soil at the project site is known to be impacted with TPH-g, TPH-d, TPH-o, VOCs, PAHs, and metals, and soil vapor at the project site is known to be impacted with VOCs. Impacted soil that is planned for export would be hauled off-site for disposal during proposed project construction, which would require special handling or disposal as a waste. Notably, the maintenance yard has not been assessed for hazardous materials contamination to date. With the known impacted soil, soil vapor, and groundwater at the project site and the unknown soil, soil vapor, and groundwater conditions in the existing maintenance yard, there is a potential for grading and construction workers to be exposed to contaminants (e.g., TPH, VOCs, PAHs, and metals) via dust and/or soil, air, and groundwater. Ground-disturbing activities during proposed project construction

would result in a potentially significant hazard to the public (construction workers on-site) or the environment through exposure to contaminated soil, soil vapor, or groundwater. Therefore, construction impacts would be potentially significant.

A Revised CAP/SGMP was prepared for the project site in 2025 (CGI 2025a). The CAP/SGMP establishes protocols and procedures for on-site handling and management of impacted soils and groundwater, if encountered during proposed project construction activities, and includes a site specific health and safety plan. However, the CAP/SGMP does not address potential contamination in the maintenance yard, and the exposure to such contamination may cause potentially significant impacts to the public or the environment. Santa Barbara County EHS, which regulates the project site under its Site Mitigation Unit program based on previously reported petroleum-impacted soil, would require a formal CAP for Alternative 4. Once the CAP has been completed, Santa Barbara County EHS would review the CAP/SGMP to ensure it includes all historical and post-remediation assessment data.

Operation. The risk of hazardous materials creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment would primarily occur during construction of Alternative 4 as on-site contamination is disturbed. However, contamination may remain in place at the project site during operation. Given that soil vapor at the project site is known to be impacted with VOCs, which could migrate from contaminated soil into indoor air, there is a risk of public exposure to VOCs. Therefore, Alternative 4 would have a potentially significant operational impact involving the creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment, and engineering controls, such as a vapor barrier, would be necessary.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-3 through HAZ-7 prior to and during construction would reduce Alternative 4's impact associated with creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-4 and HAZ-7 would reduce potential impacts associated with vapor intrusion during project operation such that impacts involving the creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-25 through 4.8-28, 6-59.)

MM HAZ-7

Regulatory Agency Notification and Oversight

Given the project site is listed as an open Santa Barbara County EHS Cleanup Program Site (EHS case #375) and a closed LUST Cleanup

Site (EHS case #51238, Central Coast RWQCB case #213), the EHS case #375, EHS case #51238, and Central Coast RWQCB case #213 shall continue to be utilized for agency oversight of assessment and remediation of the project site.

The project applicant shall submit the following documents to the Santa Barbara County EHS project manager of the open Cleanup Program Site case, and the Santa Barbara County EHS and Central Coast RWQCB project managers of the closed LUST Cleanup Site case. The Santa Barbara County EHS project manager and Central Coast RWQCB project manager shall review and approve the following documents prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit at the project site:

- Current development plan (e.g., architectural drawings and project description) and any modifications to the development plan
- All environmental assessment documents completed for the project site, including the Environmental Impact Report for the Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project (this EIR)
- All future hazardous material reports completed for the project site

Upon submittal of the listed information, and in accordance with the regulatory agency's voluntary oversight agreement, the regulatory agency may require additional actions such as: development of subsurface investigation workplans; completion of additional soil, soil vapor, and/or groundwater subsurface investigations; installation of soil vapor or groundwater monitoring wells; soil excavation and off-site disposal; completion of human health risk assessments; and/or completion of remediation reports or case closure documents.

The project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant (PG or PE) to conduct any required subsurface soil, soil vapor, groundwater investigations, or human health risk assessments in accordance with a sampling plan that shall be reviewed and approved by the regulatory agency. In the event the regulatory agency identifies the need for installation of soil vapor or groundwater monitoring wells to reduce potential hazards to the public or the environment, the project applicant shall identify soil vapor or groundwater monitoring wells on the final project plans for review and approval by the regulatory agency. In the event the regulatory agency identifies the need for soil excavation and off-site

disposal to reduce potential hazards to the public or the environment, the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review the final grading plans to ensure soil excavation and off-site disposal are included, and shall approve the final grading plans prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. If required workplans, investigations, or other mitigation actions require regulatory agency remediation reports or case closure documents, the qualified environmental consultant shall submit these documents to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The project applicant shall also provide proof of Santa Barbara County EHS's and Central Coast RWQCB's approval of the current development plan, environmental assessment documents, hazardous material reports, and additional workplans, investigations, human health risk assessments, remediation reports, or case closure documents (as applicable) to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.

Plan Requirements and Timing. Prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit at the project site, the project applicant shall submit the abovementioned documents to the Santa Barbara County EHS project manager of the open Cleanup Program Site case, and the Santa Barbara County EHS and Central Coast RWQCB project managers of the closed LUST Cleanup Site case. Prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit, the project applicant shall also retain a qualified environmental consultant to conduct any required subsurface soil, soil vapor, groundwater investigations, or human health risk assessments in accordance with a sampling plan that shall be reviewed and approved by Santa Barbara County EHS or the Central Coast RWQCB.

Monitoring. If required workplans, investigations, or other mitigation actions require regulatory agency remediation reports or case closure documents, the qualified environmental consultant shall submit these documents to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee for review and approval prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.

E. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

1. Water Quality Standards

Threshold: Would the Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-14 through 4.9-19, 6-59.)

Explanation: **Construction.** Alternative 4 would involve the demolition of the existing clubhouse, portions of the existing maintenance facility, and comfort station. The existing clubhouse and comfort station were constructed in 1971 and have the potential to contain asbestos and lead-based paint. Demolition activities have the potential to release these pollutants into on-site soils, where they could then be transported off-site in stormwater runoff during storm events. SWRCB's Construction Stormwater General Permit includes requirements for projects to address demolition-related pollutants. In compliance with these requirements, the SWPPP would specify BMPs to control the discharge of pollutants associated with demolition, including asbestos and lead. In addition, demolition activities would be required to be scheduled when there is a low probability of precipitation. In addition, demolition and construction activities would be required to adhere to the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District regulations regarding asbestos and California Department of Public Health regulations regarding lead-based paint materials. However, the release of lead-based materials or asbestos is possible if improperly handled, which could result in pollutant discharge during demolition and exacerbate the existing toxicity impairment in Bell Canyon Creek. Therefore, this impact would be potentially significant, and mitigation is required.

Subsurface investigations were conducted for soils up to the anticipated depths of construction for the comfort station, the clubhouse, and the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. Subsurface investigations did not encounter groundwater underlying the existing clubhouse, Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, or comfort station. Although subsurface investigations did not encounter groundwater, water table levels can fluctuate and seasonal perched groundwater⁸ can exist subsurface. If groundwater or seasonal perched groundwater is encountered during excavation activities, temporary groundwater dewatering during construction may be required. Depending on the quality of the water, groundwater could be discharged into Devereaux Creek or Bell Canyon Creek. Groundwater dewatering would be conducted in accordance with Central Coast RWQCB regulations which require testing and treatment, as necessary, of groundwater prior to its release into surface waters to prevent exceedances of effluent limitations and discharge flow rates. However, the potential exists that dewatered

groundwater could be contaminated with pollutants such as gasoline, diesel, and motor oil from past oil extraction activities on the project site. The extraction of contaminated groundwater could result in an accidental release of hazardous materials into Devereaux Creek or Bell Canyon Creek. The environmental effects of potential contaminated groundwater release would not be adequately minimized through Central Coast RWQCB regulations alone. Therefore, groundwater dewatering would have the potential to substantially degrade surface water quality. This impact would be potentially significant, and mitigation would be required.

Construction would not introduce substantial wastes (i.e., wastewater, pet wastes, wildlife wastes) or introduce livestock or other animals which could substantially increase *E. coli* concentrations in Bell Canyon Creek. In addition, on-site portable toilets would be provided for construction workers, which would also limit the potential for release of *E. coli*. Therefore, construction would not have the potential to introduce *E. coli* into Bell Canyon Creek.

Construction activities would require approximately 86,500 cubic yards of soil cut and 56,000 cubic yards of soil fill, with the remaining 30,500 cubic yards used at graded areas of the project site which would occur across the 193-acre project site. Selenium is a naturally occurring element; however, soils on the project site contain minimal amounts of selenium and construction activities would not contribute to the existing selenium impairment in Bell Canyon Creek. Grading operations would increase the potential for erosion and sedimentation and the release of nitrates within the soil. If grading activities occur during the rainy season, or in the event of heavy storms, soils from the site could be entrained, eroded, and transported to Devereaux Creek or Bell Canyon Creek. Construction could correspondingly contribute to existing impairments by reducing dissolved oxygen and increase turbidity in Devereaux Creek or increase nitrate levels in Bell Canyon Creek. In addition, chemicals, liquid products, petroleum products, and concrete-related waste may be spilled or leaked and have the potential to be transported off-site via stormwater runoff.

Construction projects of one or more acres are subject to the requirements of the Construction Stormwater General Permit, which requires preparation and implementation of a SWPPP to control the discharges of pollutants, including sediment, into local surface water drainages. The SWPPP would specify the storm water monitoring and construction BMPs required to be implemented to minimize water quality degradation. Construction BMPs would include, but are not limited to, erosion and sediment control BMPs designed to

minimize erosion and retain sediment on-site, and good housekeeping BMPs to reduce the risk of spills, leaks, and off-site discharge of construction debris and waste.

In addition to NPDES permit requirements, construction activities would be subject to the requirements of Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code which requires preparation of an erosion and sediment control plan in order to obtain a grading permit. The City accepts a SWPPP in lieu of an erosion control and sediment plan, if the SWPPP contains the requirements of the City's required elements of an erosion and sediment control plan. As stated in Municipal Code Section 15.09.110, the City's Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee would review the SWPPP as part of the grading permit application to ensure the City's required elements of an erosion and sediment control plan are implemented within the SWPPP. Accordingly, the SWPPP prepared for Alternative 4 would include information on proposed BMPs that would be used during construction to retain sediment on-site, minimize surface runoff and erosion, utilize vegetation for erosion control, and control pollution from on-site stormwater discharges, as well as a summary of precautionary measures to be taken to ensure vehicle use does not result in erosion. These requirements would minimize the potential for pollutants such as nitrates and toxicity from entering Bell Canyon Creek and contributing to the existing impairments.

Construction of Alternative 4 includes a new golf cart path bridge crossing Devereaux Creek, maintenance of an existing bridge crossing Devereaux Creek, and the removal of an existing culvert, which could temporarily affect water quality, including by increasing turbidity, in Devereaux Creek. The construction contractor would implement construction BMPs and stormwater monitoring consistent with the SWPPP and Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code to reduce the potential to introduce sediment and pollutants and degrade water quality in Devereaux Creek. However, construction work inside Devereaux Creek during periods of high flows could result in the degradation of water quality from increased erosion. Therefore, this impact would be potentially significant, and mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 require implementation of asbestos and lead-based paint abatement plans which require asbestos and lead based components to be removed intact, proper transportation and disposal of asbestos and lead based components, and the testing and monitoring of unidentified suspect materials prior to removal to confirm if asbestos and lead-based components are

present in such materials. With implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2, potential impacts for asbestos and lead based materials to worsen toxicity in Bell Canyon Creek, introduce toxicity to Devereaux Creek, or substantially degrade water quality would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-5 requires proper handling and disposal of any contaminated groundwater encountered during potential groundwater dewatering activities. If contaminated groundwater is generated during construction, the Central Coast RWQCB or the City shall be consulted to determine if the treated groundwater can be disposed of through one of their waste discharge permit options, or if an individual NPDES and/or waste discharge requirement would be required. The groundwater discharge and disposal requirements vary by agency, location, concentration, and contaminants of concern and would therefore be developed in consultation with the City and/or the Central Coast RWQCB. With implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-5, contaminated groundwater would be remediated and disposed of in compliance with Central Coast RWQCB or the City requirements, thereby reducing potential toxicity associated with groundwater dewatering impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure BIO-4 requires construction vehicle equipment maintenance to take place in designated staging areas which are not permitted to be located near any storm drain inlets, drainage swales, or surface waterways, including Devereaux Creek. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-1 above requires culvert removal and bridge installation at Devereaux Creek to occur within the dry season to minimize the potential for construction pollutants to enter water within Devereaux Creek and result in increased turbidity or decreased dissolved oxygen. Combined implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and HYD-1 would ensure that potential impacts related to degrading water quality due to culvert removal and bridge installation would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Overall, implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, HAZ-2, HAZ-5, BIO-4, and HYD-1 would reduce Alternative 4's potential to substantially degrade water quality to a less than significant level. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-14 through 4.9-19, 6-59.)

MM HYD-1

Dry Season Construction in Devereaux Creek

Prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit, the project applicant shall include within the construction contract the requirement that work related to culvert removal, and bridge

installation and maintenance at Devereaux Creek must occur during the dry season (June 1 to October 15) when water flows are low. The construction contractor shall only conduct work related to culvert removal and bridge installation/maintenance at Devereaux Creek during the dry season.

Plan Requirements and Timing. The construction contract shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. During construction, the construction contractor shall schedule culvert removal and bridge installation to occur during the dry season. The construction contractor shall provide the Planning and Environmental Review Director with a minimum of a 7-day notice for when culvert removal and bridge installation are scheduled to occur.

Monitoring. The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall visit the site during scheduled culvert removal and bridge installation to confirm such activities are taking place during the dry season.

2. Runoff

Threshold: Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-22 through 4.9-23, 6-60.)

Explanation: **Construction.** Construction would comply with several regulations such as the Construction Stormwater General Permit and the City Municipal Code intended to control stormwater runoff and reduce pollutants and ensure construction activities would not result in substantial runoff water which would exceed the capacities of Devereaux Creek or Bell Canyon Creek. However, even with adherence to regulatory requirements, construction activities could result in additional sources of polluted runoff related to asbestos, lead-based paints, groundwater dewatering, culvert removal, and bridge installation. This impact would be potentially significant, and mitigation is required.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 require

implementation of asbestos and lead-based paint abatement plans which require asbestos and lead-based components to be removed intact, proper transportation and disposal of asbestos and lead-based components, and the testing and monitoring of unidentified suspect materials prior to removal to confirm if asbestos and lead-based components are present in such materials. With implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2, potential impacts for asbestos and lead-based materials to provide substantial sources of polluted runoff would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-5 requires proper handling and disposal of any contaminated groundwater encountered during potential groundwater dewatering activities. If contaminated groundwater is generated during construction, the Central Coast RWQCB or the City shall be consulted to determine if the treated groundwater can be disposed of through one of their waste discharge permit options, or if an individual NPDES and/or waste discharge requirement would be required. The groundwater discharge and disposal requirements vary by agency, location, concentration, and contaminants of concern and would therefore be developed in consultation with the City and/or the Central Coast RWQCB. With implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-5, contaminated groundwater would be remediated and disposed of in compliance with Central Coast RWQCB or the City requirements, thereby reducing the potential for groundwater to provide substantial sources of polluted runoff to a less than significant level.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4 requires construction vehicle equipment and maintenance to occur in designated staging areas which are not permitted to be located near any storm drain inlets, drainage swales, or surface waterways, including Devereaux Creek. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-1 requires culvert removal and bridge installation at Devereaux Creek to occur within the dry season to minimize the potential for construction pollutants to enter water within Devereaux Creek. Combined implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and HYD-1 would ensure that potential impacts related to providing substantial sources of polluted runoff due to culvert removal and bridge installation would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Overall, implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, HAZ-2, HAZ-5, BIO-4, and HYD-1 would reduce Alternative 4's potential to introduce substantial additional sources of polluted runoff to a less than significant level. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-22 through 4.9-23, 6-60.)

3. Water Quality Control Plan

Threshold: Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-26 through 4.9-27, 6-60.)

Explanation: Construction and operation of Alternative 4 would be conducted in compliance with applicable regulatory requirements related to stormwater runoff to minimize the potential for pollutants to degrade water quality. These include the Construction Stormwater General Permit, the Central Coast RWQCB's Post-Construction Requirements, the County's Stormwater Technical Guide for Low Impact Development, and Chapter 13.04 and Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code. In accordance with these permits Alternative 4 would be required to implement a SWPPP, construction BMPs, SWQMP, Source Control BMPs, and LID BMPs to reduce the potential for Alternative 4 to degrade water quality. However, Alternative 4 still has the potential to result in water quality impacts in Devereaux Creek or Bell Canyon Creek during construction related to asbestos, lead-based materials, groundwater dewatering, culvert removal, and bridge installation. These construction activities could result in the introduction of pollutants which could increase the severity of existing impairments in Devereaux Creek and Bell Canyon Creek. Worsening existing impairments could result in pollutants in excess of water quality objective quantities identified in the Basin Plan and/or cause the beneficial uses of Devereaux Creek identified in the Basin Plan to be reduced which would conflict with the Basin Plan. Therefore, construction impacts would be potentially significant, and mitigation is required.

Alternative 4 would include implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-4, and HYD-1, to reduce potential surface water quality impacts related to culvert removal and bridge installation in Devereaux Creek. Alternative 4 would include implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 in order to reduce potential surface water quality impacts related to the introduction of pollutants associated with the improper handling of asbestos or lead-based materials during demolition. Alternative 4 would include implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-5, to reduce potential surface water quality impacts related to groundwater dewatering.

With the combined implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, HAZ-2, HAZ-5, BIO-4, and HYD-1, Alternative 4 would reduce the potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality

control plan to a less than significant level. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-26 through 4.9-27, 6-60.)

F. LAND USE AND PLANNING

1. Conflicts With Plans

Threshold: Would the Project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.10-6 through 4.10-47, 6-61 through 6-62.)

Explanation: The project site is zoned as Open Space/Active Recreation (City of Goleta 2025). Pursuant to Section 17.12.010(C) of the Goleta Municipal Code, the specific intent of the Open Space/Active Recreation zone is “for existing or planned areas for public parks and active recreational activities and facilities through implementation of the Open Space/Active Recreation land use designation in the General Plan. Individual recreational areas may include a mix of passive and active recreational features or improvements.” As identified in Section 12.12.020 of the Goleta Municipal Code, allowed uses within this zone include community gardens, government buildings, park and recreation facilities, passive open space, and outdoor recreation (with a Conditional Use Permit). As the proposed renovation of the project site would consist of outdoor recreational facilities with associated recreational and support structures, and the project applicant would obtain a Conditional Use Permit, Alternative 4 would thus be permitted in the Open Space/Active Recreation zone.

The golf course's initial construction was approved by the County of Santa Barbara with building and grading permits. The project site was incorporated as part of the City of Goleta in 2002, which brought the project site under the jurisdiction of City regulations and planning. Some aspects of the Sandpiper Golf Club are considered legal non-conforming, as they were approved and operated under the previous County's approval; consequently, while the existing developments do not conform to current City codes, they are allowed to continue operating because they were legally established under the regulations in place at the time of their approval. Alternative 4 would require approval of a Development Plan from the City and a Coastal Development Permit from the California Coastal Commission to authorize the proposed improvements and continued use of the golf course and associated facilities. Upon approval of these permits, the

golf course use and related structures would no longer be considered legal non-conforming and would instead be conforming uses under the Goleta Municipal Code. This change would resolve the current non-conforming status and align the project site's use with the Open Space/Active Recreation zoning designation.

Alternative 4 would meet the development standards of the Open Space/Active Recreation zone, following the approval of a front yard setback Adjustment request. The requested Adjustment would allow eight parking spaces to be located within the front yard setback from the property line along Hollister Avenue.

Alternative 4 would be consistent with applicable Goleta General Plan land use policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, following the implementation of project-specific mitigation measures.

The entire project site is located within Review Area 2 of the Santa Barbara Airport's Airport Influence Area, as well as within the FAR Part 77 airspace surface (SBCAG 2023). Height restrictions for development on the project site, as identified by FAR Part 77, range from 361 feet to 411 feet. The maximum height of proposed renovation on the project site is anticipated to be 33 feet from grade. Accordingly, Alternative 4 would not conflict with the 2023 Santa Barbara County ALUP height restrictions.

The project would require an amendment to GWSD's Sphere of Influence and approval of an Out of Area Service Agreement to allow sewer service to the clubhouse, Rio Grande Coffee Shop, maintenance facilities, and comfort station. In addition, Alternative 4 includes a request for relinquishment or abandonment of a portion of the public right-of-way along Hollister Avenue. These discretionary actions would not result in physical environmental impacts beyond those already analyzed in this EIR but are subject to review by the Santa Barbara County LAFCO (which would approve the requested changes to GWSD's Sphere of Influence) and the City of Goleta (which would approve the public right-of-way relinquishment).

Alternative 4 would further Policies OS 2.2 (Planned Vertical Accessways) and OS 2.4 (Mitigation of Impacts to Vertical Coastal Access) by facilitating lateral pedestrian connectivity along Hollister Avenue that improves public access for all Goleta residents to vertical access points toward the shoreline. The extent of the Class I bike path proposed under Alternative 4 would compensate for the lack of a bluff top lateral access and vertical access by (1) increasing the lateral access along Hollister Avenue that would connect to

multiple vertical access points that allow visitors of the Ellwood Mesa to access the beach and lateral bluff access points located offsite and (2) providing a safe and smooth surface that is wide enough to accommodate two directional flow of walking and alternative modes of transportation to multiple lateral and vertical access points off the project site.

Additionally, Alternative 4 would further Policies VH 3.5 (Pedestrian-Oriented Design), TE 1.1 (Alternative Modes), TE 2.3 (Diversion of Automobile Trips to Alternative Modes), and TE 10.4 (Pedestrian Facilities in New Development) by providing an extended bike path that connects existing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure instead of a Type 4 path that would only occur along the project site's northern boundary and would not accommodate alternative modes of transportation, including bicycles. The Type 4 path would only accommodate pedestrian walking. By encouraging greater alternative modes of transportation, Alternative 4 would better reduce consumption of non-renewable energy sources. Alternative 4 would directly further the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, which implements the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Transportation Element Policies. One of the goals and objectives of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan is to provide more active means of transportation (bicycle and walking) in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through less vehicle miles traveled as alternative methods are used. In order to meet this objective, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan identifies a need for a Class I multi-use pathway along Hollister Avenue from Cathedral Oaks Road to Elderberry Drive, which would directly support Policies TE 10 and TE 11 from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, which require pedestrian or bicycle linkages that are safe and convenient for all Goleta residents. Alternative 4 would complete this multi-use pathway and would thus result in consistency with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan's goals and policies, whereas the Type 4 path under Alternative 4 does not meet the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

Overall, while Alternative 4 would support the City's policies for active transportation as well as comply with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, Alternative 4's impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-11; CUL-1 through CUL-4; HYD-1; NOI-1; TCR-1 and TCR-2; and UTIL-1, would reduce impacts involving conflicts with land use plans, policies, or regulations that were adopted for purposes of reducing environmental impacts. These mitigation measures would reduce

impacts involving conflict with the Goleta General Plan as they would minimize potential impacts to protected environmental resources within the Goleta General Plan. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.10-6 through 4.10-47, 6-61 through 6-62.)

G. NOISE

1. Noise Standards

Threshold: Would the Project result in generation of a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Construction)

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.11-11 through 4.11-13, 6-62 through 6-63.)

Explanation: Noise from construction activities at the clubhouse and comfort station would not exceed 65 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptors, and no noise control is needed during construction to reduce noise levels for these receptors. However, noise levels from all other improvements (construction activities for golf course improvements, maintenance yard, Rio Grande Coffee Shop/Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, and Hollister Avenue improvements) may exceed Goleta's 65 dBA standard at the nearest residences to those activities.

Specifically, the extended bike path's approximate center of each construction area would be within 50 feet of residences on Elderberry Drive and Pebble Beach Drive, compared to 100 feet with the proposed project for Elderberry Drive and 1,600 feet for Pebble Beach Drive. Additionally, the extended bike path would be within 80 feet of the Ellwood School.

Because construction would occur close to sensitive receptors, short-term noise impacts associated with construction activities for Alternative 4 were analyzed based on typical construction equipment noise levels derived from the Federal Highway Administration's Roadway Construction Noise Model, and predicted average-daily construction noise levels (in dBA [A-weighted decibel] Leq) were calculated assuming three louder pieces of equipment operating simultaneously with the equipment operating in approximately the center of each construction area to the nearest sensitive receptors (a distance of 50 feet). Heavy-duty construction equipment used for construction of the bike path may require excavators, concrete trucks, dump trucks, pavers, loaders, and rollers. The three loudest

pieces of equipment from this list would be an excavator, loader, and roller. At a distance of 50 feet, these pieces of equipment would generate a noise level of 80 dBA. Construction for Alternative 4 would exceed Goleta's 65 dBA construction noise standards. Alternative 4 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 to ensure construction noise levels do not exceed Goleta's 65 dBA construction noise standards. With similar assumptions to Alternative 4, the use of a temporary noise barrier would reduce construction noise levels by 15 dBA to 65 dBA, which would not exceed Goleta's 65 dBA standard. Accordingly, Alternative 4's construction noise impact would remain less than significant with mitigation. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.11-11 through 4.11-13, 6-62 through 6-63.)

MM NOI-1

Construction Noise Reduction

The construction contractor shall prepare and submit a Construction Noise Control Plan to the City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee for review and approval prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for a grading permit/demolition permit. The Construction Noise Control Plan shall specify the noise reduction measures to be implemented during project construction that uses heavy-duty equipment within 400 feet of residences, which may include improvements to the golf course (e.g., grading of the course), maintenance yard, Barnsdall area, and Hollister Avenue to ensure noise levels do not exceed 65 dBA at nearby sensitive receptors at the nearest residences. The measures specified in the Construction Noise Control Plan shall be included on the building and grading plans and shall be implemented by the construction contractor during construction. Measures in the Construction Noise Control Plan may include, but would not be limited to, the following:

- Prior to the start of and for the duration of construction, the contractor shall properly maintain and tune all construction equipment in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations to minimize noise emissions.
- Prior to use of any construction equipment, the contractor shall fit all equipment with properly operating mufflers, air intake silencers, and engine shrouds no less effective than as originally equipped by the manufacturer.
- Staging and delivery areas shall be located as far as feasible from existing residences.
- Installation of temporary sound barriers/blankets to break the line of sight between construction equipment and residences within 400 feet of heavy-duty equipment

operation. The barriers shall be constructed with a solid material that has a density of at least 1.5 pounds per square foot with no gaps from the ground to the top of the barrier.

- To the extent consistent with applicable safety regulations, trucks operating with reverse motions alarms shall be outfitted with SAE J994 Class D or equivalent alarms (ambient-adjusting, or “smart alarms” that automatically adjust the alarm to 5 dBA above the ambient near the operating equipment), or switch off back-up alarms and replace with human spotters in compliance with all safety requirements and laws.
- A construction notification sign shall be posted at the job site, clearly visible to the public, that includes permitted construction days and hours, as well as the telephone numbers of the City of Goleta’s and the contractor’s authorized representatives that are assigned to respond in the event of a noise complaint.
- If the authorized contractor’s representative receives a complaint, either City code enforcement or a contractor-retained and Goleta-approved noise consultant shall conduct noise measurements at the properties that registered the complaint. The noise measurements shall be conducted for a minimum of one hour to determine if noise levels are compliant with City’s 65 dBA standard. The consultant shall prepare a letter report for code enforcement summarizing the measurements, calculation data used in determining impacts, and potential measures to reduce noise levels to the maximum extent feasible.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall approve the Construction Noise Control Plan prior to issuance of the zoning clearance for the grading permit/demolition permit. The measures specified in the Construction Noise Control Plan shall be included on the building and grading plans.

Monitoring: The City shall monitor compliance with the requirements of the Construction Noise Control Plan periodically during construction and shall promptly investigate and respond to all noise complaints.

2. Vibration

Threshold: Would the project generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.11-17 through 4.11-18, 6-63.)

Explanation: **Construction.** Construction vibration would also occur on-site near the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, a historical structure. Equipment may be used within 15 feet of the building when accounting for equipment setbacks; at a distance of 15 feet, a vibratory roller would generate a vibration level of 0.37 in/sec PPV and a large bulldozer would generate a vibration level of 0.16 in/sec PPV. The equipment would exceed the Caltrans vibration damage potential threshold for historical structures of 0.12 PPV in/sec for transient sources within a distance of 42 feet and 20 feet, respectively. Therefore, if a vibratory roller, large bulldozer, or similar heavy-duty construction equipment is used within these distances to the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, building damage could occur from vibration and impacts would be potentially significant from construction vibration.

Alternative equipment near the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station would be used to reduce construction related vibration. Specifically, use of a static roller would generate vibration levels of approximately 0.09 in/sec PPV at a distance of 15 feet (McIver 2012). Grading and earthwork equipment that is limited to 100 horsepower or less would generate 0.006 in/sec PPV within 15 feet of Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. With implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2, project groundborne vibration would be less than the significance threshold of 0.08 in/sec PPV at the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. Therefore, with mitigation, project construction vibration impacts would be less than significant.

Construction of the extended bike path under Alternative 4 would move construction equipment closer to residences, with a vibratory roller being potentially used within 30 feet of the residential structures on Elderberry Drive and Pebble Beach Drive. This would equal a vibration level of approximately 0.17 PPV in/sec. at a distance of 30 feet. This vibration level would be well below the Caltrans vibration damage potential threshold for older structures of 0.5 PPV in/sec for transient sources. Therefore, temporary impacts associated with the vibratory roller (and other potential equipment) to off-site residential structures would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.11-17 through 4.11-18, 6-63.)

MM NOI-2

Construction Vibration Reduction Measures

Prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for grading and building permit, the City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall verify that the construction plans include the following requirements:

- For paving activities within 42 feet of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, a static roller shall be used in lieu of a vibratory roller.
- For grading and earthwork activities within 20 feet of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, offroad equipment shall be limited to 100 horsepower or less.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall confirm the requirements are included on the grading and building permits prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for grading and building permits.

Monitoring: The City shall monitor compliance with the requirements of the vibration reduction measure periodically during grading and construction activities within 50 feet of Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station.

H. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

. 1. Tribal Cultural Resources

Threshold: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.15-7 through 4.15-10, 6-65.)

Explanation: **Construction.** Although the Tribes did not identify tribal cultural resources within the project site, the presence of the abovementioned resources indicates a high sensitivity for cultural resources in the area. Moreover, ground disturbance during project construction could inadvertently encounter and consequently damage or destroy unanticipated cultural resources that may qualify as tribal cultural resources upon evaluation. Such impacts to tribal cultural resources would be potentially significant. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures TCR-1 and TCR-2, as well as CUL-2 through CUL-4, would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Project impacts involving a substantial adverse change to tribal cultural resources would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measures TCR-1 and TCR-2, in conjunction with Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL4, would minimize potential impacts to cultural resources of Native American origin by requiring Native American monitoring and procedures for final disposition of any unanticipated discoveries of such resources. Therefore, with implementation of these measures, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.15-7 through 4.15-10, 6-65.)

MM TCR-1

Native American Monitoring

At least 30 days prior to the commencement of project-related ground-disturbing activities, including, but not limited to, site clearing, grubbing, trenching, and excavation, the project applicant shall secure a tribal monitoring agreement with Native American Tribes. Should more than one of the Tribes wish to provide monitoring for the project, they may do so on a rotating basis to provide equal representation onsite during ground-disturbing activities. The tribal monitoring agreement shall be consistent with the processes and procedures outlined in the Cultural Resource Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan (Plan) prepared under Mitigation Measure CUL-2, and the project applicant shall submit the tribal monitoring agreement to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to the commencement of project-related ground-disturbing activities. The Native American monitor(s) shall have the authority to temporarily divert, redirect, or halt ground-disturbing activities to allow recovery of cultural resources, in coordination with the qualified archaeologist retained under Mitigation Measure CUL-2. The project applicant shall notify the retained Native American monitor(s) of scheduled ground disturbance at least five business days in advance. Work may proceed if the retained Native American monitor(s) are unavailable

at the time of ground disturbance. Native American monitoring may be reduced or terminated in consultation with the project applicant and the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, as warranted by conditions such as encountering bedrock, the presence of fill soil, or negative findings during initial ground disturbance. The Native American monitor(s) shall maintain monitoring logs throughout project-related ground-disturbing activities and submit the monitoring logs to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director after each phase of construction (e.g., site clearing, grubbing, trenching) has concluded.

Plan Requirements and Timing. At least 30 days before ground-disturbing activities begin, the project applicant shall secure a tribal monitoring agreement with Native American Tribes. The agreement shall align with the Cultural Resource Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan from Mitigation Measure CUL-2 and shall be provided to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to the commencement of project-related ground-disturbing activities. The project applicant shall notify the Native American monitor(s) at least five business days before ground disturbance. Work can proceed if the Native American monitor(s) are unavailable.

Monitoring. The Native American monitor(s) shall maintain monitoring logs throughout project related ground-disturbing activities and submit the monitoring logs to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director after each phase of construction has concluded. Monitoring logs shall be kept on file with the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director for the duration of construction.

MM TCR-2

Final Disposition of Unanticipated Tribal Cultural Resources

Inadvertent discoveries of archaeological resources found during construction shall be immediately evaluated by the qualified archaeologist (retained under Mitigation Measure CUL-2) for their potential to qualify as tribal cultural resources, and shall be treated in accordance with the Cultural Resource Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan (Plan) prepared under Mitigation Measure CUL2. The appropriate treatment method, which may include one or more of the following treatments, shall be determined by the qualified archaeologist in consultation with the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, and the Native American monitor(s). The qualified archaeologist shall provide the data recovery plan prepared pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-4 to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director,

or designee, for review and approval prior to initiation of the appropriate treatment.

- Preservation-in-place of the cultural resources, if feasible. Preservation in place means avoiding the resources, leaving them in the place where they were found with no development affecting the integrity of the resources.
- Reburial of the resources in the immediate vicinity of the project site. The measures for reburial may include the following in accordance with the Plan: a) measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts in perpetuity; b) reburial shall not occur until all legally required cataloging and basic recordation have been completed, with an exception that sacred items, burial goods, and Native American human remains are excluded; c) any reburial process shall be culturally appropriate; and d) listing of contents and location of the reburial shall be included in the data recovery plan prepared pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-4.
- If preservation in place or reburial is not feasible, then the resource(s) may be curated in a culturally appropriate manner as described in the Plan prepared pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-2 at a Santa Barbara County curation facility that meets the California Office of Historic Preservation Guidelines for the Curation of Archaeological Resources, ensuring access and use pursuant to these guidelines. The collection and associated records shall be transferred, including title, and are to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence of curation in the form of a letter from the curation facility stating that subject archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid, shall be provided to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director by the project applicant. No destructive or invasive testing on sacred items, burial goods, and Native American human remains shall be permitted. Results concerning finds of any inadvertent discoveries shall be included in the data recovery plan prepared pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-4.

Plan Requirements and Timing. Inadvertent discoveries of archaeological resources during construction shall be immediately evaluated by the qualified archaeologist for their potential to qualify as tribal cultural resources and treated according to the Cultural Resource Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan from Mitigation

Measure CUL-2. The qualified archaeologist shall provide the data recovery plan prepared pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-4 to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to initiation of the appropriate treatment.

Monitoring. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall consult with the qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor(s) to determine the appropriate treatment process. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall also review and approve the data recovery plan prior to initiation of the appropriate treatment. The qualified archaeologist shall submit evidence of completion of the appropriate treatment method, to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director within 30 days of completion.

I. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

1. Solid Waste and Solid Waste Laws

Threshold: (i) Would the Project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

(ii) Will the Project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.16-15 through 4.16-18, 6-66.)

Explanation: **Demolition and Construction.** Alternative 4 would generate solid waste resulting from the demolition of existing structures and construction of the proposed golf clubhouse, maintenance facility, comfort station, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop. Alternative 4 would involve the demolition of the existing clubhouse (9,305 square feet), maintenance facility structures (5,025 square feet to be demolished), comfort station (290 square feet), and removal of 62,483 square feet of concrete golf cart paths. In addition, Alternative 4 would construct a 37,179 square foot golf clubhouse, 7,106 square foot maintenance facility, 329 square foot comfort station, and 1,044 square foot Rio Grande Coffee Shop, all of which would generate solid waste during construction.

Alternative 4 would result in slightly more solid waste generation than the proposed project due to increased construction activities.

However, the increase would be nominal given the overall demolition and construction activities. Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 would be required to reduce solid waste generated during construction below the City's project specific threshold of 350 tons of nonrecyclable construction and demolition debris. Once operational, Alternative 4 would result in the same solid waste generation as the proposed project which does not exceed the City's project-specific threshold of 196 tons per year. Therefore, solid waste impacts related to the operation of Alternative 4 would be similar compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.16-15 through 4.16-18, 6-66.)

MM UTIL-1

Additional Diversion Requirements

Demolition debris generated by removal of the existing concrete golf cart paths shall be recycled at a minimum 98 percent diversion rate. All other materials (non-concrete materials) shall be recycled at a minimum 65 percent diversion rate. The project applicant's Waste Management Plan, required in accordance with Chapter 8.10, Article IV of the City's Municipal Code, shall include a measure that requires the construction contractor to recycle all concrete debris from the existing concrete golf cart path removal. The Waste Management Plan shall be submitted to the City Director of Public Works or designee for review and approval prior to the start of construction. During construction, the City Director of Public Works or designee shall assign a monitor to inspect the project site on a quarterly basis to ensure the requirements of the Waste Management Plan are being implemented. In addition, the project applicant shall retain proof of 98 percent diversion rate of the demolition waste generated from the concrete golf cart paths via waste tonnage data, supported by original or certified photocopies of receipts and weight tickets on other records of measurement from recycling companies, deconstruction contractors, and/or landfill and disposal companies, and submit these to the City Director of Public Works or designee for review and approval prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

Plan Requirements and Timing. The project applicant shall prepare and submit the Waste Management Plan to the City Director of Public Works or designee prior to the start of construction. The project applicant shall submit proof of achieving a 98 percent diversion rate of the demolition waste generated from the concrete golf cart paths to the City Director of Public Works or designee following the completion of construction. The City Director of Public Works or designee shall review and approve the applicant-provided proof prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

Monitoring: A monitor chosen by the Director of Public Works Department, or designee, shall inspect the project site on a quarterly basis from the start of construction activities.

SECTION IV.
FINDINGS IMPACTS THAN CANNOT BE FULLY MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN
SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

The City Council hereby finds that there are no significant and unavoidable environmental impacts that cannot be fully mitigated to a less than significant level. As a result, no Statement of Overriding Considerations is warranted.

SECTION V.
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Regarding Alternative 4's potential to result in cumulative impacts, the City hereby finds as follows:

A. AESTHETICS

Cumulative development in the vicinity of the project site could obstruct scenic views or vistas experienced from public viewing areas, as well as result in the overall degradation of visual character. Cumulative development would mostly consist of ground-level improvements or infrastructure removal. However, the City of Goleta Fire Station 10 would occupy 11,600 square feet with a maximum roof height of 32 feet, and would be located directly across Hollister Avenue from the project site. As discussed in the Final Environmental Impact Report for City of Goleta Fire Station 10, development of the fire station would require tree removal and would alter views along Hollister Avenue (City of Goleta 2018). Cumulative projects, including the fire station, could change views along Hollister Avenue and potentially result in a significant cumulative impact on scenic views experienced from the Hollister Avenue scenic corridor. However, the 4 would improve the quality of views experienced from Hollister Avenue and the overall visual character of the project site, as the Alternative 4 would add vegetative screening by the maintenance yard, restore the aging Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station and add visually appealing landscaping, underground the existing power lines, and add native vegetation throughout the golf course. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not result in a considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts to scenic vistas and visual character.

There are no officially designated State Scenic Highways in Goleta. Thus, there would be no cumulative impacts to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

Cumulative development would contribute to an increase in light and glare throughout Goleta. However, future projects, including Alternative 4, would be required to implement City lighting regulations, which would minimize the potential for skyglow or light

trespass by requiring lighting fixtures to be designed, located, aimed downward or toward structures (if properly shielded), and retrofitted if feasible. Therefore, although several projects listed in Table 3-1 in Section 3, Environmental Setting of the Draft EIR, would occur in the near vicinity of the project site, implementation of City lighting regulations would ensure that cumulative impacts involving light and glare would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-30 through 4.1-31.)

B. AIR QUALITY

Conflicts with an Air Quality Management Plan and Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions. The planned, pending, and reasonably foreseeable projects within Goleta, at the time of this project, would include the construction of a total of 467 residential units. Based on the Department of Finance's 2.59 persons per household in Goleta, the cumulative growth in Goleta would be approximately 1,209 residents. SBCAG forecasts a population of 34,700 in Goleta in 2050 (SBCAG 2019), which functions as a basis for the 2022 Ozone Plan's emissions forecast. The addition of 1,209 residents to Goleta would result in a population of 33,800, which would be below SBCAG population forecasts. Thus, cumulative development would be accommodated within SBCAG growth projections. Cumulative development would not exceed the SBCAG growth assumptions, which function as a basis for the 2022 Ozone Plan's emissions forecast, and would not result in cumulatively considerable project emissions. Cumulative impacts related to conflicts with the 2022 Ozone Plan and the release of cumulative considerable criteria air pollutant emissions would be less than significant.

Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations. Cumulative impacts in proximity to the project site such as the Annual Pavement Rehabilitation Project and Pavement Management Program adjacent to the northeast of the project site and Fire Station 10 located north of the project site could expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC emissions if construction schedules overlapped. Alternative 4's construction emissions would be short-term, temporary, and cease following the completion of construction. In addition, based on the existing wind patterns at the project site emissions would be carried away from sensitive receptors. Because the winds at the project site would push pollutant concentrations away from sensitive receptors, Alternative 4's emissions would not substantially overlap at the same receptors as cumulative projects. Operation of Alternative 4 would not result in substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, Alternative 4's contribution to cumulative impacts related to exposing receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would not be considerable.

Odors. Cumulative projects would adversely affect sensitive receptors from odor emissions if cumulative projects were typical odor-producing land uses. Construction of cumulative projects would result in construction equipment-related odors; however, the temporary nature of construction would ensure less than significant cumulative odor impacts. In addition, it is likely project odors would not be distinguishable due to vehicle exhaust on Hollister Avenue or United States Route 101. Cumulative projects in proximity to the project site such as the Annual Pavement Rehabilitation Project and Pavement Management Program and Fire Station 10 do not include odor producing facilities that

could result in substantial odors. Therefore, cumulative odors from the surrounding area from construction and operations would not be combined at the same receptors, and cumulative impacts related to odors would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.2-16 through 4.2-18.)

C. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The cumulative projects would consist of construction of a total of 467 residential units, 378,670 square feet of industrial space (storage facilities, warehouses, distribution and delivery facilities, and a repurposed hangar building), and 58,690 square feet of commercial space (office space, car dealership facilities, and shopping center improvements). Cumulative projects also include healthcare facility remodeling and expansion, a synagogue and storage building, a church, a fire station, habitat restoration projects within Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve, three oil and gas infrastructure removal projects, two battery energy storage system projects, and several infrastructure improvements.

Cumulative development in the City of Goleta would have the potential to disturb special-status species, riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, wetlands, and wildlife movement. Existing City policies as well as federal and State regulations would protect special-status species, riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, wetlands, and wildlife movement during the course of cumulative project development. Individual development proposals are reviewed separately by the City and must undergo environmental review when it is determined that the potential for significant impacts exists. Cumulative projects would be required to implement mitigation measures, similar to Alternative 4, if it is determined that significant impacts for individual cumulative projects would occur. Nevertheless, cumulative development may have a potentially significant cumulative impact on biological resources, given the scope of anticipated development. Alternative 4 would include the implementation of mitigation measures that would minimize impacts on biological resources such that Alternative 4's impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, Alternative 4 would not have a considerable contribution to potential cumulative impacts.

Cumulative development have a potential to conflict with biological resource plans and policies. However, individual cumulative projects would be required to implement mitigation measures, similar to Alternative 4, if it is determined that significant impacts involving conflict with biological resource plans and policies for individual cumulative projects would occur. Therefore, cumulative development would have a less than significant cumulative impact involving conflict with biological resource plans and policies.

There would be no cumulative impact regarding conflict with adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans, as no such plans are implemented within the geographic scope of cumulative impacts to biological resources. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.3-61 through 4.3-62.)

D. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Cumulative projects would have the potential to adversely impact historical built environment resources. However, the magnitude of impacts for individual projects would depend upon the location, size of development, and proximity to historical built environment resources. Historic resource evaluations would be completed on a case-by-case basis for all future development. Compliance with applicable regulations and implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, including resource avoidance measures and noise and vibration reduction measures, would address impacts related to built environment resources associated with cumulative development. Therefore, cumulative development would have a less-than-significant cumulative impact involving substantial adverse changes in the significance of built environment resources.

Cumulative projects would have the potential to adversely impact buried archaeological resources through ground-disturbing construction activities. However, existing City policies and regulations would protect any unknown resources that might be uncovered in the course of project development. Individual development proposals are reviewed separately by the City and undergo environmental review when it is determined that the potential for significant impacts exists, which is occurring for this project. In the event that future cumulative development would result in impacts to known or unknown cultural resources, impacts to such resources would be addressed on a case-by-case basis. Nevertheless, there is potential for significant cumulative impacts to archaeological resources in the City of Goleta given the breadth of cumulative development and the area's sensitivity for archaeological resources. Alternative 4 has the potential to impact unknown archaeological resources; however, Alternative 4 would be required to implement Mitigation Measures CUL2 through CUL-4, which would require archaeological monitoring, a cultural resources sensitivity meeting for construction personnel, and implementation of appropriate procedures for evaluation and treatment of any discoveries made during construction. With implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4, the project would not have a considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts to archaeological resources.

Cumulative development projects would have the potential to adversely impact buried human remains through ground-disturbing construction activities. The magnitude of impacts for individual projects would depend upon the location, size of development, and depth of ground disturbance. State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 would apply to all future development, and compliance with this regulation would address impacts related to buried human remains associated with cumulative development. Therefore, cumulative development would have a less than significant cumulative impact involving the disturbance of human remains.(Draft EIR pp. 4.4-23 through 4.4-24.)

E. ENERGY

Cumulative development in Goleta would increase demand for energy resources. However, the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards and CALGreen require energy efficient appliances and building materials that reduce energy consumption in new development. Furthermore, vehicle fuel efficiency is anticipated to continue improving

through implementation of the existing Pavley regulations in accordance with Assembly Bill 1493.

The City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan includes Policies TE 1.6, TE 7.2, and TE 7.12, which allow the City to require developers to provide improvements that reduce the use of single-occupancy vehicles, requires the City to collaborate with the Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District to ensure bus transit is reliable throughout Goleta, and allows the City to require new or substantially renovated development to incorporate design measures to facilitate transit use.

The City's CAP includes measures such as requiring projects to dedicate land for bicycle trails, requiring projects along transit corridors to provide for transit access, and requiring preferential parking to commuters who carpool, vanpool, ride-share, or use alternatively fueled vehicles. Continual implementation of these policies in the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan and measures included in the City's CAP would ensure new development would promote alternative transportation and reduce vehicle travel.

As a result of increasing energy efficiency standards associated with electricity and natural gas consumption, water use, and transportation, the combined increase in energy consumption in Goleta would not be expected to result in wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Therefore, cumulative energy impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative development, like Alternative 4, would be constructed in accordance with the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards, CALGreen requirements, the City's EV Reach Code, and the City's CAP. Cumulative development would receive electricity that is produced in compliance with SB 100, which would promote the use of renewable energy. As a result, cumulative impacts related to conflicts with renewable energy plans would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.5-11 through 4.5-12).

F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Cumulative projects proposed in and around Goleta would expose additional people and property to seismic and geologic hazards that are present in the region. The magnitude of geologic hazards for individual projects would depend upon the location, type, and size of development and the specific hazards associated with individual sites. Any specific geologic hazards associated with each individual site would be limited to that site without affecting other areas. In addition, existing regulations, including compliance with CBC requirements, would reduce seismic and geologic hazards to acceptable levels. Seismic and geologic hazards would be addressed on a case-by-case basis and would not result in considerable impacts. Cumulative geology and soils impacts would be less than significant. Areas throughout Goleta would continue to be developed and redeveloped and involve grading and excavation activities that would potentially encounter paleontological resources. Given the high sensitivities of geologic units underlying Goleta, cumulative projects could potentially damage a paleontological

resource or unique geologic feature. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be potentially significant. Ground-disturbing activities associated with Alternative 4 have the potential to result in the destruction, damage, or loss of undiscovered scientifically important paleontological resources due to the high paleontological sensitivity of the underlying geologic units. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-2 would minimize the potential for Alternative 4 to cause a substantial adverse change in known or unknown paleontological resources by requiring WEAP training, monitoring, and setting forth procedures for the recovery, identification, and curation of fossils discovered during construction. Therefore, Alternative 4's contribution to cumulative impacts related to paleontological resources or unique geologic features would not be considerable with implementation of mitigation. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.6-25 through 4.6-26.)

G. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

GHG impacts are assessed in a cumulative context since no single project can cause a discernible change to the climate. Therefore, cumulative significance is based on the same thresholds as used for project-level evaluation. In the absence of a City-adopted numeric threshold, the significance of Alternative 4's GHG emissions is evaluated on the County's 2.63 MT CO₂e per employee per year. In addition, consistency with applicable plans, policies, regulations, and requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions. For this project, the most directly applicable adopted regulatory plans to reduce GHG emissions are the 2022 Scoping Plan, the 2050 RTP/SCS, the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, and the City of Goleta's CAP.

Alternative 4 would not exceed the County's 2.63 MT CO₂e per employee per year threshold. Alternative 4 would be consistent with the statewide, regional, and local plans by including energy and water conservation measures, and solar readiness consistent with the latest iteration of CALGreen and the Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Furthermore, Alternative 4 would not convert natural lands and would contribute to the job and housing balance. Alternative 4 includes 52 bicycle parking spaces to the project site and extension of a Class I bicycle path to promote alternative modes of transportation that would promote GHG emissions reductions from vehicles. Therefore, Alternative 4 would be consistent with the State, regional, and local plans. Thus, based on the CEQA Guidelines for determining the significance of GHG emissions, Alternative 4's contribution to cumulative GHG impacts would not be considerable. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.7-16 through 4.7-17.)

H. HAZARDOUS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The magnitude of hazards for individual projects would depend upon the location, type, and size of development and the specific hazards associated with individual sites. If soil and/or groundwater contamination are found to be present on sites of planned and future development, these conditions would be required to comply with existing applicable local, State, and federal regulations. Hazard evaluations would be completed on a case-by-case basis for future development. Compliance with applicable regulations and

implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, including remedial action on contaminated sites, would address impacts related to these hazards and hazardous materials associated with future development in the City. Cumulative impacts related to the creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials; accidental release of hazardous materials; handling of hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of a school; or location of an existing hazardous material site would therefore be less than significant.

Several cumulative projects are within the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport Influence Area, thereby potentially exposing persons to risk of airport safety hazards. However, these projects are subject to review of airport-related hazards during the environmental review process and by the FAA and ALUC, which would ensure that development does not impose an aviation-related hazard on structures or people. Therefore, cumulative airport safety impacts would be less than significant.

All cumulative projects would be required to adhere to the Santa Barbara County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, which includes comprehensive actions for emergency response and evacuation, ensuring that all projects within Santa Barbara County adhere to established protocols. Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with evacuation plans, as projects would be required to maintain clear access routes and ensure that construction activities do not obstruct evacuation routes. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to emergency response would be less than significant.

Cumulative projects would involve construction over various periods of time and would therefore have the potential to cause wildfires through equipment that could create sparks, be a source of heat, or leak flammable materials on cumulative projects' sites. However, cumulative projects would be required to comply with applicable regulations, such as the California Public Resources Code, which would reduce the risk of wildfire. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to wildfire would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.8-31 through 4.8-32.)

I. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The geographic scope for cumulative impacts related to water quality, drainage, and sedimentation are areas where runoff discharges to Bell Canyon Creek and Devereaux Creek. This geographic scope is appropriate as development in this area could contribute to existing impairments in Bell Canyon Creek and Devereaux Creek. The geographic scope for cumulative impacts related to groundwater are projects within the GWD service area. This geographic scope is appropriate as GWD would provide water to cumulative development which, in part, is sourced from the Basin. The geographic scope for cumulative impacts related to flooding is the Bell Canyon Creek and Devereaux Creek floodplains. This geographic scope is appropriate as cumulative development within these floodplains and floodways can result in increased flooding, including redirection of flood flows, increases in flood boundaries, and increases in flood elevations.

Water Quality, Drainage, and Sedimentation. Cumulative development in Goleta would increase impervious surfaces, redirect the drainage of surface flow during storm events, and increase pollutant loading, peak flows, erosion, sedimentation, and flooding. For the cumulative analysis related to hydrology and water quality, cumulative projects being considered include the projects discharging to the same waters as Alternative 4 (i.e., Bell Canyon Creek and Devereaux Creek). Bell Canyon Creek is impaired by a variety of pollutants, including selenium, nitrate, E. coli, and toxicity. Devereaux Creek is impaired by dissolved oxygen and turbidity. The Annual Pavement Rehabilitation Project and Pavement Management Program, Viajero Battery Storage Project, and Fire Station 10, are examples of cumulative projects that would also potentially discharge stormwater runoff to Bell Canyon Creek and Devereaux Creek and could potentially increase the volume of stormwater runoff and contribute to pollutant loading in stormwater runoff discharged to these waterways. Cumulative projects would be required to comply with federal, state, and City water quality requirements, such as the Construction Stormwater General Permit, Post-Construction Requirements, the Phase II MS4 Permit, and Chapter 13.04 of the City's Municipal Code. Further, cumulative projects would be required to implement mitigation if, due to project-specific circumstances, a potential impact to water quality could occur. However, the proximity of cumulative development to Bell Canyon Creek and Devereaux Creek could continue to result in continued impairment of these waterways. Due to the existing impairments of Bell Canyon Creek and Devereaux Creek and the potential for cumulative development to discharge pollutants to these waterways, cumulative impacts to water quality, drainage, and sedimentation are significant.

Alternative 4's demolition activities would be required to obtain coverage from SWRCB's Construction Stormwater General Permit, which includes requirements for projects to address demolition-related pollutants. The construction contractor would comply with Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 to minimize the potential for pollutants associated with asbestos and lead-based materials would enter runoff and degrade water quality. Construction of Alternative 4 would also be required to obtain coverage from the Construction Stormwater General Permit, which requires preparation and implementation of a SWPPP to control the discharges of pollutants, including sediment, into local surface water drainages through implementation of erosion and sediment control BMPs and good housekeeping BMPs. Water quality impacts associated with culvert removal and bridge installation in Devereaux Creek would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and HYD-1 which require construction vehicle equipment and maintenance to occur in designated staging areas which are not permitted to be located near any storm drain inlets, drainage swales, or surface waterways and require culvert removal and bridge installation/maintenance in Devereaux Creek to occur during the dry season. In addition, if groundwater dewatering is required, groundwater dewatering would occur in compliance with Mitigation Measure HAZ-5 which requires proper handling and disposal of any contaminated groundwater encountered during potential groundwater dewatering activities. During operation, Alternative 4 would comply with Chapter 13.04 of the City's Municipal Code by utilizing Source Control and LID BMPs to detain, retain, and treat runoff consistent with the requirements of the Central Coast RWQCB's Post-Construction Requirements and the County's Stormwater Technical Guide for Low Impact

Development. Alternative 4 would implement bioretention basins in accordance with the Preliminary Stormwater Control Plan prepared for Alternative 4, which serves as the SWQMP for Alternative 4. Compliance with these existing regulations to protect water quality, implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5, and implementation of stormwater control and treatment infrastructure would ensure Alternative 4's contribution to significant cumulative water quality impacts would not be considerable.

Groundwater. Cumulative projects that are provided water by GWD would increase water demand from GWD which may, in part, be met by groundwater sourced from the Goleta Basin. However, GWD is subject to the adjudication requirements of the Wright Judgement and is only permitted to extract water in accordance with the allocations determined by the Wright Judgement. Accordingly, although cumulative development served by GWD would increase water demand, GWD is not permitted to increase groundwater extraction such that GWD would exceed their allocation of up to 2,000 acre-feet per year. Cumulative projects served by GWD would be subject to GWD's adjudication requirements of the Wright Judgement and therefore would not receive a water allocation if project's water demand would cause GWD to exceed their allocation of 2,000 acre-feet per year from the Goleta Basin in order to serve the cumulative project. As a result, cumulative impacts related to sustainable groundwater management would be less than significant.

Flooding. The cumulative study area for flooding and inundation are the Bell Canyon Creek and Devereaux Creek floodplains and floodways. Cumulative development within these floodplains and floodways can result in increased flooding, including redirection of flood flows, increases in flood boundaries, and increases in flood elevations. Cumulative projects listed in Table 3-1 in Section 3, Environmental Setting of the Draft EIR, such as the Ellwood Butterfly Habitat Management Plan Implementation or Annual Pavement Rehabilitation Project and Pavement Management Program may encroach upon these floodplains or floodways but must be designed in accordance with Chapter 15.10 of the City's Municipal Code which requires the use of flood resistant materials, elevating new construction two feet above base flood elevations, and prohibition of construction within floodways unless a registered professional engineer certifies that construction would not result in any increase in flood levels during the occurrence of the base flood discharged, among other requirements. Cumulative development would be reviewed by the City to verify compliance with all applicable regulations governing development within floodplain. Existing City design requirements for development within a floodplain would ensure cumulative development is designed to prevent substantial changes to the floodplain. As a result, cumulative impacts related to flooding would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.9-28 through 4.9-29.)

J. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would not physically divide an established community. Most cumulative projects would not include the construction of new linear features that could prevent mobility of a community. Cumulative

projects that include new linear features, such as the planned construction of a new overcrossing over United States Highway 101, would improve connectivity within the city of Goleta. Conflicts regarding compatibility between past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects and applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations would be localized and addressed on a case-by-case basis. The City General Plan, Municipal Code, and other relevant land use or planning documents are legally binding documents guiding land use and development decisions within the city. All cumulative projects must be reviewed for consistency, and if determined to have conflicts with these plans, they would not be approved. Therefore, cumulative development would not result in a significant cumulative impact to land use and planning. (Draft EIR, p. 4.10-48.)

K. NOISE

Construction noise is localized and rapidly attenuates within an urban environment. Accordingly, the cumulative impact analysis for noise considers impacts that would occur from the construction and operation of cumulative projects would occur within 0.1-mile from the project site. These projects include the following:

- Beach Hazards Removal
- Ellwood Butterfly Habitat Management Plan Implementation
- Ellwood Tree Safety Emergency Permit and Ellwood North Restoration
- Annual Pavement Rehabilitation Project and Pavement Management Program
- Hazardous Fuel Reduction at Ellwood Mesa/Sperling Preserve Open Space
- Viajero Battery Storage Project
- Greenbark Battery Energy Storage Project
- City of Goleta Fire Station 10

Some construction activities from the cumulative projects listed above may occur within several hundred feet of the nearest sensitive receptors and therefore may expose these receivers to construction noise simultaneously with construction noise generated from the project site. Theoretically this could result in increased noise exposure to the sensitive receivers from combined noise levels; however, real world conditions would result in less of a cumulative effect through noise direction, angles, attenuation, and dispersion. In addition, cumulative projects would also be required to comply with City of Goleta standards (e.g., restricting construction noise levels to 65 dBA or less). The project would implement Mitigation Measure NOI-1 to reduce project construction noise levels to comply with Goleta's construction noise thresholds. Therefore, while cumulative construction noise may occur from the project and simultaneous construction of another project within several hundred feet, a substantial cumulative construction noise impact

would not occur as in practice this effect would be minimal as previously explained.

Similar to construction noise, construction vibration is localized and rapidly attenuates within an urban environment. Potential vibration from the cumulative projects listed above would occur from a different direction from the nearest sensitive receptor than Alternative 4 and thus approach different angles of the nearest vibration sensitive receivers, thus ensuring the vibration travels further distances before it could theoretically combine with the project's vibration. As those projects would be constructed at a similar or further distance from the nearest sensitive receiver, their vibration levels would be anticipated to be well below vibration limits as well. While higher vibration levels can occur from activities such as blasting or pile driving, construction that occurs in bedrock areas or involves substantial underground excavation requiring building piles would not be anticipated for the types of cumulative projects proposed nearby. Therefore, the combined vibration level from cumulative projects would still be well below vibration limits, and no cumulative construction vibration impact would occur.

Some cumulative projects listed above would include similar operational noise sources as Alternative 4 (e.g., mechanical equipment noise). Operational noise from these sources is localized and rapidly attenuates due to the effects of distance, intervening structures, and topography that block the line of sight. In addition, other ambient noise sources in closer proximity to the receptors would dominate the soundscape, effectively masking project-related noise leading to a cumulative increase. Therefore, the ability of on-site project noise to combine with noise from offsite sources to create a substantial increase in noise levels would not occur. However, cumulative projects could create a cumulative increase in off-site traffic noise if the cumulative increase in vehicle trips resulting from cumulative development would result in a 3 dBA or greater increase in traffic noise on Hollister Avenue or Cathedral Oaks Road. The project's addition to traffic would not result in a noticeable off-site traffic noise increase; thus, the project's traffic noise increase would not be considerable. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.11-19 through 4.11-20.)

L. PUBLIC SERVICES

Goleta has a population of approximately 32,515 people. Development of the cumulative projects would add a total of 467 residential units, which would result in an additional 1,209 people based on the city's average persons per household of 2.59 (DOF 2024). This increase would raise the population of the SBCFD service area to approximately 175,477 people (SBCFD 2025a). With approximately 214 firefighters, SBCFD would provide a ratio of approximately 2.44 firefighters per 2,000 persons within its service population which is above the City goal of one firefighter on duty 24 hours a day for every 2,000 persons. The City has accounted for cumulative growth within the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, which informs the potential need for expansion of fire services within the City. Pursuant to Chapter 17.70 of the Municipal Code, cumulative development would be required to pay development impact fees which would provide funding for expanded fire protection facilities to accommodate new residents. In addition, once constructed, Fire Station 10 would reduce potential

constraints associated with increased demands for fire protection service that could be experienced by existing fire stations in Goleta. A Final Environmental Impact Report for Fire Station 10 was prepared and certified by the City Council in December 2018. 1 Fire Station 10 would sufficiently accommodate demand for fire services generated by cumulative growth. Accordingly, cumulative development would not generate demand for fire protection services such that additional facilities would be required. As such, cumulative impacts related to fire protection services and facilities would be less than significant.

Cumulative development would result in additional residents, commercial, and industrial development which would increase the demand for police services in Goleta. Although not required at this time, increased demands may eventually require additional Deputy Service Units, which eventually may result in the need for new or expanded police stations in Goleta. Cumulative development would be required pay development impact fees, which would provide funding for expanded police stations. If the City determines a new or expanded police station would be needed in the future, the potential environmental impacts of developing a police station would be evaluated and mitigated as necessary as part of project-specific environmental review. Because the location, timing, and features of a new police station are not currently known, any environmental impact analysis of a new station would be speculative at this time. However, the required project-specific environmental review would ensure potential environmental impacts of a new or expanded police station are evaluated and mitigated, if necessary. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to police facilities would be less than significant.

The need for school services in Goleta would increase in association with the anticipated population increase from cumulative development. Cumulative development identified in Table 3-1 of Section 3, Environmental Setting of the Draft EIR would add a total of 467 residential units, which could result in approximately 93 additional students in GUSD and 93 additional students in SBUSD. GUSD has capacity available for 194 students in Goleta and SBUSD has capacity available for 1,050 students in Goleta. Therefore, cumulative development would not generate enough students to necessitate the development of new or expanded school facilities. In addition, cumulative development would be required to pay state-mandated developer fees to fund the construction of school facilities to accommodate students generated from new development projects which, pursuant to Section 65995(3)(h) of the California Government Code, is considered full and complete mitigation of potential impacts related to school capacity. Therefore, cumulative impacts to schools would be less than significant.

The demand for library services in Goleta would increase in association with the anticipated population increase of 1,209 people from cumulative development. There are currently no specific plans for a new library in the City, and renovations associated with the existing Goleta Valley Library are underway. Development impact mitigation fees assessed on cumulative development would be used to develop additional libraries as needed, subject to City discretion. At the time additional new or expanded library facilities are proposed, these facilities would be subject to project-specific environmental review

and all applicable federal, State, and local regulations that would reduce environmental impacts associated with facility development or expansion. Therefore, required project-specific environmental review for a new or expanded library facility would ensure cumulative impacts related to library facilities would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.13-11 through 4.13-12.)

M. RECREATION

Cumulative development would add a total of 467 residential units, which would increase the demand for parks and recreation in the City. As required by Chapter 16.14 of the Goleta Municipal Code, new residential developments within the City must dedicate 0.0128 acre per dwelling unit to parks and recreation, or pay in-lieu fees toward the future development of such facilities. Thus, cumulative development in the City would generate demand for approximately 6.0 acres of recreational facilities. If parks and recreation facilities are not developed in Goleta, cumulative growth could result in the increased use and deterioration of existing park and recreation facilities. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to parks and recreational facilities would be potentially significant.

Alternative 4 would not directly or indirectly generate population growth because Alternative 4 does not include residential development and proposed utility extensions would serve only the Sandpiper Golf Club. Although Alternative 4 could, in a conservative scenario, result in approximately 55 additional residents in Goleta due to increased employment at Sandpiper Golf Club, Alternative 4 includes development of recreational facilities that would result in increased access to recreational opportunities for residents of Goleta. These include the construction of sidewalks to improve access to Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve, construction of a Class I bicycle path within Hollister Avenue's right-of-way, and dedication of lateral access along beach frontage. While Alternative 4's inclusion of restaurant and coffee shop facilities proximate to the project site may result in increased use of nearby parks and trails due to increased access, ultimately these improvements would expand recreational opportunities in Goleta. Because Alternative 4 would ultimately expand recreation opportunities in Goleta through the inclusion of a Class I bicycle path and dedication of lateral access along beach frontage, Alternative 4's overall contribution to cumulative impacts related to parks and recreational facilities would not be considerable. (Draft EIR, p. 4.12-7.)

N. TRANSPORTATION

Cumulative development in Goleta would be subject to the same circulation-related programs, plans, ordinances, and policies as Alternative 4. Specifically, cumulative development would be required to demonstrate consistency with the City's Transportation Element and BPMP, which guide the continued development and improvement of the transportation system in Goleta. In addition, cumulative development would be reviewed by the City and SBCFD to ensure adequate emergency access. However, there are several cumulative projects (i.e., Fire Station 10, Hollister Avenue Complete Streets Corridor Plan, Hollister Avenue Old Town Interim Striping, Hollister Avenue Class I Bike Path Lighting), that could result in cumulative temporary closures of lanes on Hollister

Avenue during construction. As a result, cumulative development could result in a significant impact to conflicts with transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, transportation hazards, and delays in emergency access on Hollister Avenue. As a Condition of Approval, the project applicant's construction contractor would be required to implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan, which requires the project applicant to coordinate with the City to ensure construction activities on Hollister Avenue would not substantially overlap with nearby construction activities, thereby limiting the potential for multiple closures on Hollister Avenue. Accordingly, Alternative 4 would limit the potential for multiple closures on Hollister Avenue due to cumulative development. Therefore, with implementation of the Construction Traffic Management Plan, Alternative 4's contributions to cumulative conflicts with transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, as well as any potential to result in transportation hazards or delays in emergency access on Hollister Avenue, would not be considerable.

Significant cumulative VMT impacts could occur from cumulative development if cumulative development would raise VMT in the City beyond established thresholds. Based on technical guidance from the LCI, if a project has a less than significant impact on VMT using an efficiency-based threshold (e.g., VMT per resident), the project would not contribute to a cumulative VMT impact (LCI 2018). The City's screening criteria is analogous to an efficiency-based threshold, and therefore applicable to evaluate cumulative VMT impacts. Alternative 4's VMT impact would be less than significant based on the City's screening criteria because the project's proposed retail development is locally serving, and the reduction in annual rounds of golf would decrease VMT associated with golfers compared to existing conditions. Therefore, Alternative 4's contribution to cumulative VMT impacts would not be considerable. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.14-14 through 4.14-15.)

O. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

The geographic scope for considering cumulative impacts to tribal cultural resources is based on the ethnographic use patterns of the project site and surrounding region. For the ethnographic period, the geographic extent includes the entire traditional Chumash territory. Development of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future developments could cumulatively contribute to the erasure of Chumash tribal cultural resources from the landscape. However, compliance with the provisions of AB 52 would ensure that any known or potential tribal cultural resources are treated in consultation with local Native American groups. Compliance with AB 52, implementation of project specific measures to protect tribal cultural resources on a case-by-case basis, and continued involvement by local Native American groups in regional planning would generally limit the destruction of tribal cultural resources such that cumulative impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 4.15-10.)

P. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Development of the cumulative projects in Goleta would add a total of 467 residential units, 378,670 square feet of industrial space, and 58,690 square feet of

commercial space, which would increase water demand in Goleta. Using water demand rates for the County's 2024 Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual for multifamily development (0.22 AFY/unit), Light Industry (0.28 AFY/1,000 square feet), and General Commercial development (0.30 AFY/1,000 square feet), the additional water demand from cumulative development, assuming all projects are approved and constructed, is estimated at approximately 226 AFY. The estimated cumulative water demand of 208 AFY represents approximately 5.0 percent of the 2040 normal year water supply surplus, and approximately 7.8 percent and 9.3 percent of GWD's dry year one and dry year two water supply surpluses, respectively.

Cumulative projects would adhere to the Goleta Water District Code, including water shortage restrictions during drought which would allow GWD to meet water demands during a five-year drought. Pursuant to the SAFE Water Supplies Ordinance, GWD is permitted allocate a maximum 154.7 acre-feet of water supply allocation to new or additional development in 2025 (GWD 2024b). Cumulative development would be able to utilize GWD's permitted allocation on a first-come-first-serve basis in order to meet water demands associated with cumulative projects. Accordingly, water demand from cumulative development is not anticipated to exceed the GWD's 2025 maximum permitted allocation of 154.7 AFY to new or additional water services. GWD is required to reevaluate its supplies annually to determine if it can continue to issue new water allocations. In the event GWD determines inadequate supplies are available to serve new projects in the future, GWD cannot release potable service water to new or additional service connections unless certain specific conditions are met. Beyond 2025, if GWD determines it cannot allocate water supply to new connections, cumulative development projects must meet one of the requirements to obtain water services which would ensure water supplies would be distributed to cumulative development in a manner which preserves water supply. Therefore, cumulative development would not deplete GWD's projected water surpluses such that a substantial reduction in water supplies would occur. Therefore, cumulative development would have a less than significant impact on water supply.

Cumulative development in Goleta would also increase wastewater generation. Consistent with the wastewater generation factors used in the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Final EIR (184 to 220 gallons per day per residential unit, and 100 gallons per day per 1,000 square feet of habitable space for commercial and industrial development), cumulative development would generate approximately 146,476 gallons per day of wastewater, or approximately 0.15 MGD. This is a conservative estimate as it assumes residential units would generate 220 gallons of wastewater per unit per day. This wastewater generation represents approximately 5.7 percent of the remaining 2.63 MGD capacity available at GSD's WWTP. Therefore, cumulative development would have a less than significant impact related to wastewater.

Cumulative development would introduce new structures which would require installation of stormwater infrastructure. Cumulative projects would be required to comply with the drainage requirements of Chapter 13.04 of the City's Municipal Code to control and reduce stormwater flows. These requirements would ensure cumulative projects

would not substantially affect existing stormwater drainage system or result in inadequate facilities for the control of stormwater runoff. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to stormwater infrastructure would be less than significant.

Cumulative development would raise the demand for electricity and natural gas in the SCE and SCG service areas. However, SCE and SCG service a majority of southern California, and cumulative development in Goleta is not anticipated to result in substantial energy demand such that new SCE and/or SCG facilities would be required. Therefore, cumulative impacts to electricity and natural gas infrastructure would be less than significant.

Similar to electricity and natural gas demand, cumulative development would increase the demand for telecommunications infrastructure. However, there is extensive telecommunications infrastructure available in Goleta to serve cumulative development provided by Verizon, Qwest, AT&T, and Level 3. Therefore, cumulative impacts to telecommunications facilities would be less than significant.

Cumulative development would increase solid waste generation, thereby reducing the capacity of the Tajiguas Landfill and potentially the Kettleman Hills Facility, if contaminated soil disposal is required. According to the County's 2024 Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, if solid waste generation exceeds 40 tons per year, it is considered an adverse, yet less than significant, contribution to cumulative impacts to solid waste facilities. Solid waste generation from demolition and construction of Alternative 4 is estimated to be 349 tons with implementation of Mitigation Measure UTIL-1, and Alternative 4's operational solid waste is estimated to be 105.5 tons per year. Therefore, project construction and operation would have an adverse, but not considerable contribution to cumulative impacts related to solid waste. (Draft EIR, pp. 4.16-18 through 4.16-20.)

SECTION VI.
FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL
CHANGES

Sections 15126(c) and 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines, require that an EIR address any significant irreversible environmental changes that would occur should the project be implemented. Generally, a project would result in significant irreversible environmental changes if any of the following would occur:

- The project would involve a large commitment of non-renewable resources;
- The primary and secondary impacts of the project would generally commit future generations to similar uses;
- The project involves uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental accidents; or
- The proposed consumption of resources is not justified.

Construction of Alternative 4 would require building materials and energy, including non-renewable resources. Consumption of these resources would occur with any development in Goleta and are not unique to Alternative 4. Operation of Alternative 4 would irreversibly increase local demand for non-renewable energy resources such as natural gas and electricity. Any additional vehicle trips associated with Alternative 4 would incrementally increase local traffic and regional air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions. However, these impacts would be less than significant.

Development accommodated by Alternative 4 would require an irreversible commitment of fire protection services, law enforcement, water supply, wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal services; however, these impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 5-3.)

SECTION VII.
GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires a Draft EIR to discuss the ways the Project could foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing, directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(e), a Project would be considered to have a growth-inducing effect if it would:

- Directly or indirectly foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing in the surrounding environment;
- Remove obstacles to population growth (e.g., construction of an infrastructure expansion to allow for more construction in service areas);

- Tax existing community service facilities, requiring the construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects; or
- Encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively.

In addition, CEQA Guidelines provide that growth inducement must not be assumed.

Population Growth. Alternative 4 would not construct new housing or extend roads. While Alternative 4 would extend utility infrastructure to the new clubhouse, new comfort station, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop, these extensions would serve only Alternative 4. Accordingly, Alternative 4 would not lead to direct growth due to residential development or indirect growth due to road or infrastructure extensions into undeveloped portions of Goleta. Alternative 4 would result in approximately 21 additional employees, which could cause indirect growth; however, given the size of the city workforce and the relatively small number of jobs being created, these jobs would likely come from the local workforce. As such, it is not expected that people would relocate to Goleta because of the project.

However, in a conservative scenario where all projected employees and their families were assumed to relocate to Goleta, there would be a population growth of 55 people,¹ which would raise Goleta's population to approximately 32,570 people.² This population growth would account for approximately 2.5 percent of the total anticipated growth in Goleta by 2050. This growth would not exceed the Santa Barbara County Association of Government's 2050 population forecast of 34,700 (Santa Barbara County Association of Government 2019). Therefore, Alternative 4 would not induce substantial population growth that could lead to substantial adverse environmental effects. (Draft EIR, p. 5.-1.)

Economic Growth. Alternative 4 would generate temporary employment opportunities during construction. Based on the size of the project and scale of construction, construction workers would be expected to be drawn from the existing regional work force. As such, construction of the project would not be growth-inducing from a temporary employment standpoint. However, Alternative 4 would also provide long-term employment opportunities and generate approximately 21 additional employees in Goleta.

Employment in Goleta is forecasted to increase by 3,860 jobs between 2025 and 2050 (Santa Barbara County Association of Government 2019). The 21 permanent jobs anticipated to be generated by Alternative 4 would be approximately 0.5 percent of the projected job growth between 2025 and 2050, and therefore would be within employment forecasts. These employees would be expected to primarily use existing commercial services in Goleta, creating only a minor need for expanded commercial services. As a result, Alternative 4 would not be expected to induce economic expansion to the extent that substantial environmental impacts associated with Alternative 4 would occur. (Draft EIR, p. 5-2.)

Removal of Obstacles. Alternative 4 would provide improved recreational facilities and associated amenities on a site that is currently developed with existing recreational uses. The project site is adjacent to industrial and recreational/open space uses to the west; residential uses to the north; and residential and recreational/open space uses to the east. Alternative 4 would rely on Hollister Avenue and existing connecting roadways (such as United States Highway 101 and Cathedral Oaks Road) for site access. No new roads would be required for Alternative 4. The project would utilize existing water, wastewater, and solid waste facilities that serve Goleta. Utility expansion to serve the new clubhouse, comfort station, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop would be limited to just those uses. No additional infrastructure or facilities beyond those necessary to accommodate Alternative 4 would be required. In addition, no undeveloped land in the vicinity of the project site would have new potential for development through the extension of utility services to the project site. For these reasons, implementation of Alternative 4 would not extend infrastructure in a manner that would remove any obstacle to growth. (Draft EIR, p. 5-2.)

SECTION VIII. **ALTERNATIVES**

A. BACKGROUND

The Draft EIR analyzed four alternatives to the Project as proposed and evaluated these alternatives for their ability to avoid or reduce the Project's significant environmental effects while also meeting the majority of the Project's objectives. The City finds that it has considered and rejected as infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR and described below. This section sets forth the potential alternatives to the Project analyzed in the EIR and evaluates them in light of the Project objectives, as required by CEQA.

Where significant impacts are identified, section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to consider and discuss alternatives to the proposed actions. Subsection (a) states:

- (a) An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. The lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. There is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.

Subsection 15126.6(b) states the purpose of the alternatives analysis:

- (b) Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1), the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.

In subsection 15126.6(c), the State CEQA Guidelines describe the selection process for a range of reasonable alternatives:

- (c) The range of potential alternatives to Alternative 4 shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the Project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Additional information explaining the choice of alternatives may be included in the administrative record. Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.

The range of alternatives required is governed by a "rule of reason" that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with Alternative 4. Alternatives are limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project.

B. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The following objectives have been established for the Project (Draft EIR, ES-9) :

- Maintain and improve golf course playability and establish a new golf course routing plan that more closely follows the natural topography of the project site.
- Reduce golf course turf area and replace with native and coastal appropriate landscaping to restore the golf course to a more natural state, thereby reducing water usage and agrichemical application.

- Provide improved recreational and dining facilities for golfers, diners, and special event attendees at the Sandpiper Golf Club.
- Provide enhanced maintenance facilities to support Sandpiper Golf Club operations.
- Rehabilitate, preserve, and adaptively reuse the historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station.
- Protect water quality and bluff stability by converting existing private septic systems to public sewers and utilizing sand-capping to filter stormwater.
- Improve public views across the property from Hollister Avenue by undergrounding overhead utility lines and implementing other improvements.
- Improve coastal access for the public in the vicinity of the project site.

C. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS

Section 15126.6(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines specifies that an EIR should (1) identify alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were eliminated from detailed consideration because they were determined to be infeasible during the scoping process; and (2) briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives; (ii) infeasibility; and/or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.

The following alternatives were considered but rejected as part of the environmental analysis for the Project:

- Alternative location (Draft EIR, pp. 6-2 through 6-3.)
- Alternative use (Draft EIR, p. 6-3.)

Finding: The City Council rejects the above alternatives, on the following grounds, each of which individually provides sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative: (1) the alternatives would likely not further reduce any of Alternative 4's significant impacts; and (2) the alternatives are technically, financially, and legally infeasible given that there are no other properties in the City or surrounding area that could support renovation similar to Alternative 4, and the project applicant does not own or control any other property within the City that would be suitable for renovation. Additionally, development of the site with more intensive recreational uses could generate greater environmental impacts than Alternative 4, including those related to an increase in population, vehicle trips and associated emissions, or impervious surface areas.

Therefore, these alternatives are eliminated from further consideration.

D. EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR ANALYSIS

The alternatives selected for further detailed review within the EIR focus on alternatives that could reduce the Project's significant environmental impacts, while still meeting most of the basic Project objectives. Those alternatives include:

- **Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative (Draft EIR, pp. 6-7 through 6-16)**
- **Alternative 2: Clubhouse Renovation (Draft EIR, pp. 6-16 through 6-33)**
- **Alternative 3: Revised Site Plan (Draft EIR, pp. 6-33 through 6-49)**
- **Alternative D4: Proposed Project (Draft EIR, pp. 4.1-16 through 4.17-5)**

1. Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative

Description: The No Project Alternative assumes that Alternative 4 is not approved and the Sandpiper Golf Club and course is not renovated. The existing project site would be maintained, and golf course operations would continue under existing conditions. The No Project Alternative would not upgrade the existing clubhouse, comfort station, or maintenance yard; would not rehabilitate/adaptively reuse the aging Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station; would not reduce the irrigated turf area of the golf course; would not provide lateral access or open space easements; and would not eliminate septic system use. Under the No Project Alternative, the Sphere of Influence request would not be included. (Draft EIR, p. 6-5.)

Impacts:

a. Aesthetics

Under the No Project Alternative, the Sandpiper Golf Club would be operated and maintained in the existing condition and would not be renovated. The No Project Alternative would not involve new construction or the addition of structures on the project site that could impact scenic vistas, which would reduce construction impacts when compared to Alternative 4. However, the No Project Alternative would not include undergrounding of the existing power lines or restoration of the existing Barnsdall Rio Gas Station and therefore would not result in the aesthetic improvements to the project site that would occur as part of Alternative 4. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no construction impacts on scenic vistas, but would not improve the visual quality of the site or community. Overall, the No Project Alternative would have no impact when compared to existing conditions, but a greater visual impact when compared to Alternative 4, because it would not include the site renovation and undergrounding on utilities lines along Hollister Avenue that would be implemented as part of Alternative 4.

The project site is not visible from a scenic highway. Like Alternative 4, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on scenic resources within a State scenic highway.

The No Project Alternative would not result in renovation that would conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations that govern scenic quality. However, the No Project Alternative would not support the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan's policies governing scenic resources, because it would not include site renovation that would be implemented as part of Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative would not result in new sources of light and glare, as no renovation would occur. Sources of light and glare on the project site, under the No Project Alternative, would remain the same as existing conditions. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving the creation of new sources of light and glare, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on aesthetics. The No Project Alternative's aesthetics impacts resulting from construction and light and glare would be reduced when compared to Alternative 4, due to the lack of renovation on the site. However, the No Project Alternative would not include visual enhancements provided by Alternative 4, such as the undergrounding of existing power lines or restoration of the existing Barnsdall Rio Gas Station. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-7 through 6-8.)

b. Air Quality

The No Project Alternative would not result in renovation that could lead to indirect population growth and therefore would not conflict with the land use assumptions and population projections used to forecast emissions in the 2022 Ozone Plan. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving conflict with an applicable air quality management plan, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative would not include construction or demolition activities, including construction vehicle trips, that could emit criteria air pollutants. Operation and maintenance of the Sandpiper Golf Club under the No Project Alternative would maintain existing conditions, similar to Alternative 4. Overall, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving generation of criteria pollutant emissions, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no construction or demolition activities or construction vehicle trips to the project site that could expose sensitive receptors to pollutants. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative would maintain existing conditions on the project site and would not involve demolition or construction activities. The No Project Alternative would not have the potential to generate odors beyond those already occurring. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no change involving odor emissions, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on air quality. The No Project Alternative's air quality emissions would remain the same and would be less compared to Alternative 4 due to the lack of construction emissions from renovation of the site. (Draft EIR, p. 6-8.)

c. Biological Resources

The No Project Alternative would not include any renovation activities on the project site and therefore would have no potential to impact special-status plant and wildlife species, riparian habitat or Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA), wetlands, or wildlife migration based on renovation on the project site. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on these biological resources from renovation. Because the No Project Alternative would not include any renovation activities on the project site, the No Project Alternative has no potential to conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, and no impact would occur as a result of renovation. As with Alternative 4, the No Project Alternative would not be located in an area subject to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, and no impact would occur. Overall, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on biological resources from renovation activities, which is a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4. (Draft EIR, p. 6-9.)

D. Cultural Resources

The No Project Alternative would not involve new construction near the historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station and would not have the potential to damage Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station due to vibration from construction equipment. While the No Project Alternative would have no impact on historic resources when compared to existing conditions, the No Project Alternative would not restore the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, as would occur under Alternative 4. The Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station has been unused and largely abandoned since the 1950s. This long period of inactivity has left it vulnerable to deterioration from weather, vandalism, and lack of upkeep. Under the No Project Alternative, the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station would remain at risk of further deteriorating and losing its historic integrity.

The No Project Alternative would not involve ground-disturbing activities (other than normal routine maintenance activities) that could potentially damage or disturb subsurface archaeological resources. Therefore, the No Project Alternative

would have no impact on archaeological resources, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

Under the No Project Alternative, no ground-disturbing activities on the project site would occur that could potentially damage or disturb human remains. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on human remains, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on cultural resources. The No Project Alternative's cultural resources impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the lack of renovation of the site. However, the No Project Alternative would not restore the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, putting this building at further risk due to the lack of use. (Draft EIR, p. 6-9.)

e. Energy

Under the No Project Alternative, no construction activities would occur that would result in the consumption of energy. However, the No Project Alternative would not replace aging on-site structures with energy efficient features that could reduce energy use on-site, including the installation of a new irrigation system and construction of buildings compliant with current energy efficiency standards. Overall, the No Project Alternative would not change the current consumption of energy at the site. When compared to existing conditions, the No Project Alternative would have no impact related to energy. When compared to Alternative 4, however, the No Project Alternative would have a greater impact, as it would result in less overall operational energy efficiency than Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative would not include construction activities that would result in increased energy use on the project site. However, the No Project Alternative would not renovate existing structures to be compliant with current energy efficiency standards, would not include a new maintenance building that allows for the installation of solar panels on the roof, would not increase the number of electric vehicle charging stations on the project site, and would not improve pedestrian and bicycle transportation along Hollister Avenue; all of which are aligned with Senate Bill 100, the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP), Strategic Energy Plan, or Municipal Code requirements. While the No Project Alternative would not conflict with renewable energy or energy efficiency plans, the No Project Alternative would result in less overall operational energy efficiency than Alternative 4.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have no impact related to energy. The No Project Alternative's energy impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the lack of construction during construction of the site. However, the No Project Alternative would result in less overall operational energy efficiency than Alternative 4. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-9 through 6-10.)

f. Geology and Soils

The No Project Alternative would be located on the same project site as Alternative 4 and would be subject to the same seismic hazards, including fault rupture. The No Project Alternative would not involve ground-disturbing activities, and would not introduce new structures, residents, or employees to the project site. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving risk of loss, injury, or death due to fault rupture when compared to existing conditions, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative would not involve renovation on the project site that could increase the risk of loss, injury, or death due to seismic ground shaking when compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no additional impact involving risk of loss, injury, or death due to strong seismic ground shaking. However, the No Project Alternative would not include the renovation/reconstruction of existing buildings with buildings that meet current, more stringent seismic design requirements than were in place at the time of development of the existing buildings. Thus, the No Project Alternative would not result in seismic upgrades to buildings provided by Alternative 4 from construction of new buildings designed with current seismic standards and therefore the seismic safety the golf course facilities would remain unchanged from when they were constructed.

The No Project Alternative would not involve ground-disturbing activities or increase the potential for the risk of loss, injury, or death related to liquefaction to occur on the project site when compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving risk of loss, injury, or death due to seismic-related ground failure. Although the No Project Alternative would have no impact, the No Project Alternative would not include the renovation of the site with buildings constructed in accordance with modern seismic safety standards. The No Project Alternative would not involve renovation on the project site that could increase the risk of loss, injury, or death due to landslides when compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving risk of loss, injury, or death due to landslides, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative would not involve construction activities, such as grading, that would increase the potential for erosion and sedimentation. Under the No Project Alternative, existing drainage patterns on the project site would be maintained, and the No Project Alternative would not result in new sources of runoff that could contribute to project site erosion. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative would not increase the potential for unstable soils to occur on the project site when compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the No

Project Alternative would have no impact involving unstable soils, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

Soils on the project site have very low potential for expansion. The No Project Alternative would not involve on-site renovation that could potentially increase the risks to life or property from expansive soils. The No Project Alternative would have no impact involving expansive soils because of no renovation, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

Although the No Project Alternative would not include the abandonment of on-site septic tanks, it also would not involve the installation of additional septic tanks on-site. As such, the No Project Alternative would not result in increased impacts related to the use of septic tanks, similar to Alternative 4. However, the No Project Alternative's impact involving septic tanks would be greater than Alternative 4, as the No Project Alternative would not discontinue use and abandon the on-site septic tanks and would perpetuate the risk of septic tank failure at the project site.

The No Project Alternative would not involve ground-disturbing activities that could potentially damage or disturb unanticipated paleontological resources would occur. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving paleontological resources, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have no impact related to fault rupture, liquefaction, landslides, erosion, unstable soils, and expansive soils, which is a lesser impact than Alternative 4. However, the No Project Alternative would not include the demolition of existing buildings with the construction of new buildings that meet current, more stringent seismic design requirements than were in place at the time of development of the existing buildings. The No Project Alternative would result in a greater impact related to the use of septic systems when compared to the project. The No Project Alternative would have no impact related to paleontological resources, which is a lesser impact than Alternative 4. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-10 through 6-11.)

g. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The No Project Alternative would not result in construction activities or additional vehicle trips than what is already occurring that could emit greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Unlike Alternative 4, the No Project Alternative would not increase operational GHG emissions. The No Project Alternative would have no impact involving GHG emissions, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative does not involve renovation activities that would increase GHG emissions and therefore would not have the potential to conflict with existing policies or regulations established to reduce GHG emissions. The No

Project Alternative would not increase the total number of electric vehicle parking spaces at the project site, would not improve public transit along Hollister Avenue, would not improve the existing and aging irrigation system to maximum water use efficiency, and would not upgrade the existing buildings to be consistent with modern building electrification requirements; all of which are aligned with existing policies or regulations established to reduce GHG emissions. Nevertheless, the No Project Alternative would not increase GHG emissions and would have no impact related to conflicts with existing policies or regulations established to reduce GHG emissions, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have no impact related to GHG emissions. The No Project Alternative's GHG emissions impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the lack of additional GHG emissions associated with renovation of the site. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-11 through 6-12.)

h. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The No Project Alternative would not alter the existing use of the project site and would not introduce new construction-related activities that could increase the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. However, unlike Alternative 4, operation of the No Project Alternative would not reduce fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course. As a result, the ongoing transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during operation would continue at current levels. While the No Project Alternative would not increase hazardous materials use beyond existing conditions, its impact would be greater than that of Alternative 4, which includes operational reductions. Nonetheless, this impact would remain less than significant.

The No Project Alternative would not result in a change in the use of the project site and consequently would not have the potential to disturb hazardous materials within the existing clubhouse, comfort station, or Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, or within project site soils or groundwater. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no additional impact involving the accidental release of hazardous materials, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative would not involve any handling of hazardous materials for construction and would not result in the increased handling of hazardous materials within the vicinity of Ellwood School. Unlike Alternative 4, operation of the No Project Alternative would not result in reduced fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course and therefore would not decrease the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during operation compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not change the existing condition involving the handling of hazardous materials within 0.25-mile of a school, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative would not result in a change of use of the project site and consequently would not have the potential to disturb existing hazardous materials within project site soils or groundwater. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving the creation of a significant hazard to the public or environment, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4, which would involve soil disturbance and potentially disturb hazardous materials within project site soils.

As with Alternative 4, the No Project Alternative would continue to be located outside of the safety and noise contours of the Santa Barbara Airport. The No Project Alternative would not change the use of the property and would not introduce additional employees or visitors to the project site. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no change to the condition involving safety hazards or excessive noise related to airport operations, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative would maintain existing roadway conditions at the project site and would not involve construction vehicles or operational traffic that could potentially interfere with an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no change to the site's condition that would interfere with an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative would maintain existing conditions at the project site and would not involve renovation activities which could increase the risk of wildland fire beyond existing conditions. As discussed in Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the project site is partially located within a fire hazard severity zone. As the No Project Alternative would maintain existing conditions, the existing on-site buildings would not be renovated in accordance with the most recent building code standards for wildfire protection. Nonetheless, as the No Project Alternative would not involve construction activities with the potential to result in wildfire ignition, the No Project Alternative's impacts related to wildfire would be decreased when compared to Alternative 4 and would be less than significant.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have a less than significant impact related to hazards and hazardous materials. However, unlike Alternative 4, operation of the No Project Alternative would not result in a reduction in fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course and therefore would not decrease the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during operation that are currently occurring. Additionally, the No Project Alternative would not renovate existing buildings to meet current building code standards for wildfire protection. However, the No Project Alternative's impact related to wildfire would be decreased when compared to Alternative 4, as the No Project Alternative would

not include construction activities that would increase the risk of wildfire ignition. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-12 through 6-13.)

i. Hydrology and Water Quality

The No Project Alternative would not result in demolition or new construction that could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. No new sources of pollutants would be introduced to the project site, and existing drainage patterns would be maintained. The No Project Alternative would have no impact involving water quality degradation during construction, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4. However, unlike Alternative 4, operation of the No Project Alternative would not result in a reduction in fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course, would not include a new water-efficient irrigation system, and would not include new on-site bioretention basins. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not decrease the potential to impair water quality due to pesticides, reduced irrigation, and additional stormwater treatment infrastructure on-site.

Unlike Alternative 4, the No Project Alternative would not involve construction and consequently would not require groundwater dewatering. The No Project Alternative would not introduce new impervious surfaces that could affect groundwater recharge. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative would not involve renovation and would maintain existing conditions at the project site. The No Project Alternative would not include construction activities that could alter the drainage pattern of the project site, including through the alteration of a course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces in a manner that could result in substantial erosion or siltation and introduction of polluted runoff, which is a lesser level of impact compared to Alternative 4. However, unlike Alternative 4, the No Project Alternative would not remove the existing culvert and restore Devereaux Creek to its natural condition and flow.

The No Project Alternative would be subject to the same on-site inundation hazards as Alternative 4. Like Alternative 4, hazardous materials stored on-site would be located outside the inundation areas and stored in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. The No Project Alternative would not change the risk of release of stormwater pollutants during inundation compared to existing conditions.

The No Project Alternative would not result in water quality impacts related to erosion, groundwater dewatering, construction of new structures, or addition of new uses to the site. Consequently, the No Project Alternative would not conflict with the goals of the Basin Plan. The No Project Alternative would have no impact

on on-site water use and therefore would not interfere with the management of the Basin in accordance with the Wright Judgement or implementation of Goleta Water District's Groundwater Management Plan Goleta Groundwater Basin. However, the No Project Alternative would not decrease the potential to impair water quality or reduce water use on-site. Nevertheless, the No Project Alternative would have no change/impact involving obstruction of a water quality control plan or groundwater management plan, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have no impact related to hydrology and water quality. However, unlike Alternative 4, operation of the No Project Alternative would not decrease the potential to impair water quality due to pesticides, reduced potential for overwatering, and additional stormwater treatment infrastructure on-site. Nevertheless, the No Project Alternative's hydrology and water quality impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the lack of construction activities during renovation of the site. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-13 through 6-14.)

j. Land Use and Planning

The No Project Alternative would not include construction that could physically divide an established community. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving the physical division of an established community, which would be the same level of impact as Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative would not include renovation or other additional on-site activities beyond existing conditions. The No Project Alternative would not support Policies VH 2.3, VH 4.14, and PF 6.2 related to the undergrounding of existing utility lines, as the No Project Alternative would not underground the existing utility lines. Additionally, the No Project Alternative would not support Policy VH 5.4 related to preservation of historic structures, as the No Project Alternative would not adaptively reuse the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not directly conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Impacts would be less than significant, which is a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4. (Draft EIR, p. 6-14.)

k. Noise

The No Project Alternative would not involve demolition or construction, including grading and excavation, that could result in the generation of construction noise levels that exceed City of Goleta standards. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving generation of a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative would maintain existing on-site conditions and would not introduce new structures or land uses that could result in increases in operational noise. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving generation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative would maintain existing on-site conditions and would not introduce new vehicle trips to and from the project site. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving generation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels due to vehicle trips, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative would not involve new construction near the historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station and would not result in any potential to affect the building due to construction-related ground-borne vibration. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving ground-borne vibration, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative would be located outside the noise contours from Santa Barbara Airport and, unlike Alternative 4, would not result in increased employees or visitors on the project site. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have no impact related to noise. The No Project Alternative's noise impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the lack of renovation of the site. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-14 through 6-15.)

I. Parks and Recreation

The No Project Alternative would not result in new employees or visitors at the project site, and would consequently not increase demand for parks or recreational facilities. The No Project Alternative would not redevelop the Sandpiper Golf Club, an existing recreational facility, and would thus have no impact involving construction or expansion of a recreational facility that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Unlike Alternative 4, the No Project Alternative would not expand recreational access at the project site through the extension of a Class I bicycle path or dedication of a lateral access easement along the beach frontage on the sand and along Hollister Avenue. Nevertheless, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on parks or recreational facilities, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4. (Draft EIR, p. 6-15.)

m. Public Services

The No Project Alternative would not result in new employees or visitors at the project site and would not increase demand for public services, including fire protection, police protection, schools, or other public facilities. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on public services, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4. (Draft EIR, p. 6-15.)

n. Transportation and Circulation

Unlike Alternative 4, the No Project Alternative would not include any improvements to Hollister Avenue or the Class 1 bicycle path. The No Project Alternative would not change vehicle miles traveled (VMT) generated from the site, which is a lesser level of impact compared to Alternative 4. The No Project Alternative would not involve any changes to the existing circulation network at or surrounding the project site and would not include any construction activities at the project site that could result in delays to emergency access. Overall, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on transportation and circulation, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-15 through 6-16.)

o. Tribal Cultural Resources

The No Project Alternative would involve no ground-disturbing activities and would have no potential to adversely impact tribal cultural resources. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on tribal cultural resources, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4. (Draft EIR, p. 6-16.)

p. Utilities and Service Systems

The No Project Alternative would not include any installation of utility infrastructure or necessitate additional utility infrastructure to the project site. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact related to the relocation or construction of new or expanded utility infrastructure, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative would not change the existing water use on the site. Unlike Alternative 4, the No Project Alternative would not reduce irrigated turf and corresponding reductions in water use for golf course irrigation.

The No Project Alternative would not include any renovation or increase in employees or visitors and would not increase existing wastewater generation on the project site. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact related to wastewater generation, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

The No Project Alternative would not require construction activities or include additional operations at the Sandpiper Golf Club and therefore would not increase solid waste generation compared to existing conditions. Accordingly, the No

Project Alternative would have no impact related to solid waste generation, which would be a lesser level of impact than Alternative 4.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have no impact related to utilities and service systems. The No Project Alternative's impacts related to the installation of utility infrastructure, wastewater, and solid waste would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the lack of renovation of the site. The No Project Alternative would result in no impact on water supply but would not include reductions in water use for golf course irrigation. (Draft EIR, pages 6-7 through 6-16.)

Attainment of Project Objectives: None. The No Project Alternative would not fulfill any project objectives. (Draft EIR, p. 6-67.)

Finding: The City Council rejects Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative, on the following ground, which individually provides sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative: (1) the alternative fails to meet all of the Project objectives.

2. Alternative 2: Clubhouse Renovation

Description: Alternative 2 would consist of just demolition of the existing clubhouse facility and reconstructing a new clubhouse building. This alternative would not involve golf course recontouring, replacement of the existing comfort station or maintenance yard, construction of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop (including restoration and adaptive reuse of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station), coastal access improvements, dedication of a lateral access easement, dedication of an open space easement in Bell Canyon, or Hollister Avenue improvements. Similar to Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would involve the demolition of the existing 9,305 square foot clubhouse, and construction of a new 37,179 square foot, two-level clubhouse and basement, and 135 parking spaces. The new clubhouse would feature expanded storage areas for materials and supplies needed for golf course operations, employee support spaces, a lobby, pro-shop, grab and go café, kitchens, gallery, offices, golf simulator rooms, a guest lounge, a new restaurant and kitchen, and a cocktail bar. The new clubhouse would expand outdoor dining terrace areas by 4,416 square feet, indoor restaurant seating by 47 seats, and outdoor restaurant seating by 54 seats. The new clubhouse would require an additional 12 employees, for a total of 47 projected full-time staff at the Sandpiper Golf Club. Similar to Alternative 4, the project applicant would request a zoning code adjustment to allow a portion of the clubhouse to exceed the 25-foot height limit for the Open Space/Active Recreation zone, and the Sphere of Influence request would remain. Operation of the golf course would be similar to existing conditions, as the number of golf rounds would not change, maintenance activities would be the same as existing conditions, and the amount of turf would not be reduced. (Draft EIR, p. ES-10.)

Impacts:

a. Aesthetics

Under this alternative, potential impacts related to aesthetics would be limited to those involving the demolition, construction, and operation of the proposed clubhouse. Construction of the clubhouse in accordance with Alternative 2 would be visible from the Hollister Avenue scenic corridor and related scenic viewpoints, but such visual impacts would be temporary and construction areas would be screened with fencing during construction to obstruct views of equipment and the construction sites from public viewing areas. Due to this alternative's reduced construction activities, Alternative 2 would result in fewer temporary visual impediments from the Hollister Avenue scenic corridor and related scenic viewpoints during construction compared to Alternative 4. Alternative 2's tree removal would be limited to the clubhouse site and would include tree plantings at the clubhouse to maintain the existing, vegetated conditions that surround the clubhouse, and would screen views of the new, paved parking areas from Hollister Avenue. Similar to Alternative 4, the addition of new trees at the clubhouse would not interfere with previous, unobstructed, scenic views from public locations. However, Alternative 2 would not include undergrounding of the existing power lines or restoration of the existing Barnsdall Rio Gas Station, and therefore would not result in the same aesthetic improvements to the project site that would occur as part of Alternative 4. Therefore, Alternative 2 would have lesser construction impacts, but would include fewer visual enhancements than Alternative 4. Like Alternative 4, impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant.

Alternative 2 would not place infrastructure in an area visible from an officially designated State scenic highway. As with Alternative 4, existing buildings topography, and vegetation obscure views of the project site and existing on-site development from vehicles travelling along United States Route 101 (U.S. 101). Alternative 2's clubhouse would be the same height as Alternative 4's clubhouse, and thus obscured from views from U.S. 101, similar to Alternative 4. No impact to scenic highways would occur, the same as Alternative 4.

Alternative 2's clubhouse would not differ from Alternative 4's clubhouse and therefore would be consistent with the same policies and regulations governing visual quality as those applicable to Alternative 4's clubhouse. Alternative 2's clubhouse would meet the same development standard as Alternative 4, including maximum lot coverage, maximum building height,⁵ minimum setbacks, and parking, of the Open Space/Active Recreation zone. In addition, Alternative 2's clubhouse would not exceed Federal Air Regulations (FAR) Part 77 building height restrictions and would not obstruct views of the Pacific Ocean in compliance with Section 30251 of the California Coastal Act. Like Alternative 4, impacts to scenic quality would be less than significant.

Alternative 2 would reduce the amount of lighting from on-site structures compared to Alternative 4 because it would not include lighting associated with the Rio Grande Coffee Shop and parking lot. Light sources associated with Alternative 2's clubhouse would be the same as Alternative 4's clubhouse and be designed in accordance with City standards, including City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy 4.12, Lighting, which requires outdoor lighting fixtures to be designed, located, aimed downward or toward structures (if properly shielded), retrofitted if feasible, and maintained in order to prevent over-lighting, energy waste, glare, light trespass, and sky glow. Because of a decrease in employees and associated vehicle trips compared to Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would result in less vehicle-related lighting than Alternative 4. Lighting would be similar to the surrounding area due to frequent residential and commercial vehicles near the U.S. 101 and Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oaks Road interchange. Alternative 2 would introduce the same glare from sunlight reflecting on the clubhouse's glass surfaces but would reduce the overall glare compared to Alternative 4 due to Alternative 2's reduction in renovation activities. Like Alternative 4, impacts related to light and glare would be less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's aesthetics impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the reduction in construction and lack of renovation of the site. However, Alternative 2 would include fewer visual enhancements than Alternative 4 because it would not include the undergrounding of utilities or restoration of the existing Barnsdall Rio Gas Station. Alternative 2 would have no impact on scenic highways and less than significant impacts on scenic vistas, scenic quality, and light and glare, similar to Alternative 4. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-16 through 6-17.)

b. Air Quality

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would not change the project site's existing land use and therefore would not conflict with the land use assumptions that inform the 2022 Ozone Plan's emissions forecasts. Alternative 2 would require nine fewer employees than Alternative 4 and therefore would result in less indirect population growth compared to Alternative 4. Given that Alternative 4's indirect population growth is within Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) growth projections utilized within the 2022 Ozone Plan, Alternative 2 would also be within SBCAG growth projections and therefore would not conflict with the 2022 Ozone Plan. Alternative 2's impacts related to conflicts with an air quality management plan would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2 would reduce the scope of Alternative 4's construction activities by limiting demolition and construction to the clubhouse and therefore would reduce criteria air pollutant emissions during construction compared to Alternative 4. Given that construction of Alternative 4 would not exceed Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) emissions thresholds, Alternative 2's

reduced construction would also not exceed SBCAPCD thresholds. Similarly, given Alternative 2's reduced scale compared to Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would generate less criteria air pollutant emissions during operation compared to Alternative 4, which would not exceed SBCAPCD thresholds. Alternative 2's impacts related to release of criteria air pollutants would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Because Alternative 2 would limit construction to the clubhouse, Alternative 2's construction would result in less toxic air contaminant emissions on the project site compared to Alternative 4 and would limit toxic air contaminant emissions to the clubhouse area, farther from single-family residences to the east of the project site. As with Alternative 4, operation of Alternative 2 would not involve the use of equipment that would increase toxic air contaminant emission on the project site. Alternative 2's impacts related to the release of toxic air contaminants would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Because Alternative 2 would limit construction to the clubhouse, Alternative 2's construction would result in less odors from construction equipment compared to Alternative 4, which would be intermittent, temporary, and dissipate rapidly with distance from in-use construction equipment. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would include food preparation at the clubhouse restaurant; however, odors associated with food preparation would primarily be confined to the indoor dining areas. Food-related odors would also dissipate rapidly, and given the northeast to southwest wind patterns, would not be carried to nearby development north and east of the project site. Alternative 2's odor impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's air quality impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the reduction in construction and less renovation of the site. Like Alternative 4, Alternative 2's impacts to air quality would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 6-18.)

c. Biological Resources

Alternative 2 would limit construction to the clubhouse area and therefore would avoid impacts to red sand verbenas and southern California black walnut in Bell Canyon and woolly seablite along the coastal bluff, similar to Alternative 4. Unlike Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would not include landscaping within coyote brush scrub occupied by cliff malacothrix along the coastal bluff and would not involve planting of milkweed where Santa Barbara honeysuckle is located. In addition, Alternative 2 would not include trenching for a water main from the comfort station and does not have the potential to result in direct impacts to special-status plant species that have expanded into proposed disturbance areas at this portion of the project site. Accordingly, Alternative 2 would avoid potentially significant direct impacts to special-status plant species, and would not require implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, or BIO-3 for special-status plant species. As

with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 could result in indirect impacts to special-status plant species due to water quality effects and chemical spills or vehicle leaks; therefore, Alternative 2 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4, which includes best management practices (BMP) to reduce potential indirect impacts to special-status plant species. Alternative 2's impacts related to special-status plant species would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Alternative 2 would limit construction to the clubhouse area and therefore would avoid direct impacts to Crotch's bumble bee, monarch butterfly and monarch ESHA, California red-legged frog, and southwestern pond turtle, and tidewater goby. Accordingly, Alternative 2 would not require implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, or BIO-9 for special status wildlife species. However, Alternative 2 could result in similar indirect impacts to special-status wildlife species habitat due to water quality effects, chemical spills, or vehicle leaks. In addition, if nests are present, Alternative 2 could result in impacts to special-status bird species due to the potential to disturb nests during tree removal or in proximity to the clubhouse during construction. Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and BIO-10 calling for construction BMPs and nesting bird surveys and avoidance would therefore continue to be required. Alternative 2's impacts related to special-status wildlife species would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Alternative 2 would limit project activities to the clubhouse area and therefore would avoid direct impacts to riparian habitat and ESHA. As such, Mitigation Measure BIO-11 would no longer be required. Alternative 2 could result in similar indirect impacts to ESHA habitat due to water quality effects, chemical spills, or vehicle leaks; therefore, Alternative 2 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4, which includes BMPs to reduce potential indirect impacts to ESHA. Alternative 2's impacts related to riparian habitat and ESHA would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Alternative 2 would limit project activities to the clubhouse area and therefore would avoid direct impacts to state or federally protected wetlands and would not require implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, or BIO-11. Alternative 2 could result in indirect impacts to wetlands due to water quality effects chemical spills, or vehicle leaks; therefore, Alternative 2 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4 which includes BMPs to reduce potential indirect impacts to state or federally protected wetlands. Alternative 2's impacts related to federally protected wetlands would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

As Alternative 2 would limit project activities to the clubhouse area, it would avoid substantial noise exceeding Goleta's noise standards, which would avoid impediments to wildlife migration or the use of wildlife nursery sites that could occur

with Alternative 4. Accordingly, Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would not be required to reduce construction noise levels that could affect essential behavioral activities of wildlife. Given that Alternative 2 would not require mitigation for construction noise, Alternative 2 would result in less than significant impacts related to wildlife movement, which is reduced compared to Alternative 4.

Alternative 2 would limit project activities to the clubhouse area and therefore would avoid potential conflicts with Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 1.6 and Policy CE 9.5 which would result from Alternative 4's activities in areas other than the clubhouse. As a result, Alternative 2 would not require implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, or BIO-11 to reduce impacts related to conflicts with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Accordingly, Alternative 2 would result in a less than significant impact related to conflict with policies protecting biological resources, which is reduced compared to Alternative 4.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would not be located in an area subject to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Alternative 2 would have no impact related to conflicts with these plans, which would be the same level of impact compared to Alternative 4.

Based on the above, Alternative 2 would have a reduced level of impact compared to Alternative 4 due to Alternative 2's reduced construction activities and lack of renovation of the site. Alternative 2's impact related to special-status plant and wildlife species, riparian habitat and ESHA, and state and federally protected wetlands would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated, similar to Alternative 4. Like Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would have no impact related to conflicts with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. For impacts to wildlife movement and conflicts with local policies or ordinances, Alternative 2 would reduce Alternative 4's less than significant with mitigation impact to a less than significant level. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-18 through 6-20.)

d. Cultural Resources

Alternative 2 would not involve the restoration and adaptive reuse of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, a historical resource, and would concentrate construction at the clubhouse. Therefore, Alternative 2 would not have the potential to result in damage to the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station from vibration caused by construction equipment proximate to the station. Mitigation Measures CUL1 and NOI-2 would not be required for Alternative 2. Alternative 2 would result in no construction impacts to historic resources, which is reduced compared to Alternative 4. However, Alternative 2 would not include the restoration of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, such that the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station would remain at risk of further deteriorating and losing its historic integrity.

Construction of Alternative 2 would reduce the amount of ground disturbance compared to Alternative 4, which would reduce the potential to encounter unknown archaeological resources. Because some ground disturbance would still occur, Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4 would continue to be required. These measures would minimize potential impacts to unanticipated discoveries of archaeological resources by requiring archaeological monitoring, a cultural resources sensitivity meeting for construction personnel, and implementation of appropriate procedures for evaluation and treatment of any discoveries made during construction. Alternative 2's impacts related to archaeological resources would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Construction of Alternative 2 would reduce the amount of ground disturbance compared to Alternative 4, which would reduce the potential to encounter unknown human remains. As with Alternative 4, in the event of unanticipated discovery of human remains, the construction contractor would comply with State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and human remains would be preserved in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Alternative 2's impacts related to human remains would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's cultural resources impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the reduction in ground disturbing activities and avoidance of construction equipment use near the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. Alternative 2 would result in no impact to historical resources, compared to Alternative 4's less than significant with mitigation impact; however, Alternative 2 would not restore and adaptively reuse the Barnsdall Rio Gas Station putting this building at further risk due to the lack of use. Alternative 2's impact to archaeological resources would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 2's impact to human remains would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-20 through 6-21.)

e. Energy

Alternative 2 would reduce the scope of Alternative 4's construction activities by limiting demolition and construction to the clubhouse which would reduce the amount of petroleum-based fuels used for construction equipment compared to Alternative 4. As with Alternative 4, energy use during construction would be temporary and minimized in compliance with existing regulations such as California Code of Regulations Title 13 Sections 2449 and 2485, which prohibit diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles and off-road diesel vehicles from idling for more than five minutes. Due to Alternative 2's reduced renovation activities, including the omission of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, Alternative 2 would use less energy during operation than Alternative 4. Operation of Alternative 2 would require the same energy consumption for the clubhouse as Alternative 4's clubhouse and would adhere to the same energy efficiency standards as

Alternative 4, such as the California Green Building Standards Code and the 2025 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Furthermore, Alternative 2 would be designed in accordance with the City's Energy Performance Reach Code which would provide electric-ready facilities for the use of electric infrastructure. In addition, Alternative 2 would continue to utilize the existing on-site electric golf carts for golfers. Alternative 2's impact related to the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy resources would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would adhere to the California Green Building Standards Code and the 2025 Building Energy Efficiency Standards to minimize unnecessary energy use in the clubhouse. The clubhouse would be supplied power from Southern California Edison (SCE) in accordance with Senate Bill 100, which requires SCE to increase renewable energy procurement to 60 percent by 2030, and 100 percent by 2045. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would provide 15 electric vehicle (EV) charging spaces at the clubhouse, which would make up 88 percent of the 17 total parking spaces proposed in accordance with Alternative 2. This amount of electric vehicle parking would be consistent with the requirements of the CALGreen intervening code update and the City's Municipal Code, which requires new non-residential construction to construct at least 30 percent of new parking spaces to be EV capable or include EV charging infrastructure. Alternative 2 would include 12 bicycle spaces at the clubhouse to encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation, consistent with the City's Climate Action Plan, Strategic Energy Plan, General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, or Municipal Code. Alternative 2's impact related to conflicts with state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency be less than significant, the same as Alternative 4.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's overall energy impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the reduction in construction and lack of renovation of the site, but would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-21 through 6-22.)

f. Geology and Soils

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would not locate structures within 50 feet of the More Ranch Fault and would not directly or indirectly cause the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault. This impact would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2 would include renovation in an area with the same risks of seismic activity as Alternative 4. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 requiring recommendations from the project-specific geotechnical reports to be put into grading and building plans; however, only the recommendations of the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed Club House would apply for Alternative 2 as no other renovation

would be included. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce potential impacts due to ground-shaking to a less than significant level through incorporation of structural integrity recommendations. Unlike Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would not include seismic upgrades associated with renovation of existing maintenance buildings with buildings that meet current, more stringent seismic design requirements. Therefore, Alternative 2's impacts related to ground-shaking would be greater compared to Alternative 4, but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Alternative 2 would be subject to the same liquefaction risks as Alternative 4's clubhouse, which are very low. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 design would incorporate design measures required by the California Building Code (CBC) which reduce the potential for substantial adverse effects due to liquefaction. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to liquefaction would be similar to Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2 would be subject to the same landslide risks as Alternative 4's clubhouse, which is not located in an area with landslide potential. Alternative 2's clubhouse would require the same cut and fill slopes as Alternative 4, which would not result in substantially steep slopes or other conditions that could induce a landslide. However, Alternative 2 would not include recontouring of the golf course within high landslide potential areas. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to landslides would be less than Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Construction of Alternative 2 would reduce the amount of ground disturbance compared to Alternative 4, which would reduce the potential for erosion. Alternative 2's clubhouse would be 37,179 square feet, or 0.85-acre, which would exempt Alternative 2's construction from obtaining coverage under the Construction Stormwater General Permit. However, Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code requires preparation of an erosion and sediment control plan in order to obtain a grading permit. Thus, Alternative 2 would still include implementation of an erosion control plan to minimize erosion during construction activities. Alternative 2 would include implementation of bioretention basins at the clubhouse to treat and discharge stormwater onto the golf course consistent with the requirements of the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), including erosion control, during operation. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would not substantially increase the rate of runoff on the site compared to existing conditions, as the impervious surfaces added to the project site from the clubhouse would represent an increase of less than 0.2 percent compared to existing conditions. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to erosion would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would not locate structures in an area subject to substantial liquefaction potential, landslide hazards, or potential for soil collapse. Potential impacts associated with geotechnical hazards would be minimized with adherence to the CBC. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 may require

groundwater dewatering during construction, but groundwater dewatering would be limited to the localized perched water on the project site and would be temporary, only occurring if perched groundwater is encountered. Therefore, construction of Alternative 2 would not result in substantial groundwater withdrawals that could result in subsidence on-site. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to the risk of landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would locate renovation on soils with very low potential for expansion. The construction contractor would be required to comply with the CBC, including the use of non-expansive fill material, to minimize the potential for structural hazards associated with soil expansion. Alternative 2's impact related to creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property related to expansive soil would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would involve connecting the clubhouse to the Goleta West Sanitary District sewer system and the abandonment of the private septic systems serving the clubhouse, but would retain the existing septic tank serving the comfort station. Alternative 2 would not involve the installation of additional septic tanks on-site and therefore would not result in impacts related to the use of septic tanks. The No Project Alternative would have no impact, which would be the same level of impact compared to Alternative 4.

Alternative 2 would reduce the amount of ground disturbance compared to Alternative 4, which would reduce the potential to encounter paleontological resources or unique geologic features compared to Alternative 4. However, Alternative 2 could result in the disturbance of unknown paleontological resources at the clubhouse area; therefore, Alternative 2 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-2 to reduce potential construction impacts to paleontological resources and unique geologic features to a less than significant level by requiring a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training, monitoring, and setting forth procedures for the recovery, identification, and curation of fossils discovered during construction. Alternative 2's impacts related to paleontological resources and unique geologic features would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's impacts related to fault rupture, liquefaction, landslides, unstable soils, and expansive soils, would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant. Alternative 2's impacts related to erosion would be reduced compared to Alternative 4, but would remain less than significant. Alternative 2 would result in no impact related to septic systems, which is the same as Alternative 4. Alternative 2's impacts related to ground-shaking and paleontological resources would be reduced compared to Alternative 4, but remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 2 would not include

seismic upgrades associated with renovation of existing maintenance buildings with buildings that meet current, more stringent seismic design requirements. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-22 through 6-23.)

g. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Alternative 2 would reduce the scope of Alternative 4's construction activities by limiting demolition and construction to the clubhouse. Therefore, this alternative would result in reduced GHG emissions during construction compared to Alternative 4. In addition, Alternative 2's reduced scope would reduce GHG emissions during operation compared to Alternative 4 because Alternative 2 does not include construction of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop. Given the reduction in GHG emissions compared to Alternative 4, Alternative 2's impacts related to GHG emissions would be reduced compared to Alternative 4. Impacts would remain less than significant.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would include design features to promote renewable energy use, energy efficiency, water efficiency, and reductions in vehicle travel, all of which contribute to the creation of minimal GHG emissions. Alternative 2 would include EV charging infrastructure that exceeds California Green Building Standards and City requirements for EV charging infrastructure. Alternative 2's clubhouse would be the same as Alternative 4 and therefore be designed in accordance with the same energy efficiency standards. Alternative 2 would incorporate water efficient fixtures to reduce water consumption for landscaping, plumbing, and irrigation consistent with the latest Title 24 Green Building Code and Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Alternative 2 would not reduce the maximum rounds of golf per year and therefore would result in increased vehicle miles traveled (VMT) compared to Alternative 4. Alternative 2 would not include installation of a new water-efficient irrigation system and would not result in minimal GHG emissions related to reduced water use like Alternative 4. Alternative 2 would introduce less bicycle parking than Alternative 4, would not include construction of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop (which is designed as a bicycle way station and would encourage bicycling in the area), would not include the Class I bicycle path, and would therefore not promote minimal GHG emissions from vehicles like Alternative 4. Accordingly, while Alternative 2 would not implement components included in Alternative 4 to reduce GHG emissions, Alternative 2 would still be consistent with applicable GHG reduction plans. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to consistency with applicable GHG reduction plans would be increased compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's GHG emissions impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to decreased construction activity. As Alternative 2 would include less infrastructure that would minimize on-site GHG emissions, impact related to consistency with applicable GHG reduction plans would increase

compared to Alternative 4. Alternative 2's impacts related to GHG emissions would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-23 through 6-24.)

h. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Alternative 2 would reduce the scope of Alternative 4's construction activities by limiting demolition and construction to the clubhouse and therefore would result in less hazardous material usage compared to Alternative 4. Hazardous materials used during construction of Alternative 2 would be handled in accordance with the same regulations as Alternative 4, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Waste Control Law, and California Code of Regulations Title 22. Alternative 2 would not be required to implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan but would be required to implement construction site BMPs to reduce potential spills in accordance with Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code. All hazardous material transport, use, or disposal associated with Alternative 2's operation would comply with existing hazardous materials regulations established by United States Environmental Protection Agency, the State of California, the County of Santa Barbara, and the City of Goleta. These regulations prescribe measures for the safe transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials to reduce risk of spills. However, unlike Alternative 4, operation of the Alternative 2 would not reduce fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course and therefore would not decrease the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during operation. Alternative 2's construction-related impact would be reduced compared to Alternative 4, but Alternative 2's operational impact would be increased. Alternative 2's overall impact would remain less than significant.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would include demolition of the existing clubhouse which has the potential to contain asbestos-containing materials (ACM), lead-based paint (LBP), mercury, and polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB). Alternative 2 would require less ground disturbance than Alternative 4 and therefore would have less potential to result in release of hazardous soils; however, grading at the clubhouse could potentially disturb hazardous materials in soil, leading to an accidental release of hazardous materials. As with Alternative 4, construction of Alternative 2 could also encounter perched groundwater which, if contaminated, could result in the accidental release of hazardous materials. In addition, operation of Alternative 2 could result in exposure to volatile organic compounds in the soil, similar to Alternative 4. Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6 would continue to be required, which would reduce potential hazardous material impacts associated with accidental releases of hazardous materials during demolition of the existing clubhouse, and grading of potentially contaminated soil, soil vapor, or groundwater to a less than significant level. However, unlike Alternative 4, operation of Alternative 2 would not reduce fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course and therefore would not decrease the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during operation. Alternative 2's construction-related impact would be reduced compared to Alternative 4, but Alternative 2's operational impact

would be increased. Alternative 2's overall impact would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Alternative 2 would limit construction activities to the clubhouse area, which is located approximately 0.6-mile southwest of the Ellwood School. Accordingly, construction of Alternative 2 would not involve handling hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of a school. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2's construction activities would have the potential to create a significant hazard involving the release of ACMs, LBP, mercury, or PCBs into the environment, or through exposure and transport of on-site contaminated soil or groundwater, which would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6. However, unlike Alternative 4, operation of the Alternative 2 would not result in a reduction in fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course and therefore would require increased handling of hazardous materials associated with landscaping compared to Alternative 4. Alternative 2's construction-related impact would be reduced compared to Alternative 4, but Alternative 2's operational impact would be increased. Alternative 2's overall impact would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Alternative 2 would have less potential to result in hazardous material release due to the presence of on-site hazardous materials compared to Alternative 4 due to the reduction in ground disturbing activities; however, Alternative 2's ground disturbing activities could still potentially result in hazardous material release. Mitigation Measures HAZ-3 through HAZ-6 and HAZ-7 would be required, which mandate oversight from Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Services and Central Coast RWQCB. Alternative 2's impact related to the presence of on-site hazardous materials would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would be located outside of the safety and noise contours of the Santa Barbara Airport. Alternative 2's clubhouse would be the same as Alternative 4 and therefore would not conflict with the standards of Review Area 2 of the Santa Barbara Airport's Airport Influence Area or FAR Part 77. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to safety hazards and excessive noise due to proximity to an airport would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2 would not include construction on Hollister Avenue and therefore would result in less potential to interfere with emergency response or evacuation of Hollister Avenue compared to Alternative 4. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2's operations would not introduce activities that could impede or interfere with the Santa Barbara County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan or emergency evacuations on Hollister Avenue. Alternative 2's impact related to impaired implementation or physical interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2 would be located on the same site as Alternative 4 and therefore be exposed to the same fire risks as Alternative 4. Alternative 2 would reduce the amount of construction compared to Alternative 4 and therefore reduce the potential for construction equipment to result in a fire. As with Alternative 4, construction of Alternative 2 would comply with California Public Resources Code Sections 4442, 4427, 4428, and 4431 to minimize the potential for wildland fire. Alternative 2's clubhouse would result in the same fire risk as Alternative 4's clubhouse. However, under Alternative 2, the proposed clubhouse would be constructed with adherence to the standards of the California Fire Code, CBC, and California Code of Regulations Title 14, all of which would improve the structure's resilience and safety during a wildfire event. The other on-site structures would not be renovated to the same fire code standards. Nonetheless, as Alternative 2 would involve less construction than Alternative 4, Alternative 2's impact related to wildland fire would be lesser when compared to Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's hazardous materials impacts from construction would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the reduction in construction activities, lack of encroachment onto Hollister Avenue, and lack of renovation of the site. Alternative 2's operational impacts related to hazardous materials would be increased compared to Alternative 4 due to the increased use of hazardous materials for landscaping. Alternative 2's impacts related to upset or accident of hazardous materials, emissions of hazardous materials near schools, and hazardous materials sites would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Impacts related to transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, airport hazards, emergency response plans, and wildland fires would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-24 through 6-26.)

i. Hydrology and Water Quality

Given the reduction in construction activities, Alternative 2 would have a reduced potential to degrade water quality compared to Alternative 4. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would include demolition of the existing clubhouse, which could discharge ACB and LBP to on-site soils where they could then be transported off-site in stormwater runoff. Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 would continue to be required, and would minimize the potential for the accidental release of ACB and LBP.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 could require groundwater dewatering of perched groundwater during construction which, if contaminated, could result in releases of hazardous materials into stormwater. Mitigation Measure HAZ-5 would continue to reduce the potential for the accidental discharge of contaminated groundwater. Construction of Alternative 2 would not be required to comply with the Construction Stormwater General Permit, but would be required to implement construction site BMPs to minimize the creation of stormwater pollutants during

construction activities in accordance with Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code.

Alternative 2 would not include work at Devereaux Creek and therefore would not result in the potential to degrade water quality in Devereaux Creek due to increased temporary erosion and would not require implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1 or BIO-4. In addition, adherence to the City's Municipal Code would ensure construction activities would not result in substantial runoff water which would exceed the capacities of Devereaux Creek or Bell Canyon Creek. Alternative 2's construction impacts related to water quality degradation, erosion, and the introduction of substantial polluted runoff and exceedances of stormwater capacity would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Alternative 2 would include implementation of bioretention basins at the clubhouse to treat and discharge stormwater onto the golf course consistent with the requirements of the Central Coast RWQCB but would not include Alternative 4's other bioretention basins outside of the clubhouse area and therefore would not result in the same long-term stormwater quality improvements as Alternative 4. As with Alternative 4, treated water and high-flow bypass from the basins would be discharged to the golf course rather than the storm drain system in Hollister Avenue that outlets to Bell Canyon Creek which would minimize the amount of stormwater and potential stormwater pollutants entering Bell Canyon Creek. Alternative 2 would also abandon the existing clubhouse septic system which, upon completion, would reduce the potential for groundwater quality to be affected by sewage. Unlike Alternative 4, operation of Alternative 2 would not result in a reduction in fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course. Alternative 2 would not install a new efficient irrigation system included in Alternative 4 and therefore would increase the potential for golf course operation to discharge stormwater pollutants compared to Alternative 4. Alternative 2 would not include changes to the maintenance facility and therefore the potential to introduce stormwater pollutants from the maintenance facility would be the same as under existing conditions. Alternative 2's operational impacts related to water quality degradation, erosion, and the introduction of substantial polluted runoff and exceedances of stormwater capacity would be increased compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

As with Alternative 4, construction of Alternative 2 has the potential to require groundwater dewatering of perched groundwater. Groundwater dewatering activities would be localized and temporary, lasting only during excavation activities, if groundwater is encountered. The anticipated duration and minimal amount of groundwater dewatering that would be required for excavation would not result in substantial groundwater losses in the Goleta Groundwater Basin (Basin). Similar to Alternative 4, given the limited infiltration potential of on-site soils and the minimal amount of impervious surface increase generated by Alternative 2, Alternative 2 would not substantially change groundwater infiltration rates on-

site or result in substantial interference to groundwater recharge. Alternative 2's impact related to substantially decreasing groundwater supplies or interfering with groundwater recharge would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Unlike Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would not result in long-term improvements associated with culvert removal and the restoration of Deveraux Creek to its natural flow. Alternative 2's impact related to on- or off-site flooding would be increased compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2 would be subject to the same on-site inundation hazards as Alternative 4. The new clubhouse would be located outside of a flood hazard zone, tsunami zone, seiche hazard zone, and dam inundation zone. Like Alternative 4, hazardous materials stored on-site would be located outside the inundation areas and stored in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. Impacts related to risk of release of stormwater pollutants during inundation would be similar to Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Given the reduction in construction activities, Alternative 2 would have a reduced potential to degrade water quality in conflict with the Basin Plan compared to Alternative 4 during construction but would not result in the same long-term stormwater quality improvements as Alternative 4. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would adhere to Chapter 13.04 and Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code to minimize water quality impacts, and would require Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5 to reduce potential water quality impacts to a less than significant level. Accordingly, Alternative 2's impacts related to conflicts with the Basin Plan would be greater than Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As described above, Alternative 2 would not adversely impact groundwater supplies, but would result in greater water use during operation than Alternative 4 because Alternative 2 would not reduce the amount of irrigated golf course turf from 125 acres to 62 acres. Alternative 2 would not interfere with the management of the Basin in accordance with the Wright Judgement. Accordingly, Alternative 2's impact related to conflicts with the Wright Judgement or Goleta Water District's Groundwater Management Plan Goleta Groundwater Basin would be greater than Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's hydrology and water quality impacts during construction would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the reduction in construction activities and lack of renovation of the site. Alternative 2's operational impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be increased compared to Alternative 4 due to the increased use of pesticides and fertilizers for landscaping and less infrastructure to improve stormwater quality. Alternative 2's impacts related to water quality, polluted runoff, and conflict with water quality plans or groundwater management plans would remain less than significant with mitigation

incorporated. Impacts related to groundwater, erosion and siltation, flooding, and release of pollutants from inundation would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-26 through 6-28.)

j. Land Use and Planning

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would be located on the existing Sandpiper Golf Club and would not include any components that could divide an established community. Alternative 2 would have no impact related to the physical division of an established community, which would be the same level of impact compared to Alternative 4.

Alternative 2's clubhouse would be the same as Alternative 4's clubhouse and would therefore be consistent with all applicable Goleta Municipal Code zoning standards and FAR Part 77 standards. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would be consistent with most policies of the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan through implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-4, BIO-10, CUL-2 through CUL-4, TCR-1, and TCR-2 to minimize potential impacts related to cultural resources, tribal cultural resources, and biological resources. However, Alternative 2 would not support Policies VH 2.3, VH 4.14, and PF 6.2 related to the undergrounding of existing utility lines, as Alternative 2 would not underground the existing utility lines. Additionally, Alternative 2 would not support Policy VH 5.4 related to preservation of historic structures, as Alternative 2 would not adaptively reuse the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. As Alternative 2 would not include the Class I bicycle path, Alternative 2 would be inconsistent with the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, as well as Policies OS 4.4, VH 2.5, VH 3.3, VH 3.5, and VH 4.10. This impact would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated, which would be a similar level of impact compared to Alternative 4. However, given Alternative 2's reduced renovation, Alternative 2 would not require implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, BIO-9, BIO11, HYD-1, NOI-1, or UTIL-1 to reduce impacts related to conflict with the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-28 through 6-29.)

k. Noise

Due to Alternative 2's reduction in construction activities compared to Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would result in less construction noise compared to Alternative 4. Construction of the clubhouse in accordance with Alternative 2 would require the use of the same construction equipment the same distance from sensitive receptors as Alternative 4's clubhouse. As with the construction of Alternative 4's clubhouse, construction of Alternative 2 would not exceed 65 A-weighted decibels (dBA) at the nearest sensitive receptors, and no noise control is needed. Alternative 2 would not include construction activities for golf course improvements, maintenance yard, the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, restoration and adaptive reuse of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, or Hollister Avenue improvements, and therefore would not include the construction of project

components which could exceed 65 dBA at the residential receptors to the east of the project site. Therefore, construction of Alternative 2 would not require implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 to reduce construction noise levels, unlike Alternative 4. Alternative 2's noise impact would be less than significant, which is reduced compared to Alternative 4.

Due to Alternative 2's reduction in construction activities, Alternative 2 would result in less construction traffic noise than Alternative 4. Because Alternative 4's construction traffic would not result in an increase of 3 dBA or more, the reduced construction in accordance with Alternative 2 would not result in an increase of 3 dBA or more of traffic noise. Alternative 2's construction traffic noise impact would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2's clubhouse would be the same as Alternative 4. Therefore, operational noise in the clubhouse due to the use of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning units, and conversational noise would not exceed City noise thresholds. In addition, Alternative 2 would not include the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, which would decrease operational noise at the residential receptors to the east of the project site compared to Alternative 4. Alternative 2's impact related to operational noise would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Due to the absence of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, Alternative 2 would result in fewer new vehicle trips than Alternative 4. Alternative 2's operational traffic noise impact would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Unlike Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would not include the use of a vibratory roller or large bulldozer in proximity to the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station and therefore would not result in potential damage to the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station due to vibration from construction equipment. As a result, Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would not be required. Therefore, Alternative 2's vibration impacts would be less than significant, which is reduced compared to Alternative 4.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would be located outside of the noise contours from Santa Barbara Airport. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to excessive airport noise would remain less than significant, which is the same as Alternative 4.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's noise impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the reduction in construction activities and distance from existing noise- and vibration sensitive receptors. Alternative 2 would reduce Alternative 4's less than significant noise and vibration impacts to less than significant. Airport noise impacts would be less than significant and the same as Alternative 4. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-29 through 6-30.)

I. Parks and Recreation

Alternative 2 would require less construction activities and therefore would result in less potential to degrade existing park facilities due to construction worker use. Alternative 2 would require nine fewer employees than Alternative 4 and therefore would result in less indirect population growth compared to Alternative 4, which would reduce alteration in ratio of parkland per 1,000 residents compared to Alternative 4. Given that Alternative 4 would not substantially reduce this ratio, Alternative 2 would also not substantially reduce the amount of parkland available to the residents of Goleta. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 could increase the amount of visitors at the clubhouse restaurant which may increase the use of nearby parks and trails. However, given the minimal additional anticipated non-golfer visitors, it is unlikely that these visitors would substantially degrade existing park facilities. In addition, Alternative 2 would result in fewer non-golfer visitors to the project site because Alternative 2 does not include the Rio Grande Coffee Shop. Therefore, although Alternative 2 does not include the recreational facilities included in Alternative 4 (i.e., sidewalks to provide access to Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve, construction of a Class I bicycle path, and dedication of lateral access along beach frontage on the sand and along Hollister Avenue to enhance coastal access to Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve and Haskell's Beach), Alternative 2 would also not substantially increase the use of existing park and recreational facilities such as Sperling Preserve, Santa Barbara Shores Park, or Haskell's Beach such that a need for new or physically altered park facilities would occur or physical deterioration of existing facilities would occur or be accelerated. Alternative 2's impact to park facilities would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Unlike Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would not renovate the existing golf course. However, as described above, Alternative 2 would not result in substantial deterioration of recreational facilities and furthermore would not necessitate new or expanded recreational facilities. Therefore, Alternative 2 would not result in adverse physical effects on the environment due to new or expanded recreational facilities. Alternative 2's impact related to recreational facilities would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's construction impacts to parks and recreation would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the reduction in construction activities. Alternative 2's operational impacts related to parks and recreation would be similar to Alternative 4. Alternative 2's impacts related to parks and recreation would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 6-30.)

m. Public Services

Alternative 2 would require nine fewer employees than Alternative 4 and therefore would result in less indirect population growth compared to Alternative 4. Given that Alternative 4's indirect population growth would not result in substantially

diminished fire protection services, police protection services, school capacities, or library services, Alternative 2's reduced indirect population growth would also not result in substantially diminished public services. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would be located in proximity to existing fire stations and police stations and would be adequately served by existing fire protection and police protection services in Goleta. In addition, as with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would also include the required payment of development impact fees which would provide funding for expanded public services in accordance with Chapter 17.70 of the Municipal Code and Goleta Union School District and Santa Barbara Unified School District fees. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to public services would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-30 through 6-31.)

n. Transportation and Circulation

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would not include elements that would conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Alternative 2 would add bicycle parking spaces to the project site, providing facilities for bicycle travel. Alternative 2 would not result in any temporary lane, bicycle route, or sidewalk closures on Hollister Avenue. However, unlike Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would not include any improvements to Hollister Avenue or extension of the Class I bicycle lane. Alternative 2 would require nine fewer employees than Alternative 4 which, as with Alternative 4, would not substantially interfere with Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District operations. Alternative 2's impact related to conflicts with transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities during construction would be reduced compared to Alternative 4. However, unlike Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would not include infrastructure along Hollister Avenue to promote bicycle and pedestrian transportation, and would not further support the City's policies related to bicycle and pedestrian facilities. However, impacts would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2 would require less construction activities than Alternative 4 and therefore would generate less short-term VMT increases than Alternative 4. This construction-related VMT increase would be temporary and would not have a lasting effect on the overall transportation network or long-term VMT patterns in the area. Alternative 2's proposed clubhouse would be the same as Alternative 4 and therefore the clubhouse restaurant would be exempt from quantitative VMT analysis and presumed to have a less than significant impact on VMT pursuant to the City's VMT Guidelines. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2's non-restaurant portion of the clubhouse would serve golfers. Alternative 2 would not increase the time between tee-offs and correspondingly reduce the annual rounds of golf per year, and therefore would result in additional VMT from golfers compared to Alternative 4. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to conflicts with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) would be greater than Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

As with Alternative 4, during construction of Alternative 2, equipment staging would occur on-site and construction personnel would park on-site, which would minimize the potential for construction related vehicles and equipment to disrupt circulation in the immediate area. Alternative 2 would not include construction in the right-of-way of Hollister Avenue and therefore would not result in any roadway impediments on Hollister Avenue. Alternative 2 would include the same new driveway for entrance to the clubhouse parking lot and would include the same reconfigurations to the existing clubhouse driveway. As with Alternative 4, these driveways would be designed in accordance with City and Santa Barbara County Fire Department (SBCFD) driveway access control and vision clearance standards which would ensure Alternative 2's design would not result in the potential to result in line-of-sight disruptions and increase hazards between vehicles and pedestrians and vehicles and cyclists, similar to Alternative 4. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would not introduce new incompatible uses, such as farm equipment, to roadways, and Alternative 2's uses would be the same as existing on-site uses. Accordingly, Alternative 2's impacts to increased hazards would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

As stated above, during construction of Alternative 2, equipment staging would occur on-site and construction personnel would park on-site, which would minimize the potential for construction related vehicles and equipment to result in inadequate emergency access. Alternative 2 would not result in inadequate emergency access on Hollister Avenue because Alternative 2 does not include construction in the Hollister Avenue right-of-way. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would be designed in accordance with all applicable SBCFD standards to maintain adequate emergency access. As with Alternative 4, SBCFD and the City would review and approve Alternative 2's design, which would ensure Alternative 2 would provide adequate egress for emergency access. Therefore, Alternative 2's impacts to emergency access would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's transportation and circulation impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the lack of construction in the Hollister Avenue right-of-way. Alternative 2's impacts related to transportation and circulation would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-31 through 6-32.)

o. Tribal Cultural Resources

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would be located in an area with high sensitivity for cultural resources, including tribal cultural resources. Alternative 2 would require less ground disturbance, which would reduce the potential to encounter tribal cultural resources compared to Alternative 4. Although impacts would be reduced, potential to unearth previously unidentified resources would remain. As such, Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4, TCR-1, and TCR-2 would be required, including implementation of a tribal monitoring agreement and appropriate disposition of any unanticipated tribal cultural resources discovered

during construction. Alternative 2's impact related to tribal cultural resources would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. (Draft EIR, p. 6-32.)

p. Utilities and Service Systems

Alternative 2 would require the installation and relocation of the same utility infrastructure as required for Alternative 4's clubhouse, but unlike Alternative 4 would not include utilities associated with the maintenance facility, comfort station, or Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station and Rio Grande Coffee Shop. Accordingly, Alternative 2's impact related to the relocation or construction of utility infrastructure would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2 would not include reductions in irrigated turf and, unlike Alternative 4, would not result in a reduction in water use for golf course irrigation. Alternative 2's water demand from the clubhouse would be the same water demand as Alternative 4's clubhouse. Unlike Alternative 4, Alternative 2 would not reduce on-site water use associated with reductions in irrigated turf. As with Alternative 4, the project applicant would ensure Alternative 2 would adhere to the water shortage restrictions during stages of drought, as set forth in Goleta Water District Code Chapter 6.21. Accordingly, although Alternative 2 would have greater impacts on water supply than Alternative 4, impacts would remain less than significant.

Based on a 100 gallons per day per 1,000 square feet wastewater generation factor, Alternative 2 would result in 0.003 million gallons per day (MGD) of wastewater. A 0.002 MGD increase in wastewater flows represents approximately 0.2 percent of the 0.93 MGD capacity available for Goleta West Sanitary District customers. Accordingly, existing wastewater treatment plant capacity would be sufficient to accept wastewater generated by Alternative 2. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to wastewater treatment capacity would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2 would result in less solid waste generation during construction and operation than Alternative 4 due to reduced construction activities and reduced renovation of the golf course. Alternative 2 would involve the demolition of the existing clubhouse (9,305 square feet). Based on a solid waste generation factor of 100 pounds per square foot for demolition, the demolition of the existing clubhouse would result in approximately 4656 tons of debris. Based on a solid waste generation factor of 3.89 pounds per square foot for construction, the construction of Alternative 2 would generate approximately 72 tons of debris⁸. In total, Alternative 2's demolition and construction activities would generate approximately 537 tons of solid waste. With the required 65 percent diversion rate for demolition and construction debris, construction of Alternative 2 would generate approximately 188 tons of solid waste¹⁰, which would not exceed the City's construction and demolition waste threshold of 350 tons. Accordingly, Alternative

2 would not require Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 due to solid waste generation during construction. Once operational, Alternative 2 would result in less solid waste generation than Alternative 4 due to the absence of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, which would not exceed the City's project-specific threshold of 196 tons per year. Therefore, Alternative 2 would reduce Alternative 4's operational solid waste impacts to a less than significant level.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's impacts related to water supply would increase to a less than significant level, compared to no impact under Alternative 4, because Alternative 2 does not include a reduction in irrigated turf. Alternative 2's impacts related to solid waste would decrease to a less than significant level as demolition and construction of Alternative 2 would not exceed City solid waste thresholds and implementation of Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 would not be required. Alternative 2's impact related to the construction of utility infrastructure and wastewater treatment capacity would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-16 through 6-33.)

Attainment of Project Objectives: Alternative 2 would fail to meet most project objectives, and would only partially meet project objectives related to providing improved recreational and dining facilities and converting existing private septic systems to public sewers. (Draft EIR, p. ES-11.)

Finding: The City Council rejects Alternative 2: Clubhouse Renovation, on the following grounds, each of which individually provides sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative: (1) the alternative fails to meet most of the Project objectives; and (2) the alternative would result in increased impacts relating to hydrology, water quality, and water supply.

3. Alternative 3: Revised Site Plan

Description: Alternative 3 would shift the proposed location of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop 75 feet southwest, such that the Coffee Shop and associated parking lot would be located approximately 50 feet southwest of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station to ensure vibration from construction vehicles and equipment would not damage the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. The new coffee shop would be directly east of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. Restoration of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, construction of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, and connection of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop to the existing sewer system under Alternative 3 would be similar to Alternative 4, with the only change being a 75-foot shift in the location of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop.

To further reduce potential vibration impacts, Alternative 3 would not include the following Hollister Avenue roadway improvements:

- Improvements to the Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oaks Road intersection, including:

- Installation of pedestrian ramps and striping to create crosswalks on all three legs of the intersection
- Construction of a pedestrian refuge on the northeastern corner
- Extension of an access ramp on the northwestern corner
- Relandscaping at the northwestern corner
- Reconfiguration of the striped median of Hollister Avenue and addition of a left-hand turn lane for the clubhouse parking lot;
- Construction of a Type 4 trail and landscaping trail along the south side of Hollister Avenue;
- Dedication of a lateral access easement along Hollister Avenue;
- Construction of a curb and gutter along the south side of Hollister Avenue;
- Relocation of the existing bus stop and pocket² approximately 200 feet east, across from a planned fire station;
- Improvements to Hollister Avenue at the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, including:
 - Construction of a 10-foot-wide bicycle entrance with a bollard
 - Construction of a new meandering concrete sidewalk, which would extend from the Rio Grande Coffee Shop to the eastern project site boundary
 - Construction of a new 24-foot-wide two-way driveway entrance for access to the parking lot
- Installation of pedestrian ramps and striping to create new crosswalks at the west and south legs of the Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road intersection, to provide for improved public access to Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve; and
- Reconstruction of the maintenance facility driveway access and striping for the addition of a lefthand turn lane to enter the maintenance yard.

Additionally, Alternative 3 would not include the construction of the free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek. Similar to Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would include the construction of a new clubhouse, comfort station, maintenance yard, golf course recontouring, dedication of lateral access easements, dedication of open

space easement at Bell Canyon, and undergrounding of existing utility lines, which would be the same as Alternative 4.

Similar to Alternative 4, the project applicant would request a zoning code adjustment to allow a portion of the clubhouse to exceed the 25-foot height limit for the Open Space/Active Recreation zone, and the Sphere of Influence request would remain. Operation of the Sandpiper Golf Club under Alternative 3 would be the same as for Alternative 4, as Alternative 3 would require the same number of employees and maintenance activities for the recontoured golf course. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-33 through 6-49.)

Impacts:

a. Aesthetics

Alternative 3 would include the same facilities as Alternative 4, excluding the Hollister Avenue improvements and free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek, and therefore would result in similar effects on scenic vistas compared to the project. Construction of Alternative 3 would occur over a similar timeframe as construction of Alternative 4 and therefore would result in similar temporary visual impediments. As with Alternative 4, construction activities associated with Alternative 3 would be visible from the Hollister Avenue scenic corridor and related scenic viewpoints, but such visual impacts would be temporary and construction areas would be screened with fencing during construction to obstruct views of equipment and the construction sites from public viewing areas. Alternative 3 would include the same tree removal and replacement as Alternative 4 which would not interfere with previous, unobstructed, scenic views from public locations. The minimal movement of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop 75 feet southwest would not result in additional impediments of scenic vistas beyond Alternative 4's Rio Grande Coffee Shop because the Rio Grande Coffee Shop would continue to be obscured by trees and would not result in additional substantial changes to the landscape. Because Alternative 3 would include the same project facilities as Alternative 4, excluding the Hollister Avenue improvements and free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek, Alternative 3 would not result in substantial adverse effects on key viewpoints surrounding the project site. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to scenic vistas would be similar to Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would not place infrastructure in an area visible from an officially-designated State scenic highway. As with Alternative 4, existing buildings, topography, and vegetation obscure views of the project site and existing on-site development from vehicles travelling along U.S. 101. Alternative 3 would not increase the height of Alternative 4's facilities, and therefore Alternative 3's facilities would be obscured from views from U.S. 101. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would result in no impact related to scenic resources within a State scenic highway.

Alternative 3's proposed facilities would not differ from the same facilities evaluated in Alternative 4, aside from the shift in the location of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop and omission of the Hollister Avenue improvements and free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek. This minor shift in location would not result in any inconsistencies with the policies and regulations governing visual quality applicable to Alternative 4. Alternative 3's facilities would meet the same development standards as Alternative 4, including maximum lot coverage, maximum building height, minimum setbacks, and parking, of the Open Space/Active Recreation zone. In addition, Alternative 3's facilities would not exceed FAR Part 77 building height restrictions and would not obstruct views of the Pacific Ocean in compliance with Section 30251 of the California Coastal Act. Alternative 3's impact related to conflicts with zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality would be similar to Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would result in the same amount of lighting compared to Alternative 4 as the Alternative 3 would include the same facilities with lighting as Alternative 4. As with Alternative 4, light sources associated with Alternative 3 would be similar to existing conditions and be designed in accordance with City standards, including City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy 4.12, Lighting, which requires outdoor lighting fixtures to be designed, located, aimed downward or toward structures (if properly shielded), retrofitted if feasible, and maintained in order to prevent over-lighting, energy waste, glare, light trespass, and sky glow. Alternative 3 would result in the same lighting sources from vehicles as Alternative 4. Lighting would be similar to the surrounding area due to frequent residential and commercial vehicles near the U.S. 101 and Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oaks Road interchange. Alternative 3 would introduce the same sources of glare from the sunlight reflecting on the glass surfaces of proposed facilities as Alternative 4. Vegetative screening around the clubhouse and maintenance yard would reduce off-site impacts of glare from the clubhouse and cars, and the comfort station would be located in the southeastern portion of the project site and would have limited potential to produce off-site glare impacts. Like Alternative 4,, Alternative 3's impact related to light and glare would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's aesthetics impacts would be the same compared to Alternative 4. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic quality, and light and glare, and no impacts related to scenic highways. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-33 through 6-35.)

b. Air Quality

Alternative 3 does not propose any change to the project site's existing land use and therefore would not conflict with the land use assumptions that inform the 2022 Ozone Plan's emissions forecasts. Alternative 3 would require the same number of employees compared to Alternative 4 and therefore would result in the same indirect population growth. Given that Alternative 4's indirect population growth is

within SBCAG growth projections utilized within the 2022 Ozone Plan, Alternative 3 would also be within SBCAG growth projections and therefore would not conflict with the 2022 Ozone Plan, which would be the same level of impact compared to Alternative 4.

Alternative 3 would reduce the scope of Alternative 4's construction activities by excluding the Hollister Avenue improvements and free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek and therefore would result in reduced criteria air pollutant emissions during construction compared to Alternative 4. Given that construction of Alternative 4 would not exceed SBCAPCD emissions thresholds, Alternative 3's construction would also not exceed SBCAPCD thresholds. Alternative 3 would include the same operational activities as Alternative 4 and therefore would generate the same criteria air pollutant emissions as operation of Alternative 4, which would not exceed SBCAPCD thresholds. This impact would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

As described above, Alternative 3 would reduce the scope of Alternative 4's construction activities which would result in less toxic air contaminant emissions on the project site compared to Alternative 4. Based on existing northeast to southwest wind patterns on the project site, these emissions would be carried away from the single-family residential receptors. As with Alternative 4, operation of Alternative 3 would not involve the use of equipment that would increase toxic air contaminant emission on the project site. Alternative 3's impact related to toxic air contaminants would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3's construction would result in the same odors as Alternative 4 which would be intermittent, temporary, and dissipate rapidly with distance from in-use construction equipment. Alternative 3 would shift the location of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop further from residential receptors than Alternative 4 which would result in the creation of odors further from residential receptors. Food-related odors associated with food preparation would primarily be confined to the indoor dining areas of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop. Food-related odors would also dissipate rapidly, and given the northeast to southwest wind patterns, would not be carried to nearby development north and east of the project site. Therefore, Alternative 3's odor impact would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's air quality impacts would be reduced to Alternative 4 due to the reduction in construction activities compared to Alternative 4. Like Alternative 4, Alternative 3's impacts to air quality would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 6-35.)

c. Biological Resources

Alternative 3 would not include construction of the free-standing bridge within Devereaux Creek and therefore would avoid impacts to monarch butterfly associated with degradation of Monarch Butterfly Roosting ESHA at Devereaux Creek due to bridge installation. Alternative 3 would result in similar direct and indirect impacts to special-status species related to habitat removal and degradation and would require Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-10 to reduce potential impacts to special-status plant and wildlife species to a less than significant level. Alternative 3's impacts to special-status species would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Alternative 3 would not include construction of the free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek and therefore would avoid Devereux Creek riparian ESHA and Monarch Butterfly Roosting ESHA along the eastern boundary of the project site. However, similar to Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would include direct impacts to riparian habitat ESHA, and aquatic resources through storm drain installation and grading activities and indirect impacts associated with construction activities such as the use of construction equipment. Therefore, Alternative 3 would require Mitigation Measures BIO-2 through BIO-4 and BIO-11 to reduce potential impacts related to riparian habitat, ESHA, and wetlands to a less than significant level. Alternative 3's impact related to riparian habitat, ESHA, and aquatic resources would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Alternative 3's construction activities could exceed City noise thresholds and result in potential disruption of wildlife movement in the short term. Accordingly, Alternative 3 would require Mitigation Measure NOI-1 to reduce potential impacts to wildlife movement related to construction noise to a less than significant level. Alternative 3 would include the same lighting as Alternative 4 which would not result in substantial impediments to wildlife movement. Alternative 3 would result in the same human presence on the project site as Alternative 4. Like Alternative 4, Alternative 3's impact related to wildlife movement would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would include installation of a storm drain and associated outlet within arroyo willow thickets ESHA along Devereux Creek, sand capping and grading within the 100-foot Streamside Protection Area, and trenching for underground utilities within riparian ESHA along Devereux Creek and along the eastern project site boundary within riparian and monarch butterfly roosting habitat ESHA. As with Alternative 4, these activities could potentially be inconsistent with General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 1.6 and Policy CE.9.5. Therefore, Alternative 3 would require implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO7, BIO-8, and BIO-11 to reduce this impact to a less than significant level, which would be the same as Alternative 4.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would not be located in an area subject to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or

other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Alternative 3 would have no impact related to conflicts with these plans, which would be the same level of impact compared to Alternative 4.

Overall, Alternative 3 would reduce Alternative 4's impacts to riparian habitat and ESHA by excluding construction of the free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek. Alternative 3's impacts related to special-status plant and wildlife species, riparian and ESHA habitat, wetlands, wildlife migration, and conflicts with local policies protecting biological resources would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Like Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would have no impact related to conflicts with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-36 through 6-37.)

d. Cultural Resources

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would include the restoration and adaptive reuse of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, a historical resource. Restoration and adaptive reuse activities would be carried out in accordance with Mitigation Measure CUL-1 to ensure the historical integrity of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station is preserved. Alternative 3 would shift the Rio Grande Coffee Shop approximately 50 feet from the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station which would ensure construction activities, including the use of a vibratory roller or large bulldozer, would not result in substantial vibration which could damage Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. Therefore, Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would not be required for Alternative 3. Alternative 3 would result in less than significant impacts to historic resources, which is reduced compared to Alternative 4.

Construction of Alternative 3 would reduce the amount of ground disturbance compared to Alternative 4 as Alternative 3 would not include the Hollister Avenue improvements or construction of the free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek. Therefore, Alternative 3 would reduce the potential to encounter unknown archaeological resources compared to Alternative 4. Because ground disturbance would still occur, Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4 would continue to be required. These measures would minimize potential impacts to unanticipated discoveries of archaeological resources by requiring archaeological monitoring, a cultural resources sensitivity meeting for construction personnel, and implementation of appropriate procedures for evaluation and treatment of any discoveries made during construction. Accordingly, Alternative 3's impact to archaeological resources would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Construction of Alternative 3 would reduce the amount of ground disturbance compared to Alternative 4 which would reduce the potential to encounter unknown human remains. As with Alternative 4, in the event of unanticipated discovery of human remains, the construction contractor would comply with State of California

Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and human remains would be preserved in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. With regulatory compliance, Alternative 3's impact to human remains would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 3 would reduce Alternative 4's impact to historical resources to less than significant and would not require the implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2. Alternative 3's impact to archaeological resources would be reduced but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 3's impact to human remains would be reduced but would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 6-37.)

e. Energy

Alternative 3 would reduce the scope of Alternative 4's construction activities by excluding the Hollister Avenue improvements and free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek and therefore would result in reduced fuel used for construction equipment compared to Alternative 4. As with Alternative 4, energy use during construction would be temporary and minimized in compliance with existing regulations such as California Code of Regulations Title 13 Sections 2449 and 2485, which prohibit diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles and off-road diesel vehicles from idling for more than five minutes. Operation of Alternative 3 would require the same energy consumption as Alternative 4, which would occur in compliance with the energy efficiency standards such as the California Green Building Standards Code and the 2025 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Alternative 3's impact related to the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy resources would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would adhere to the California Green Building Standards Code and the 2025 Building Energy Efficiency Standards to minimize unnecessary energy use in the proposed facilities. Alternative 3's facilities would be supplied power from SCE in accordance with Senate Bill 100, which requires SCE to increase renewable energy procurement to 60 percent by 2030, and 100 percent by 2045. Alternative 3 would provide the same amount of electric vehicle parking as Alternative 4 which would be consistent with the requirements of the CALGreen intervening code update and the City's Municipal Code, which requires new non-residential construction to construct at least 30 percent of new parking spaces to be EV capable or include EV charging infrastructure. Alternative 3 would include the same amount of bicycle spaces as Alternative 4 to encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation, consistent with the City's CAP, Strategic Energy Plan, General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, and Municipal Code. Furthermore, Alternative 3 would be designed in accordance with the City's Energy Performance Reach Code which would provide electric-ready facilities for the use of electric infrastructure. In addition, Alternative 3 would continue to utilize the existing on-site electric golf carts for golfers. Alternative 3's impact related to

conflicts with state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's energy impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the reduction in construction activities. Alternative 3's impacts to energy would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-37 through 6-38.)

f. Geology and Soils

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would not locate structures within 50 feet of the More Ranch Fault and would not directly or indirectly cause the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault. This impact would be the same as Alternative 4, and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would include renovation in an area with the same risks of seismic activity as Alternative 4 and therefore could result in potential risks associated with seismic ground shaking. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 requiring recommendations from the project-specific geotechnical reports to be put into grading and building plans. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce potential impacts due to ground-shaking on the project site to a less than significant level through incorporation of structural integrity recommendations. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to seismic ground shaking would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Alternative 3 would be subject to the same liquefaction risks as Alternative 4's structures, which are very low. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3's design would incorporate design measures required by the CBC which reduce the potential for substantial adverse effects due to liquefaction. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to liquefaction would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would be subject to the same landslide risks as Alternative 4 and would not place structures in areas of high landslide potential. Only activities related to the proposed golf course improvements would occur in areas with high landslide potential. Alternative 3 would require the same maximum cut and fill slopes as Alternative 4, which would not result in substantially steep slopes or other conditions that could induce a landslide. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to landslides would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Construction of Alternative 3 would reduce the amount of ground disturbance compared to Alternative 4 which would reduce the potential for erosion compared to Alternative 4. Construction of Alternative 3 would occur in compliance with the same requirements for erosion control as Alternative 4, including the Construction

Stormwater General Permit and Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code. Accordingly, construction of Alternative 3 would minimize the potential to cause substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Alternative 3 would include implementation of the same stormwater control infrastructure and site design BMPs as Alternative 4 to minimize erosion during operation. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would not substantially increase the rate of runoff on the site compared to existing conditions, as the impervious surfaces added to the project site would represent an increase of less than 0.2 percent compared to existing conditions. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to erosion would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would be subject to the same risks related to unstable geologic units and soil as Alternative 4. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would not locate structures in an area subject to substantial liquefaction potential, landslide hazards, or potential for soil collapse. Potential impacts associated with geotechnical hazards would be minimized with adherence to the CBC. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 may require groundwater dewatering during construction, but groundwater dewatering would be limited to the localized perched water on the project site and would be temporary, only occurring if perched groundwater is encountered. Therefore, construction of Alternative 3 would not result in substantial groundwater withdrawals that could result in subsidence on-site. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to the risk of landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would locate structures on soils with very low potential for expansion. The construction contractor would be required to comply with the requirements of the CBC, including the use of non-expansive fill material, to minimize the potential for structural hazards associated with soil expansion. Alternative 3's impact related to creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property related to expansive soil would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would involve connecting the clubhouse, comfort station, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop to the Goleta West Sanitary District sewer system and the abandonment of the private septic systems serving the existing clubhouse and comfort station. Alternative 3 would not involve the installation of additional septic tanks on-site and therefore would not result in impacts related to the use of septic tanks. Therefore, Alternative 3 would have no impact related to soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks, which would be the same level of impact compared to Alternative 4.

Alternative 3 would reduce the amount of ground disturbance compared to Alternative 4 which would reduce the potential to encounter paleontological resources or unique geologic features compared to Alternative 4. However, Alternative 3 could result in the disturbance of unknown paleontological resources.

Therefore, Alternative 3 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-2 to reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources and unique geologic features to a less than significant level by requiring WEAP training, monitoring, and setting forth procedures for the recovery, identification, and curation of fossils discovered during construction. Alternative 3's impacts related to paleontological resources or unique geologic features would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's erosion impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant. Alternative 3's paleontological resources impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 3's impacts related to ground-shaking would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 3's impacts related to fault rupture, liquefaction, landslides, unstable soils, and expansive soils, would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant. As with Alternative 4, there would be no impact related potential for on-site soils to be capable to support the existing on-site septic systems. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-38 through 6-40.)

g. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Alternative 3 would reduce the scope of Alternative 4's construction activities by excluding Hollister Avenue improvements and the freestanding bridge over Devereaux Creek. Therefore, this alternative would result in reduced GHG emissions during construction compared to Alternative 4. Alternative 3's operation would include the same components as Alternative 4 and therefore generate the same GHG emissions as operation of Alternative 4. Accordingly, the combined construction and operation emissions of Alternative 3 would be reduced compared to Alternative 4, which would not result in substantial GHG emissions. Therefore, Alternative 3's impacts related to GHG emissions would be reduced compared to Alternative 4. Impacts would remain less than significant.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would include design features to promote renewable energy use, energy efficiency, water efficiency, and reductions in vehicle travel, all of which contribute to the creation of minimal GHG emissions. Alternative 3 would not include additional renovation compared to Alternative 4 which could have the potential to conflict with applicable GHG reduction plans. Alternative 3 would include EV charging infrastructure that exceeds California Green Building Standards and City requirements for EV charging infrastructure. Alternative 3's proposed facilities would be the same as Alternative 4 and be designed in accordance with the same energy efficiency standards. Alternative 3 would incorporate water efficient fixtures to reduce water consumption for landscaping, plumbing, and irrigation consistent with the latest Title 24 Green Building Code and Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Alternative 3 would also include the same new water-efficient irrigation system as Alternative 4 which would

reduce GHG emissions associated with water use. Alternative 3 would include active transportation facilities (i.e., bicycle parking) and therefore would encourage active transportation and the reduction of GHG emission from vehicles. However, Alternative 3 would not include implementation of the Class I bicycle path and therefore would not promote minimal GHG emissions from vehicles like Alternative 4. Nevertheless, Alternative 3 would be consistent with applicable GHG reduction plans. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact would be greater compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's GHG emissions would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to decreased construction activity. As Alternative 3 would include less infrastructure that would minimize on-site GHG emissions, impacts related to consistency with applicable GHG reduction plans would be increased compared to Alternative 4. Impacts related to GHG emissions would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-40 through 6-41.)

h. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Alternative 3 would reduce the scope of Alternative 4's construction activities by excluding Hollister Avenue improvements and the freestanding bridge over Devereaux Creek and therefore would result in less hazardous material usage compared to Alternative 4. Hazardous materials used during construction of Alternative 3 would be handled in accordance with the same regulations as Alternative 4, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Waste Control Law, and California Code of Regulations Title 22. Construction of Alternative 3 would occur in compliance with a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan to reduce potential spills. All hazardous material transport, use, or disposal associated with Alternative 3's operation would comply with existing hazardous materials regulations established by United States Environmental Protection Agency, the State of California, the County of Santa Barbara, and the City of Goleta. These regulations prescribe measures for the safe transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials to reduce risk of spills. Accordingly, Alternative 3's impact related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would include demolition of the existing clubhouse portions of the existing maintenance facility, and comfort station, and restoration of the Barnsdall Rio Gas Station which have the potential to contain ACM, LBP, mercury, and PCB. Alternative 3 would require less ground disturbance than Alternative 4 and therefore would have less potential to result in release of hazardous soils; however, grading could potentially disturb hazardous materials in soil, leading to an accidental release of hazardous materials. As with Alternative 4, construction of Alternative 3 could also encounter perched groundwater which, if contaminated, could result in the accidental release of hazardous materials. In addition, operation of Alternative 3 could result in exposure to volatile organic

compounds in the soil similar to Alternative 4. Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6 would continue to be required, which would reduce potential hazardous material impacts associated with accidental releases of hazardous materials during demolition of the existing clubhouse, and grading of potentially contaminated soil, soil vapor, or groundwater to a less than significant level. Operation of Alternative 3 would result in the same reduction in fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course as Alternative 4 due to the same reduction of irrigated turf. Accordingly, Alternative 3's impact related to the accidental release of hazardous materials would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As with Alternative 4, construction of Alternative 3 could potentially occur within 0.25 mile of the Ellwood School. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3's construction activities would have the potential to create a significant hazard involving the release of ACMs, LBP, mercury, or PCBs into the environment, or through exposure and transport of on-site contaminated soil or groundwater, which would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to handling hazardous materials within 0.25-mile of a school would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would have potential to result in hazardous material release due to the presence of on-site hazardous materials. Mitigation Measures HAZ-3 through HAZ6 and HAZ-7 would be required which mandates oversight from Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Services and Central Coast RWQCB. Alternative 3's impact related to the presence of on-site hazardous materials would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would be located outside of the safety and noise contours of the Santa Barbara Airport. Alternative 3's facilities would be designed the same as Alternative 4 and therefore would not conflict with the standards of Review Area 2 of the Santa Barbara Airport's Airport Influence Area or FAR Part 77. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to safety hazards and excessive noise due to proximity to an airport would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would not include construction on Hollister Avenue and therefore would result in less potential to interfere with emergency response or evacuation of Hollister Avenue compared to Alternative 4. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3's operations would not introduce activities that could impede or interfere with the Santa Barbara County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan or emergency evacuations on Hollister Avenue. Alternative 3's impact related to impaired implementation or physical interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would be located on the same site as Alternative 4 and therefore be exposed to the same fire risks as Alternative 4. As with Alternative 4, construction of Alternative 3 would comply with California Public Resources Code Sections 4442, 4427, 4428, and 4431 to minimize the potential for wildland fire. Alternative 3's structures would result in the same fire risks as Alternative 4, which would be minimized with adherence to the standards of the California Fire Code, CBC, and California Code of Regulations Title 14. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to wildland fire would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's impacts related to hazardous materials would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 3's hazardous materials impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the reduction in construction activities and lack of encroachment onto Hollister Avenue. Alternative 3's impacts related to upset or accident of hazardous materials, emissions of hazardous materials near schools, and hazardous materials sites would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Impacts related to transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, airport hazards, emergency response plans, and wildland fires would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-41 through 6-42.)

i. Hydrology and Water Quality

Given the reduction in construction activities, Alternative 3 would have reduced potential to degrade water quality compared to Alternative 4. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would include demolition of the existing clubhouse, portions of the existing maintenance facility, and comfort station, which could discharge ACB and LBP to on-site soils where they could then be transported off-site in stormwater runoff. Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 would be required and would minimize the potential for the accidental release of ACB and LBP. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 could require groundwater dewatering of perched groundwater during construction which, if contaminated, could result in releases of hazardous materials into stormwater. Mitigation Measure HAZ-5 would be required to reduce the potential for the accidental discharge of contaminated groundwater. Construction of Alternative 3 would comply with the Construction Stormwater General Permit, including the implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and BMPs to minimize the introduction of pollutants during construction activities. Alternative 3 would not include the installation of bridge at Devereaux Creek or culvert removal and therefore would not require implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1 and BIO-4 to minimize the introduction of pollutants into Devereaux Creek. In addition, adherence to the City's Municipal Code would ensure construction activities would minimize substantial runoff water which would exceed the capacities of Devereaux Creek or Bell Canyon Creek. Alternative 3's construction impacts related to water quality degradation, erosion, and the introduction of substantial polluted runoff and

exceedances of stormwater capacity would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Alternative 3 would include the same stormwater control infrastructure as Alternative 4 to treat and discharge stormwater onto the golf course consistent with the requirements of the Central Coast RWQCB. As with Alternative 4, treated water and high-flow bypass from the basins would be discharged to the golf course rather than the storm drain system in Hollister Avenue that outlets to Bell Canyon Creek which would minimize the amount of stormwater and potential stormwater pollutants entering Bell Canyon Creek. Alternative 3 would also abandon the existing onsite septic systems which, upon completion, would reduce the potential for groundwater quality to be affected by sewage. Operation of Alternative 3 would result in the same reduction in fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course as Alternative 4. Alternative 3 would include the same new irrigation system included in Alternative 4 which would reduce water use for landscaping compared to existing conditions and therefore would reduce the potential for operation of the golf course to discharge stormwater pollutants due to erosion compared to existing conditions. Alternative 3 would include the same maintenance facility as Alternative 4, and potential stormwater pollutants from the maintenance facility would be minimized with storage of hazardous materials in accordance with the requirements of the Santa Barbara Public Health Department's Consolidated Unified Program Agency Hazardous Material Division and the Santa Barbara County Agriculture Commissioner. Alternative 3's operational impacts related to water quality degradation, erosion, and the introduction of substantial polluted runoff and exceedances of stormwater capacity would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

As with Alternative 4, construction of Alternative 3 has the potential to require groundwater dewatering of perched groundwater. Groundwater dewatering activities would be localized and temporary, lasting only during excavation activities, if groundwater is encountered. The anticipated duration and minimal amount of groundwater dewatering that would be required for excavation would not result in substantial groundwater losses in the Basin. Similar to Alternative 4, given the limited infiltration potential of on-site soils and the minimal amount of impervious surface increase generated by Alternative 3, Alternative 3 would not substantially decrease groundwater infiltration rates on-site or result in substantial interference to groundwater recharge, Alternative 3's impact related to substantially decreasing groundwater supplies or interfering with groundwater recharge would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3's bioretention basins would be sized to collect and convey stormwater runoff on the project site to the golf course such that an increase in on-site flooding compared to existing conditions would not occur in accordance with Central Coast RWQCB requirements. Alternative 3 would not include work within Devereaux Creek and therefore has no potential to result in

on- or off-site flooding in Deveraux Creek; however, Alternative 3 would not result in long-term improvements associated with culvert removal and the restoration of Deveraux Creek to its natural flow. Alternative 3's impact related to on- or off-site flooding would be greater compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would be subject to the same on-site inundation hazards as Alternative 4. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would locate structures outside of a flood hazard zone, tsunami zone, seiche hazard zone, and dam inundation zone. Like Alternative 4, hazardous materials stored on-site would be located outside the inundation areas and stored in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. Impacts related to risk of release of stormwater pollutants during inundation would be similar to Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Given the reduction in construction activities, Alternative 3 would have a reduced potential to degrade water quality in conflict with the Basin Plan compared to Alternative 4. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would adhere to the requirements of the Construction Stormwater General Permit and Chapter 13.04 and Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code to minimize water quality impacts, and would require Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5 to reduce potential water quality impacts to a less than significant level. Accordingly, Alternative 3's impacts related to conflicts with the Basin Plan would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As described above, Alternative 3 would not adversely impact groundwater supplies. Accordingly, Alternative 3 would not interfere with the management of the Basin in accordance with the Wright Judgement. Accordingly, Alternative 3's impact related to conflicts with the Wright Judgement or Goleta Water District's Groundwater Management Plan Goleta Groundwater Basin would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's overall hydrology and water quality impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the reduction in construction activities. Alternative 3's impacts related to water quality, polluted runoff, and conflict with water quality plans or groundwater management plans would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Impacts related to groundwater, erosion and siltation, flooding, and release of pollutants from inundation would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-42 through 6-44.)

j. Land Use and Planning

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would be located on the existing Sandpiper Golf Club and would not include any components that could divide an established community. Alternative 3's impact would be the same as Alternative 4, and no impact related to the physical division of an established community would occur.

Alternative 3 would largely include the same renovation as Alternative 4, excluding the Hollister Avenue improvements and would not include the construction of the free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek. Alternative 3's facilities would be the same as Alternative 4 and would therefore be consistent with all applicable Goleta Municipal Code zoning standards and FAR Part 77 standards. Alternative 3 would include installation of the same storm drain and outlet within arroyo willow thickets ESHA as Alternative 4 and therefore would have the same potential to conflict with Policy CE 1.6 of the City's General Plan/Local Coastal Plan. Alternative 3 would include trenching for underground utilities along Hollister Avenue right-of-way and would result in trenching within riparian and monarch butterfly roosting ESHA. Therefore, Alternative 3 would have a similar potential to conflict with Policy 9.5 of the City's General Plan/Local Coastal Plan compared to Alternative 4. As Alternative 3 would not include the Class I bicycle path, Alternative 3 would be inconsistent with the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, as well as Policies OS 4.4, VH 2.5, VH 3.3, VH 3.5, and VH 4.10. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would be consistent with most policies of the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan through implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-11, CUL-1 through CUL-4, NOI-1, TCR-1, and TCR-2. Alternative 3's impact would be similar when compared to Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant with mitigation. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-44 through 6-45.)

k. Noise

Alternative 3 would not include the Hollister Avenue improvements and would not include the construction of the free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek and therefore would result in less construction noise than Alternative 4. In addition, Alternative 3 would shift the location of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop resulting in a reduction in construction noise associated with the Rio Grande Coffee Shop for single-family residences to the east. Alternative 3 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 to ensure construction noise levels do not exceed Goleta's 65 dBA construction noise standards. Accordingly, Alternative 3's construction noise impact remain less than significant with mitigation.

Alternative 3 would result in less construction traffic noise than Alternative 4 because Alternative 3 would not require construction worker trips for the Hollister Avenue improvements or free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek. Because Alternative 4's construction would not result in an increase of 3 dBA or more, the reduced construction in accordance with Alternative 3 would not result in an increase of 3 dBA or more of traffic noise. Alternative 3's construction traffic noise impact would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would include the same facilities as Alternative 4 which would generate the same noise levels at nearby sensitive receptors as Alternative 4 except for the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, which would generate decreased noise at single-family residences to the east due to its relocation. Operational noise

associated with heating, ventilation, and air conditioning units, the pump station, and conversational noise would not exceed City noise thresholds. Accordingly, Alternative 3's stationary operational noise impact would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would result in the same new vehicle trips as Alternative 4 as Alternative 3 includes the same facilities as Alternative 4. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would not result in operational traffic noise exceeding 3 dBA. Alternative 3's operational traffic noise impact would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would include the use of similar construction equipment as Alternative 4, including the use of a vibratory roller and large bulldozer, which could generate substantial ground-borne vibration. The equipment would exceed the Caltrans vibration damage potential threshold for historical structures of 0.12 PPV in/sec for transient sources within a distance of 42 feet and 20 feet, respectively. However, Alternative 3 includes the relocation of Rio Grande Coffee Shop 50 feet southwest of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. This relocation would ensure that construction equipment would be operated greater than 42 feet from Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station which would minimize the potential for construction to generate ground-borne vibration that could damage the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. Unlike Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would not require implementation of mitigation to reduce potential ground-borne vibration impacts. Alternative 3 would reduce Alternative 4's vibration impact to a less than significant level.

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would be located outside of the noise contours from Santa Barbara Airport. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to excessive airport noise would remain less than significant, which is the same as Alternative 4.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's construction noise and construction vibration impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the reduction in construction activities and relocation of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop. Alternative 3's operational noise impacts would be the same as Alternative 4. Alternative 3's would result in less than significant ground-borne vibration impacts, compared to Alternative 4's less than significant with mitigation impact. Alternative 3's impacts related to construction noise would remain less than significant with mitigation. Alternative 3's impacts related to operational noise and airport noise would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-45 through 6-55.)

I. Parks and Recreation

Alternative 3 would require less construction activities and therefore would result in less potential to degrade existing park facilities due to construction worker use as construction workers would not need to spend as much time at the project site and would have less opportunities to use surrounding recreational areas during

break periods. Alternative 3 would include the same amount of employees as Alternative 4 which would not result in a substantial reduction in the amount of parkland available to the residents of Goleta. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 could increase the amount of visitors to the project site which may increase the use of nearby parks and trails; however, ultimately Alternative 3 would expand recreational opportunities in Goleta such that residents have additional options for recreation through the dedication of a lateral access easement for beach access. However, Alternative 3 would not include the Class I bicycle path and therefore would not provide the same amount of recreation infrastructure as Alternative 4. Alternative 3's impact to park facilities would be greater than Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would include similar recreational facilities as Alternative 4, excluding the Class I bicycle path. As described above, Alternative 3 would not result in substantial deterioration of recreational facilities and furthermore would not necessitate new or expanded recreational facilities. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to recreational facilities would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's parks and recreation impacts would be reduced during construction compared to Alternative 4 due to the reduction in construction activities but would be increased during operation due to the lack of the Class I bicycle path. Alternative 3's impacts related to parks and recreation would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 6-46.)

m. Public Services

Alternative 3 would require the same employees as Alternative 4 and therefore would result in the same indirect population growth compared to Alternative 4. Given that Alternative 4's indirect population growth would not result in substantially diminished fire protection services, police protection services, school capacities, or library services, Alternative 3's indirect population growth would also not result in substantially diminished public services. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would be located in proximity to existing fire stations and police stations and would be adequately served by existing fire protection and police protection services in Goleta. In addition, as with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would also include the required payment of development impact fees which would provide funding for expanded public services in accordance with Chapter 17.70 of the Municipal Code and Goleta Union School District and Santa Barbara Unified School District fees. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to public services would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-46 through 6-47.)

n. Transportation and Circulation

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would not include elements that would conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Alternative 3 would add the same bicycle parking spaces and bicycle entrance to the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, but would not include the continuation of the Class I bicycle path to the project site or dedication of a lateral access easement along Hollister Avenue, and would therefore provide less facilities for bicycle and pedestrian travel. As with Alternative 4, the design for Alternative 3's proposed driveways would be subject to review and approval by the City and SBCFD which would minimize the potential for vehicle to pedestrian and vehicle to cyclist conflicts. Unlike Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would not result in any temporary lane, bicycle route, or sidewalk closures on Hollister Avenue and would not include roadway impediments on Hollister Avenue during construction. Alternative 3 would require the same amount of employees than Alternative 4 which, as with Alternative 4, would not substantially interfere with Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District operations. Accordingly, Alternative 3's construction impact related to conflicts with transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant. However, unlike Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would not include infrastructure along Hollister Avenue to promote bicycle and pedestrian transportation, and would not further support the City's policies related to bicycle and pedestrian facilities. However, impacts would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would require less construction activities than Alternative 4 and therefore would generate less short-term VMT increases than Alternative 4. This construction-related VMT increase would be temporary and would not have a lasting effect on the overall transportation network or long-term VMT patterns in the area. Alternative 3 would include the same facilities as Alternative 4 which would be exempt from quantitative VMT analysis and presumed to have a less than significant impact on VMT pursuant to the City's VMT Guidelines. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would increase the time between tee-offs and correspondingly reduce the annual rounds of golf per year, which would reduce the amount of vehicle trips and associated VMT generated by golfers to get to and from the project site compared to existing conditions. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to conflicts with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

As with Alternative 4, during construction of Alternative 3, equipment staging would occur on-site and construction personnel would park on-site, which would minimize the potential for construction related vehicles and equipment to disrupt in the immediate area. Unlike Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would not include construction in the right-of-way of Hollister Avenue and therefore would not result in any roadway impediments on Hollister Avenue. Alternative 3 would include the same driveway configuration as Alternative 4 which would be designed accordance with all applicable SBCFD standards to minimize line-of-sight disruptions and hazards between vehicles and pedestrians and vehicles and cyclists. As with Alternative 4,

Alternative 3 would not introduce new incompatible uses, such as farm equipment, to roadways, and Alternative 3's uses would be the same as existing on-site uses. Accordingly, Alternative 3's impacts to increased hazards would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

As stated above, during construction of Alternative 3, equipment staging would occur on-site and construction personnel would park on-site, which would minimize the potential for construction related vehicles and equipment to result in inadequate emergency access. Unlike Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would not result in any potential for inadequate emergency access in the short term on Hollister Avenue because Alternative 3 does not include construction in the Hollister Avenue right-of-way. As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would be designed in accordance with all applicable SBCFD standards to maintain adequate emergency access. As with Alternative 4, SBCFD and the City would review and approve Alternative 3's design, which would ensure Alternative 3 would provide adequate egress for emergency access. Therefore, Alternative 3's impacts to emergency access would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's transportation and circulation impacts would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 due to the lack of construction in the Hollister Avenue right-of-way. Alternative 3's impacts related to transportation and circulation would remain less than significant. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-64 through 6-65.)

o. Tribal Cultural Resources

As with Alternative 4, Alternative 3 would be located in an area with a high sensitivity for cultural resources, including tribal cultural resources. Alternative 3 would require less ground disturbance, which would reduce the potential to encounter tribal cultural resources compared to Alternative 4. Although impacts would be reduced, potential to unearth previously unidentified resources would remain. As such, Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4, and TCR-1 and TCR-2 would be required, including implementation of a tribal monitoring agreement and appropriate disposition of any unanticipated tribal cultural resources discovered during construction. Alternative 3's impact related to tribal cultural resources would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation. (Draft EIR, p. 6-65.)

p. Utilities and Service Systems

Alternative 3 would require the installation and relocation of the same utility infrastructure as required for Alternative 4. Accordingly, Alternative 3's impact related to the relocation or construction of utility infrastructure would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3's water demand would be the same as Alternative 4 which would reduce onsite water use compared to existing conditions. Accordingly, Alternative 3 would have no impact on water use, the same as Alternative 4.

Alternative 3's wastewater generation would be the same as Alternative 4 which would be accommodated by existing wastewater treatment plant capacity available for Goleta West Sanitary District customers. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to wastewater treatment capacity would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would result in less solid waste generation as Alternative 4 during construction due lack of Hollister Avenue improvements and free-standing bridge, but would still generate substantial solid waste during construction. As such, Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 would be required to reduce solid waste generated during construction below the City's project specific threshold of 350 tons of nonrecyclable construction and demolition debris. Once operational, Alternative 3 would result in the same solid waste generation as Alternative 4 which does not exceed the City's project-specific threshold of 196 tons per year. Therefore, solid waste impacts related to the operation of Alternative 3 would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's impacts related to solid waste would be reduced compared to Alternative 4 but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 3's impacts related to the construction of utility infrastructure and wastewater treatment capacity would be the same as Alternative 4 and would remain less than significant. Like Alternative 4, no water supply impacts would occur. (Draft EIR pages 6-33 through 6-49)

Attainment of Project Objectives: Alternative 3 would fail to meet the following project objectives: Maintain and improve golf course playability and establish a new golf course routing plan that more closely follows the natural topography of the project site, improve public views across the property from Hollister Avenue by undergrounding overhead utility lines and implementing other improvements, improve coastal access for the public in the vicinity of the project site. (Draft EIR, p. 6-68.)

Finding: The City Council rejects Alternative 3: Revised Site Plan, on the following grounds, each of which individually provides sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative: (1) the alternative fails to meet most of the Project objectives; and (2) the alternative would result in increased impacts relating to greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality (runoff and flooding), parks and recreation, and transportation (conflict with plans that encourage provision of alternative transportation).

4. Alternative D4: Proposed Project

Description: The proposed project involves the demolition of the existing clubhouse; construction of a new, two-story clubhouse with basement; provision of additional parking spaces; modifications to and re-routing of the existing 18-hole golf course; landscaping and irrigation improvements; replacement of existing maintenance facilities; replacement of an existing comfort station; construction of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop adjacent to the historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station; adaptive reuse and restoration of the historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station to provide seating and bicycle amenities for the Rio Grande Coffee Shop; incorporation of the new clubhouse and comfort station into the Sphere of Influence area for the Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD); right-of-way (ROW) vacation from the City; and improvements along Hollister Avenue, including revised entry points, a new public trail, undergrounding of electrical and utility lines, bus station relocation, and curb and sidewalk improvements. The Hollister Avenue improvements include construction of a Type 4 path along the Hollister Avenue ROW, which would extend westerly from the Rio Grande Coffee Shop to the proposed western clubhouse parking lot. The Type 4 path would offer views of the Pacific Ocean along the majority of the pathway, and would serve as a continuation of the De Anza Trail identified in the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Open Space Element. (Draft EIR, pp. ES-2 through ES-5.)

Impacts: Given the relative similarities between Alternative 4 and the proposed project, the proposed project is expected to result in a nominal increase in air quality, energy, greenhouse gases, land use, parks and recreation, and transportation, parks and recreation. (Draft EIR, p. 6-68.)

Attainment of Project Objectives: The proposed project would not further the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies related to vertical access and active transportation to the same extent as Alternative 4. While the proposed project would fulfill all the project objectives, it would not further Project Objective 1 to the same extent as Alternative 4 would. (Draft EIR, p. 6-68.)

Finding: The City Council rejects the proposed project on the following grounds, each of which individually provides sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative: (1) the proposed project would result in increased impacts relating to air quality, energy, greenhouse gases, land use, parks and recreation, transportation, parks and recreation; and (2) the proposed project would not fulfill the Project objectives to the same extent as Alternative 4.

E. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines indicates that an analysis of alternatives to a proposed Project shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR.

The No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) would result in the fewest adverse environmental effects when compared to existing conditions because no renovation

activities would occur; therefore, the No Project Alternative would be considered environmentally superior. However, the No Project Alternative would not result in the benefits achieved by Alternative 4 to scenic quality (through undergrounding of the existing utility lines), historic resources (through renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station), fire and seismic safety (through renovations to existing buildings), water and energy efficiency (through site-wide renovations), and wastewater leakage (through elimination of the existing septic systems). Additionally, the No Project Alternative would not fulfill any project objectives.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) provides that, if the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, then the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. The environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives would be Alternative 2 (Clubhouse Renovation). Due to Alternative 2's reduced construction footprint and schedule, Alternative 2 would have less potential than Alternative 4, Alternative 3 (Revised Site Plan), and Alternative 4 (Extended Bicycle Path) to result in impacts related to aesthetics (light and glare), air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils (landslides, erosion, and paleontological resources), greenhouse gas emissions, noise, parks and recreation, public services, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities (wastewater and solid waste). However, as Alternative 2 would exclude project features other than the new clubhouse, it would fail to meet the following project objectives:

1. Maintain and improve golf course playability and establish a new golf course routing plan that more closely follows the natural topography of the project site.
2. Reduce golf course turf area and replace with native and coastal appropriate landscaping to restore the golf course to a more natural state, thereby reducing water usage and agrichemical application.
4. Provide enhanced maintenance facilities to support Sandpiper Golf Club operations.
5. Rehabilitate, preserve, and adaptively reuse the historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station.
7. Improve public views across the property from Hollister Avenue by undergrounding overhead utility lines and implementing other improvements.
8. Improve coastal access for the public in the vicinity of the project site.

In addition, Alternative 2 would only partially meet the following project objectives as Alternative 2 would not include recreational improvements or the Rio Grande Coffee Shop and would only include removal of the septic system serving the existing clubhouse:

1. Provide improved recreational and dining facilities for golfers, diners, and special event attendees at the Sandpiper Golf Club.
2. Protect water quality and bluff stability by converting existing private septic systems to public sewers and utilizing sand capping to filter stormwater.

Alternative 3 would result in slightly increased impacts to greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality (runoff and flooding), parks and recreation, and transportation (conflict with plans that encourage provision of alternative transportation), although impacts would remain less than significant. Alternative 3 would result in similar, or slightly reduced, impacts to all other issue areas. Additionally, Alternative 3 would fail to meet the following project objectives:

1. Maintain and improve golf course playability and establish a new golf course routing plan that more closely follows the natural topography of the project site.
7. Improve public views across the property from Hollister Avenue by undergrounding overhead utility lines and implementing other improvements.
8. Improve coastal access for the public in the vicinity of the project site.

Alternative 4 would result in slightly increased impacts to noise, as Alternative 4 would be closer to sensitive receptors and result in a nominal increase in construction noise in the vicinity of these receptors. Alternative 4 would result in reduced impacts to air quality, energy, greenhouse gases, land use, parks and recreation, and transportation through the encouragement of alternative transportation and corresponding reduction in automobile travel, which would in turn reduce the amount of greenhouse gas emissions being emitted. It would also result in reduced impacts to parks and recreation by facilitating greater access to the Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve and the Pacific Ocean by allowing for a safe and wide path that connects users of the path to multiple vertical and lateral beach access points offsite, and increase access to recreational facilities. Alternative 4 would result in similar, or slightly reduced, impacts to all other issue areas. Additionally, Alternative 4 would better support the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies related to vertical access and the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies related to active transportation. Alternative 4 complies with the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan whereas Alternative 4 does not. Alternative 4 would meet all project objectives. It would also further the following project objective to a greater extent than Alternative 4 by providing lateral access along Hollister Avenue that would connect to multiple vertical access points that allow Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve visitors access to the beach and lateral bluff access points located offsite, and provide a safe and smooth surface wide enough to accommodate two directional flow of walking and alternative modes of transportation to multiple lateral and vertical access points off the project site:

1. Improve coastal access for the public in the vicinity of the project site. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-66 through 6-68.)

Attachment 1

SANDPIPER GOLF COURSE RENOVATION CEQA RESOLUTION

Exhibit B: Given the size of the
Final EIR link to the Final EIR:

<https://www.cityofgoleta.org/your-city/planning-and-environmental-review/ceqa-review/sandpiper-golf-course>

Attachment 1

SANDPIPER GOLF COURSE RENOVATION CEQA RESOLUTION

Exhibit C – MMRP

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project

The Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project (proposed project) identifies mitigation measures that will be implemented to reduce the environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. California Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 requires a public agency to adopt a reporting or monitoring program for assessing and ensuring compliance with any required mitigation measures applied to a proposed development. As stated in California Public Resources Code Section 21081.6:

“...the public agency shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.”

Section 21081.6 also provides general guidelines for implementing mitigation monitoring programs and indicates that specific reporting and/or monitoring requirements, to be enforced during implementation of the proposed project, shall be defined as part of adopting a Final EIR.

The mitigation monitoring table below lists those mitigation measures that will be required as part of approval of the proposed project. To ensure that the mitigation measures are properly implemented, a monitoring program has been devised which identifies the timing and responsibility for monitoring each measure. The proposed project applicant will have the responsibility for implementing the measures, and the various City of Goleta departments will have the primary responsibility for monitoring and reporting the implementation of the mitigation measures. Implementation responsibilities are detailed in the table below. Parties who are involved in fulfilling the requirements of the mitigation measures herein include the applicant, the applicant’s project design engineer, the construction contractor, City staff, independent third parties contracted by the City and paid for by the applicant (e.g., qualified biologists, abatement contractors, qualified environmental professionals), the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, the California Department of Public Health, and Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Services.

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
Biological Resources						
BIO-1: Pre-Construction Special-Status Plant Survey and Avoidance						
Prior to the start of construction activities, a City-approved, qualified biologist (retained by the project applicant) shall conduct a pre-construction special-status plant survey within 50-feet of the areas of proposed ground disturbance (including landscaping activities). The survey shall be conducted at the appropriate season, and in appropriate habitat, for identifying potentially occurring special-status plant species, including cliff malacothrix, woolly seablite, and Santa Barbara honeysuckle. The special-status plant survey shall be conducted in conformance with the California Native Plant Society Botanical Survey Guidelines (CNPS 2001), Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities (CDFW 2018), and the USFWS’s General Rare Plant Survey Guidelines (Cypher 2002). Reference sites shall be visited to document if target species are detectable prior to the special-status plant survey. If special-status plant species are encountered within 50 feet of project activities, the qualified biologist shall flag a minimum 50-foot buffer around all known locations to avoid potential impacts to seed banks and microhabitats that support the species. The buffers shall be flagged for avoidance prior to the start of construction activities. Any habitat area supporting special-status plants shall be considered ESHA, and appropriate setbacks shall be established within which no construction activities may occur and no landscaping may occur that will result in removal of or harm to rare plants. If construction has not commenced within two years of the most recent plant survey, the special-status plant survey shall be repeated prior to the start of construction. The qualified biologist shall submit a summary of the survey results to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to initiation of construction activities, including landscaping activities. If ground disturbing activities must occur within the established buffer, the topsoil (top 6 inches) in the disturbance areas shall be salvaged for any plant species with a California Rare Plant Rank of 1A to 2B. Salvaged topsoil shall be stored in temporary stockpiles and replaced in the same location following ground disturbance completion. If replacement in the same location is not feasible, the stockpiles shall be placed in the same vegetation community that currently supports the special-status plant species.	The project applicant is responsible for: - Retaining a City-approved, qualified biologist to conduct the pre-construction special-status plant survey. The construction contractor is responsible for: - Ensuring construction activities do not begin until survey results are reviewed and approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee). - Incorporating any required avoidance buffers and ESHA setbacks into grading and landscaping plans. The City-approved qualified biologist is responsible for: - Conducting the special-status plant survey in accordance with CNPS (2001), CDFW (2018), and USFWS (2002) guidelines during the appropriate season and in suitable habitat. - Visiting reference sites to confirm detectability of target species prior to survey. - Flagging and mapping any special-status plant locations and establish appropriate avoidance buffers. - Preparing and submitting a survey summary report to the Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee). The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, is responsible for: - Reviewing and approving the survey report prior to initiation of construction or landscaping activities. - Verifying that avoidance buffers and ESHA setbacks are incorporated into grading and landscaping plans. - Conducting periodic site inspections to confirm compliance with survey recommendations.	The qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction special-status plant survey and submit a summary of the pre-construction special-status plant survey results to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, within two years prior to the start of construction activities, including landscaping activities. If special-status plant species are detected, the qualified biologist shall flag an appropriate avoidance buffer prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.	The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the survey results and keep the results on file with the City. The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall conduct periodic spot checks to ensure that construction does not occur within the buffer during construction.			
BIO-2: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Fencing and Protection						
Prior to initiation of construction activities, the project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to delineate all ESHA, aquatic resources, and required setbacks with temporary construction fencing and/or flagging and signage. The fencing shall serve as a visual boundary for construction personnel and be maintained throughout the duration of construction. The construction contractor shall ensure that construction personnel and equipment do not enter the setback areas during the duration of construction activities. No non-native or invasive plant species that have a potential to displace or alter sensitive vegetation communities or vegetation communities supporting sensitive species shall be planted within ESHA or ESHA buffers. Areas protected under this measure shall include sensitive coastal sage scrub and coastal bluff scrub communities, riparian habitats associated	The project applicant is responsible for: - Retaining a City-approved, qualified biologist to delineate all ESHA, aquatic resources, and required setbacks prior to construction. The construction contractor is responsible for: - Installing and maintaining temporary construction fencing, flagging, and signage throughout construction.	The project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to delineate all ESHA and required setbacks with temporary construction fencing and/or flagging and signage prior to the start of construction activities.	The qualified biologist and construction contractor shall provide evidence of ESHA delineation and BMP installation to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to the start of construction. The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall conduct periodic spot checks to ensure that			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
with Devereux Creek, coastal wetlands, native grasslands, open water associated with the golf course pond, areas supporting special-status plant species, and aquatic resources. Unless otherwise authorized, the setbacks shall be as follows: ▪ Sensitive scrub communities: 25 feet ▪ Riparian vegetation: 100 feet unless otherwise authorized ▪ Coastal wetlands: 100 feet ▪ Native grasslands: 10 feet ▪ Monarch roost: 100 feet ▪ Aquatic resources and open water: 100 feet unless otherwise authorized No grading, vehicles or heavy machinery, or construction shall be permitted with the setbacks, unless reduced setbacks are approved by the City for specific activities and locations. No grading, sand capping, vehicles, heavy machinery, or construction activities shall be permitted within any ESHA at any time, unless these activities are covered under compensatory mitigation described in Mitigation Measure BIO-11.	▪ Ensuring construction personnel and equipment do not enter setback areas during construction. ▪ Avoiding planting non-native or invasive species within ESHA or ESHA buffers. The City-approved qualified biologist is responsible for: ▪ Identifying and delineating ESHA, aquatic resources, and required setbacks in the field. ▪ Installing temporary fencing, flagging, and signage to mark boundaries. ▪ Providing evidence of ESHA delineation and BMP installation to the Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee). The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing documentation of ESHA delineation and BMP installation prior to construction start. ▪ Conducting periodic spot checks during construction to ensure compliance with setback requirements.		construction does not occur within the buffer during construction.			
BIO-3: Biological Monitoring and Worker Education						
Prior to initiation of construction activities, the project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist familiar with special-status plant and wildlife species with the potential to occur in the project work area. The qualified biologist shall be present on-site daily during grading and vegetation removal. The monitor shall be responsible for the following: ▪ Ensure that procedures for verifying compliance with biological resource mitigation measures are followed. ▪ Lines of communication and reporting methods. ▪ Guiding the construction contractor in marking/flagging construction area limits. ▪ Conducting construction crew Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training. ▪ Authority to stop non-emergency work. ▪ Action to be taken in the event of non-compliance. ▪ Conducting daily wildlife clearance surveys prior to any grading, turf removal, other vegetation removal. ▪ Inspecting ESHA fencing around sensitive habitats. ▪ Preparing monitoring summaries of special-status species’ presence, or the lack thereof, on the project site during grading or vegetation removal. All construction personnel shall attend a WEAP training conducted by the qualified biologist prior to commencement of construction activities. The construction contractor(s) shall be responsible for ensuring that all new personnel receive the training after construction is initiated. The WEAP shall include a description of a special-status species potentially present in the area, jurisdictional habitats present proximate to the Project site, information on sensitive habitats to be avoided, and specific measures that shall be implemented to protect special-status species. Special-status plant species addressed in the WEAP training shall include, at a minimum, cliff malacothrix, red sand verbena, Santa Barbara honeysuckle, Southern California black walnut, and woolly seablite. Species-status wildlife species addressed in the WEAP, at a minimum, shall include California red-legged frog, tidewater goby, monarch butterfly, Crotch’s bumble bee, Cooper’s hawk, southwestern pond turtle, yellow warbler, and white-tailed kite.	The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ Retaining a qualified biologist familiar with special-status plant and wildlife species prior to initiation of construction activities. The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Ensuring all construction personnel attend WEAP training prior to commencement of construction activities and that new personnel receive training after construction begins. ▪ Maintaining records of WEAP participation and providing them to the City upon request. The qualified biologist is responsible for: ▪ Conducting WEAP training for all construction personnel, including information on special-status species and sensitive habitats. ▪ Being present on-site daily during grading and vegetation removal. ▪ Verifying compliance with biological resource mitigation measures. ▪ Guiding the construction contractor in marking/flagging construction area limits. ▪ Conducting daily wildlife clearance surveys prior to grading or vegetation removal. ▪ Inspecting ESHA fencing around sensitive habitats.	The qualified biologist shall be present on-site daily during grading and vegetation removal. This measure shall be incorporated into the grading plans and the WEAP shall be available on-site during construction. The qualified biologist shall submit a monitoring summary to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director within 30 days after completing each phase of construction.	Records of construction worker WEAP participation shall be kept on file with the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director for the duration of construction. Monitoring summaries shall be kept on file with the City for the duration of construction.			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
	▪ Preparing monitoring summaries documenting special-status species presence or absence during grading or vegetation removal. ▪ Submitting monitoring summaries to the Planning and Environmental Review Director ▪ Exercising authority to stop non-emergency work in the event of non-compliance. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing monitoring summaries submitted by the qualified biologist. ▪ Maintaining WEAP participation records and monitoring summaries for the duration of construction. ▪ Conducting periodic site inspections to verify compliance with biological monitoring and WEAP requirements.					
BIO-4: General Best Management Practices						
The construction contractor shall ensure that all construction personnel are informed of and adhere to the general requirements listed below prior to the start of construction activities. This measure shall be incorporated into the construction plans, including demolition, grading, building, and landscaping plans. The project applicant shall submit the construction plans to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the construction plans to ensure the below measures are included. ▪ Best management practices, such as silt fending or straw wattles, shall be installed prior to conducting any project activity within 100 feet of any aquatic resource, including sand capping, grading, cart path construction, or bridge construction. Implementation of BMPs shall be consistent with any requirements from the approved Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the Project. ▪ Project-related vehicles shall observe a 5-mile-per-hour speed limit within the unpaved limits of construction. ▪ All open trenches shall be fenced and sloped to prevent entrapment of wildlife species. ▪ All hollow posts and pipes shall be capped, and metal fence stakes shall be plugged with bolts or other plugging materials to prevent wildlife entrapment and mortality. ▪ All food-related trash items such as wrappers, cans, bottles, and food scraps generated during proposed project construction shall be disposed of in closed containers and removed daily from the project site. ▪ No deliberate feeding of wildlife shall be allowed. ▪ No pets shall be allowed on the project site. ▪ No firearms shall be allowed on the project site. ▪ If vehicle or equipment maintenance is necessary, it shall be performed in the designated staging areas. ▪ During construction, heavy equipment shall be operated in accordance with standard BMPs. All equipment used on-site shall be properly maintained to avoid leaks of oil, fuel, or residues. The construction contractor shall prevent oil, petroleum products, or any other pollutants from contaminating the soil or entering a watercourse (dry or otherwise). When vehicles or equipment are stationary, mats or drip pans shall be placed below vehicles to contain fluid leaks. Provisions shall be in place to remediate any accidental spills.	The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ Submitting construction plans (including demolition, grading, building, and landscaping plans) to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. ▪ Ensuring the construction plans incorporate all general requirements listed in the measure. The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Ensuring all construction personnel are informed of and adhere to the general requirements prior to the start of construction activities. ▪ Implementing and maintaining the requirements of Mitigation Measure BIO-5 during construction: The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing and approving construction plans prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance to ensure all requirements are included. ▪ Conducting periodic site inspections to verify compliance with BMPs and general requirements during construction.	This measure shall be incorporated into the construction plans, including demolition, grading, building, and landscaping plans. The project applicant shall submit the construction plans to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The construction contractor shall ensure that all construction personnel are informed of and adhere to the general requirements listed above prior to the start of construction activities.	The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the construction plans to ensure this measure is included.			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
▪ Refueling of any equipment shall only occur in designated staging areas. Designated areas shall not be located near any storm drain inlets, drainage swales, or surface waterways. When refueling gas powered equipment or mixing herbicide, workers shall refuel or mix over drip pan which is appropriately sized to catch any spillage. The designated refueling area shall be inspected frequently to ensure no spill of hazardous materials have occurred and could contaminate the ground or water. The construction contractor shall advise workers to clean and report spills immediately. ▪ Standard dust control measures shall be implemented to reduce impacts on nearby plants and wildlife. This includes a variety of options to reduce dust including replacing ground cover in disturbed areas as quickly as possible, watering active sites regularly, and suspending all excavating and grading operations during periods of high winds.						
BIO-5: Crotch’s Bumble Bee Pre-construction Survey and Avoidance						
Should ground-disturbing activities, including grading, trenching, and vegetation removal such as grubbing, be scheduled to occur during the Crotch’s bumble bee colony active period (typically spring to late summer), a qualified biologist shall conduct a habitat assessment prior to ground-disturbing activities to identify areas containing suitable habitat for Crotch’s bumble bee. The habitat assessment shall be conducted in areas supporting suitable vegetation communities and land covers and shall focus on presence of suitable floral resources and potential nest sites, and shall be conducted within areas of proposed ground disturbance that meet the preceding criteria. The qualified biologist shall submit the habitat assessment results to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director for review and approval within five days of completing the habitat assessment. Following completion of the habitat assessment, if suitable habitat is present, the qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for Crotch’s bumble bee in the areas identified as suitable, using a methodology (including number of surveys, timing of surveys, suitable survey conditions, and time of day) accepted by CDFW. The pre-construction surveys shall be conducted prior to ground-disturbing activities. The qualified biologist shall submit the pre-construction survey results to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director for review and approval within five days of completing the pre-construction surveys. If Crotch’s bumble bees are not detected during the pre-construction surveys but suitable habitat is present, a qualified biologist shall be present during ground-disturbing project activities that occur during the Crotch’s bumble bee colony active period, to ensure that no impacts occur to a previously unidentified Crotch’s bumble bee nest. No additional work restrictions with regard to Crotch’s bumble bee shall be implemented for the remainder of the colony active period. If Crotch’s bumble bees are detected, ground-disturbing activities shall be prohibited within 100 feet of any known, occupied Crotch’s bumble bee nest, or as determined by the qualified biologist, who shall demarcate the 100-foot buffer via flagging. Work shall not resume in this area for the duration of the Crotch’s bumble bee colony active period, unless the qualified biologist determines the nest is inactive, with concurrence from CDFW. If Crotch’s bumble bee remains a State candidate species or is listed as endangered or threatened under the California Endangered Species Act, and should ground-disturbing activities in areas potentially supporting habitat extend into one or more subsequent years, the habitat assessment and, if necessary, the surveys, shall be repeated in areas where ground disturbance may occur that year. Prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities, should the California Fish and Game Commission remove the candidate status of Crotch’s bumble bee and determine the species shall not be listed, then no measures protecting Crotch’s bumble bee shall be required.	The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ Retaining a qualified biologist prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities scheduled during the Crotch’s bumble bee colony active period (typically spring to late summer). ▪ Ensuring that ground-disturbing activities do not begin until habitat assessment and, if necessary, pre-construction surveys are completed and approved by the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee). The qualified biologist is responsible for: ▪ Conducting a habitat assessment prior to ground-disturbing activities. ▪ Submitting habitat assessment results to the Planning and Environmental Review Director within five days of completion. If suitable habitat is present, the qualified biologist is responsible for: ▪ Conducting pre-construction surveys for Crotch’s bumble bee using CDFW-accepted methodology prior to ground-disturbing activities. ▪ Submitting pre-construction survey results to the Planning and Environmental Review Director within five days of completion. If Crotch’s bumble bee are detected, the qualified biologist is responsible for: ▪ Demarcating a 100-foot buffer around any known, occupied nest via flagging. ▪ Ensuring no ground-disturbing activities occur within the buffer for the duration of the colony active period unless the nest is confirmed inactive with CDFW concurrence. If Crotch’s bumble bees are not detected but suitable habitat is present, the qualified biologist is responsible for:	The qualified biologist shall conduct a habitat assessment prior to any ground-disturbing activities during the Crotch’s bumble bee colony active period. Following the habitat assessment, the qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys in the identified suitable areas. If Crotch’s bumble bees are detected, prior to ground-disturbing activities, the qualified biologist shall demarcate a 100-foot buffer for any known, occupied nest via flagging. If Crotch’s bumble bees are not detected, a qualified biologist shall be present during ground-disturbing activities. The qualified biologist shall submit the habitat assessment results and pre-construction survey results to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to ground-disturbing activities. The qualified biologist shall submit monitoring results to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, following the completion of ground-disturbing activities.	The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the habitat assessment results, pre-construction survey results, and monitoring results. The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall conduct periodic spot checks to ensure that construction does not occur within the buffer during construction.			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
	▪ Remaining on-site during ground-disturbing activities occurring during the colony active period to monitor for previously unidentified nests. ▪ Preparing and submitting monitoring results to the Planning and Environmental Review Director following completion of ground-disturbing activities. ▪ Repeating habitat assessment and surveys in subsequent years if ground-disturbing activities extend beyond one season and the species remains a candidate or listed under CESA. The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Complying with flagged buffers established by the qualified biologist. ▪ Ensuring no ground-disturbing activities occur within the 100-foot buffer around occupied nests unless authorized by the qualified biologist and CDFW. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing and approving habitat assessment results, pre-construction survey results, and monitoring reports prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities. ▪ Conducting periodic spot checks during construction to ensure compliance with buffer requirements and monitoring protocols.					
BIO-6: Monarch Butterfly Roost Protection						
Construction activities (including grading and sand capping) within 200 feet of monarch butterfly ESHA shall be scheduled by the construction contractor to occur between April 1 and September 30 where feasible, to avoid overwintering monarch butterflies. If construction activities within 200 feet of monarch butterfly ESHA cannot feasibly be scheduled to avoid the overwintering season, the project applicant shall ensure the following measures are implemented prior to construction activities: ▪ A monarch specialist or qualified biologist shall conduct a survey for roosting monarchs prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities, including vegetation removal, and confirm the absence of roosting monarchs before the work can commence. Roosting monarch surveys must follow the Xerces Society Protocol (2022). Surveys shall be conducted in the early morning while temperatures are low enough that monarch butterflies remain clustered from the evening before (usually when temperatures are below 13 °C or 55 °F). ▪ Surveys shall be spaced sufficiently apart to capture roosting individuals during this timeframe and conducted during a time when monarchs are present at a local reference site as feasible. Depending on the observed monarch behavior, more than two site visits may be necessary to conclude the presence/absence of roosting monarchs throughout the season. ▪ During the overwintering season and during construction activities, roosting monarch surveys shall be conducted routinely to confirm continued absence or to identify, map, and describe roost locations if presence of roosting monarchs is confirmed. Mapped roosting	The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ Scheduling construction activities within 200 feet of monarch butterfly ESHA to occur between April 1 and September 30, where feasible, to avoid overwintering monarch butterflies. ▪ If construction cannot be scheduled outside the overwintering season, retaining a monarch specialist or qualified biologist prior to construction activities. ▪ Ensuring survey results and monitoring reports are submitted to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) within the required timeframes. The monarch specialist or qualified biologist is responsible for: ▪ Conducting pre-construction surveys for roosting monarchs prior to ground-disturbing activities, following Xerces Society Protocol (2022).	If construction activities within 200 feet of monarch butterfly ESHA cannot feasibly be scheduled to avoid the overwintering season, the project applicant shall retain a monarch specialist or qualified biologist to conduct surveys for roosting monarchs prior to the start of construction activities. The monarch specialist or qualified biologist shall submit survey results to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, within five days of completing the pre-construction survey. The monarch specialist or qualified biologist shall monitor ground-disturbing activities, including vegetation removal, during construction.	The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the survey and monitoring results.			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
locations may be adjusted as needed under the guidance of a monarch specialist or qualified biologist. - Any construction activities within 200 ft of roosting monarchs within the monarch butterfly ESHA shall be prohibited (consistent with CE 4.5 and CE 4.6d). - A monarch specialist or qualified biologist shall be present during ground-disturbing activities, including vegetation removal, to document monarch butterfly protection. The monarch monitor shall document that roosting monarchs are not disturbed by ground-disturbing activities. The monarch monitor shall have authority to stop ground-disturbing activities if monarchs show signs of unnatural disturbance.	- Submitting survey results to the Planning and Environmental Review Director within five days of completion. - Conducting routine surveys during construction to confirm continued absence or identify and map roost locations if monarchs are present. - Monitoring ground-disturbing activities within 200 feet of monarch butterfly ESHA during construction to ensure monarchs are not disturbed. - Exercising authority to stop ground-disturbing activities if monarchs show signs of unnatural disturbance. - Submitting monitoring results to the Planning and Environmental Review Director following completion of construction activities within 200 feet of monarch butterfly ESHA. The construction contractor is responsible for: - Complying with flagged buffers and restrictions established by the monarch specialist or qualified biologist. - Ensuring no construction activities occur within 200 feet of roosting monarchs. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: - Reviewing and approving survey results and monitoring reports submitted by the monarch specialist or qualified biologist. - Conducting periodic site inspections to verify compliance with monarch butterfly protection measures.	The monarch specialist or qualified biologist shall submit monitoring results to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director following the completion of construction activities within 200 feet of monarch butterfly ESHA.				
BIO-7: Implementation of Monarch Roost Protection Plan						
The project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to prepare a Monarch Roost Protection Plan prior to the start of construction activities. The Monarch Roost Protection Plan shall include the following. - Trees majorly impacted by construction, grading, and trenching of the project improvement elements within the monarch butterfly ESHA shall be replaced at a 3:1 ratio within the ESHA and as close to the impacted tree as is reasonably feasible. - If understory vegetation that supports overwintering habitat is removed within monarch butterfly ESHA, as determined by a monarch specialist, the vegetation shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio as close to the removed vegetation as is feasible. - Grading or other activities that could alter the surface hydrology that sustains the groves of trees within monarch butterfly ESHA are prohibited within the ESHA buffer (50- or 100- feet depending on whether the site is transitory or overwintering habitat). The qualified biologist shall submit the Monarch Roost Protection Plan to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to the start of construction activities. The construction contractor shall implement the Monarch Roost Protection Plan for the duration of construction.	The project applicant is responsible for: - Retaining a qualified biologist prior to the start of construction activities to prepare a Monarch Roost Protection Plan. - Ensuring the construction contractor implements the approved Monarch Roost Protection Plan for the duration of construction. The qualified biologist is responsible for: - Preparing the Monarch Roost Protection Plan - Submitting the Monarch Roost Protection Plan to the Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) for review and approval prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The construction contractor is responsible for:	The qualified biologist shall prepare a Monarch Roost Protection Plan, which shall be submitted to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.	The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the Monarch Roost Protection Plan prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
	▪ Implementing the approved Monarch Roost Protection Plan for the duration of construction. ▪ Ensuring compliance with tree and understory vegetation replacement requirements and hydrology protection measures outlined in the plan. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing and approving the Monarch Roost Protection Plan prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. ▪ Conducting periodic site inspections to verify implementation of the Monarch Roost Protection Plan during construction.					
BIO-8: Tree Protection Measures						
The construction contractor shall implement the following tree protection measures to ensure that impacts to mature native (protected) trees are minimized to the extent feasible or avoided, consistent with the City of Goleta’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Policy CE 4 and CE 9, prior to the start of project construction. The following tree protection measures shall be included within the project construction plans, including the grading and landscaping plans. All measures below shall be conducted by or under the direct supervision of an International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) certified arborist retained by the project applicant: Prior to Construction ▪ A certified arborist or qualified biologist under the supervision of the certified arborist shall monitor any ground disturbance or vegetation removal activities that have a potential to impact protected trees. ▪ Temporary fencing such as snow fencing, not less than 3 feet high with tree protection signs shall be erected around all protected trees (or tree groups) to be preserved that have a potential to be impacted during construction. The protective fence shall be installed at the protected zone boundary of each tree (or tree group), which is defined as the critical root zone. The contractor shall maintain the fence to keep it upright, taut and aligned during active construction. Fencing shall be in place and inspected by a City approved biologist prior to the start of activities with the potential to impact protected trees. Fencing shall be removed only after all construction activities with the potential to impact protected trees are complete. ▪ A pre-construction meeting shall be held between all contractors (including grading, tree removal/pruning, builders, etc.) and the project arborist. The meeting shall focus on instructing the contractors on tree protection practices. All equipment operators and spotters, assistants, or those directing operators from the ground shall provide written acknowledgement of their receiving tree protection training. This training shall include information on the location and marking of protected trees, the necessity of preventing damage, and the discussion of work practices that will accomplish such. Protection and Maintenance During Construction ▪ Contractors shall avoid heavy equipment operations, grade changes, ponding water, and fill or compaction within the protected tree zone unless where specifically approved and under the supervision of a Certified Arborist or qualified biologist in direct communication with the Certified Arborist. ▪ Contractors shall ensure that damage to the tree be avoided to the extent feasible when transporting or moving construction materials and working within or adjacent to the protected zone). If contact with the tree crown is unavoidable, affected branches may be pruned by a qualified arborist under supervision of a Certified Arborist and shall adhere to industry standards.	The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ Retaining an ISA Certified Arborist prior to the start of construction activities. ▪ Submitting construction plans that include all tree protection measures to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) for review and approval prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The qualified biologist or ISA Certified Arborist is responsible for: ▪ Monitoring any ground disturbance or vegetation removal activities that could impact protected trees. ▪ Supervising implementation of all tree protection measures The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Implementing all tree protection measures included in the approved construction plans. ▪ Ensuring compliance with fencing, irrigation, trenching, and pruning requirements under arborist supervision. ▪ Avoiding damage to protected trees during material transport and construction activities. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing and approving construction plans to ensure tree protection measures are included. ▪ Approving the ISA Certified Arborist prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.	The project applicant shall submit the construction plans that include the tree protection measures to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director for review and approval prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.	The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the construction plans to ensure this measure is included. The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall approve the arborist prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
▪ Except where specifically approved in writing beforehand, all trenching shall be done outside of the fenced protected zone. Where trenching is necessary in areas that contain roots from retained trees, contractors should use trenching techniques that include the use of either a root pruner or an Air-Spade to limit root impacts. A Certified Arborist or qualified biologist in direct communication with the Certified Arborist shall ensure that all pruning cuts be clean and sharp to minimize ripping, tearing, and fracturing of the root system. Use of both root-pruning and Air-Spade equipment shall be accompanied only by hand tools to remove soil from trench locations. The trench should be made no deeper than necessary, and when possible, alternatives to trenching should be utilized. ▪ The contractor shall be responsible for irrigating (deep watering) the trees in the summer and fall irrigation as necessary and determined by a Certified Arborist. One irrigation cycle shall thoroughly soak the root zones of the trees to a depth of two feet. The soil shall be allowed to dry out between watering to avoid keeping a consistently wet soil.. Soil moisture shall be checked with a soil probe before irrigating. The area within three feet of the trunk shall never be soaked, especially in summer months. ▪ If any protected trees are damaged to the point where continued viability is threatened, as determined by a certified arborist, the tree shall be replaced at a 3:1 ratio with like species grown from locally obtained seed. Replacement shall occur on site as feasible, or off site (within the same watershed) if on site replacement is not feasible. Replacement trees shall be monitored for a period of 5 years. Maintenance After Construction ▪ The contractors shall ensure that the mulch is kept a minimum one foot away from the trunk base and no more than 8 inches deep to avoid creating conditions favorable to the establishment and growth of decay-causing fungal pathogens.	▪ Conducting periodic site inspections to verify compliance with tree protection measures during construction.					
BIO-9: Preconstruction Semi-Aquatic Species Survey, Avoidance, and Relocation						
Prior to the start of construction activities, a qualified biologist (retained by the project applicant) shall conduct a pre-construction survey for semi-aquatic species (e.g., California red-legged frog, southwestern pond turtle) within areas of proposed ground disturbance. The survey shall be completed seven days prior to ground disturbance in dry conditions or 48 hours prior to ground disturbance in favorable conditions for upland amphibian migration (e.g., during or immediately after heavy rain events, heavy fog, or high humidity). The qualified biologist shall survey for California red-legged frog adhering to survey methods described in Revised Guidance on Site Assessment and Field Surveys for the California Red-legged Frog (USFWS 2005). Additionally, the qualified biologist shall survey for southwestern pond turtle adhering to the survey methods described in USGS Western Pond Turtle (Emys marmorata) Visual Survey Protocol for the Southcoast Ecoregion (United States Geological Survey 2006). The qualified biologist shall submit a summary of the survey results to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to initiation of ground disturbance. If a special status species is identified during construction, the construction contractor shall halt construction activities within 100 feet of the location and contact the qualified biologist. If identified during pre-construction surveys or during construction, individual special-status species in the work area shall be allowed to move out of the work area of their own volition. If special-status species are detected and do not move out of the work area, a Species Relocation and Exclusion Plan shall be prepared by the qualified biologist and submitted to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for approval prior to relocation. The Species Relocation and Exclusion Plan shall specify that if relocation by humans is required, the animal shall be captured by a qualified biologist and relocated out of harm’s way to the nearest suitable habitat, a minimum of 100 feet from the project work area where it was found. Species listed as threatened or endangered (e.g., California red-legged frog) shall only be handled as authorized by United States Fish and Wildlife Service. The qualified biologist shall document observations of special-status species on California Natural Diversity Database forms and submit the documentation to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife upon project completion. If one or more special status semi-aquatic species are detected, surveys are required each day prior to construction activities until the species has moved out of the	The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ Retaining a qualified biologist prior to the start of construction activities to conduct pre-construction surveys for semi-aquatic species (e.g., California red-legged frog, southwestern pond turtle). ▪ Ensuring surveys are completed within the required timeframe. ▪ Ensuring construction does not begin until survey results are submitted to and approved by the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee). The qualified biologist is responsible for: ▪ Conducting pre-construction surveys using approved protocols ▪ Submitting survey results to the Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to initiation of ground disturbance. ▪ Documenting observations on California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) forms and submitting to CDFW upon project completion. ▪ Conducting daily surveys prior to construction activities until species have moved or been relocated and construction is cleared to resume. ▪ Preparing and submitting monitoring results to the Planning and Environmental Review		Prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit, the qualified biologist shall submit a summary of the survey results to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director. If no special-status species are found, grading activities can commence and no further reporting is required. If species are detected and do not move out of the work area, a Species Relocation and Exclusion Plan shall be prepared by the qualified biologist and submitted to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for approval prior to relocation and commencing construction. If construction ceases for more than 30 days, a new special status survey is required.	The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review any biological survey, relocation, or exclusion reports in consultation with CDFW or USFWS. The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall conduct periodic site inspections to verify compliance with survey recommendations in the field. The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall conduct periodic spot checks to ensure that construction does not occur within the buffer during construction.		

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
work area or the qualified biologist has determined that construction may resume. Construction can commence when the semi-aquatic species moves or is relocated out of the work area and when approved by the qualified biologist. If construction ceases for more than 30 days, a new special status survey is required.	Director following completion of ground-disturbing activities. The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Halting construction activities within 100 feet of any detected special-status species and contacting the qualified biologist immediately. ▪ Complying with all buffers and relocation requirements established by the qualified biologist. ▪ Ensuring no work resumes until clearance is provided by the qualified biologist. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing and approving pre-construction survey results and any Species Relocation and Exclusion Plan prior to initiation of ground disturbance or relocation activities. ▪ Reviewing monitoring results and maintaining documentation for the duration of construction. ▪ Conducting periodic site inspections to verify compliance with species protection measures.					
BIO-10: Preconstruction Nesting Bird Surveys and Avoidance						
disturbance outside the bird and raptor breeding season, which is typically February 1 through September 1 but can vary based on local and annual climatic conditions. If construction begins within the breeding season, then not more than seven days before demolition, ground disturbance, and/or vegetation removal commences, a bird and raptor preconstruction survey shall be conducted by a City-approved biologist (retained by the project applicant) within the disturbance footprint, plus a 300-foot buffer. The survey shall be conducted by a biologist familiar with the identification of bird species known to occur in southern California. The City-approved biologist shall conduct the preconstruction nesting bird and raptor surveys during the time of day when bird species are active and for a sufficient duration to reliably conclude presence/absence of nesting birds and raptors within the 300-foot buffer. The City-approved biologist shall submit a summary of the nesting bird and raptor survey results to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee. Survey conclusions shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to initiation of construction. If no bird nests are observed no further mitigation is required. If an active nest of species protected by the California Fish and Game Code (§ 3503) or Migratory Bird Treaty Act are found within 300 feet of the disturbance footprint, the City-approved biologist shall flag their locations and map their locations on an aerial photograph of the disturbance footprint at a scale no less than 1”=200’ and/or recorded with the use of a Global Positioning System (GPS) unit. If active raptor nests are detected, the map shall include topographic lines, parcel boundaries, adjacent roads, known historical nests for protected nesting species, and known roosting or foraging areas, as required by the City of Goleta’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Policy CE 8.3. The buffer shall be 300 feet in compliance with the City of Goleta’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Policy CE 8.4. If the 300-foot buffer is infeasible, the City-approved biologist may reduce the buffer distance as appropriate, depending upon the species and the proposed work activities. If any active non-raptor bird nests are found, the City-approved biologist shall establish a suitable buffer area (varying from	The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ Retaining a City-approved biologist prior to initiation of construction activities during the bird and raptor breeding season. ▪ Ensuring construction does not begin until pre-construction survey results are submitted to and approved by the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee). ▪ Funding a City-contracted biological monitor if work within an active nest buffer is necessary. The qualified biologist is responsible for: ▪ Conducting a pre-construction nesting bird and raptor survey no more than seven days prior to demolition, grading, vegetation removal, or other ground-disturbing activities during the breeding season. ▪ Surveying the disturbance footprint plus a 300-foot buffer, during times when birds are active, and for sufficient duration to confirm presence/absence of nests. ▪ Submitting a summary of survey results to the Planning and Environmental Review	The survey shall be conducted no more than seven (7) days prior to commencement of any demolition, grading, and/or vegetation removal activities. Survey conclusions shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to the commencement of construction activities that could disturb suitable nesting habitat, such as demolition, grading, and/or vegetation removal. This measure, and any buffer requirements, shall be incorporated into the grading plans.	The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review any biological survey reports and conduct periodic site inspections to verify compliance with survey recommendations in the field. The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall conduct periodic spot checks to ensure that construction does not occur within the buffer during construction.			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
25 to 300 feet), depending on the species. The construction contractor shall ensure that no ground disturbance occurs within the buffer until the City-approved biologist confirms that the breeding/nesting is completed and all the young have fledged, and removes the buffer. If work within the buffer is necessary, a City-contracted biological monitor (funded by the project applicant) shall monitor the active nest full-time during construction activities within the buffer to ensure project activities are not indirectly impacting protected nesting birds and raptors. If work ceases for more than 30 days, a new nesting bird survey shall be conducted in accordance with this measure.	Director (or designee) for review and approval prior to construction. ▪ Flagging and mapping nest locations, and establishing buffers, if required. ▪ Confirming when nesting is complete and young have fledged before removing buffers. ▪ Monitoring active nests full-time if work within a buffer is necessary, ensuring no indirect impacts occur. ▪ Conducting a new nesting bird survey if work ceases for more than 30 days. The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Ensuring no ground disturbance occurs within established buffers until cleared by the City-approved biologist. ▪ Coordinating with the biologist and City if work within a buffer is unavoidable. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing and approving survey reports prior to construction. ▪ Verifying buffer requirements are incorporated into grading plans. ▪ Conducting periodic site inspections to confirm compliance with survey recommendations and buffer protections.					
BIO-11: Compensatory Mitigation for Impacts on Sensitive Communities and Riparian Habitat						
Onsite mitigation shall be provided to compensate for the permanent loss of arroyo willow thickets/riparian habitat (0.002 acre) at a ratio of 5:1. Temporary impacts to arroyo willow thickets/riparian habitat (0.005 acre), eucalyptus woodland/riparian habitat (0.04 acre), and non-wetland waters of the United States and State (0.002 acre) shall be restored at a 1:1 ratio. Details of the mitigation program requirements shall be described in a Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Program (HMMP). A qualified biologist, retained by the project applicant, shall prepare the HMMP. Final landscape plans for the project shall not include removal of sensitive vegetation or aquatic resources in areas for landscaping purposes only (where no construction ground disturbances, including grading, trenching, excavation for bioretention basins or other drainage or utility features, is proposed). Requirements described in the HMMP shall include: ▪ Specification that mitigation shall be on-site and shall occur adjacent, or as near as possible, to any removed habitat area. Mitigation for loss of arroyo willow/riparian habitat associated with Devereux Creek shall occur only along Devereux Creek, and near the area of impacts to the extent possible. ▪ Mitigation for the loss of riparian habitat and non-wetland waters of the United States and State shall conform with any requirements included within a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement provided by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, a Clean Water Act 401 Certification issued by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, or USACE Clean Water Act Section 404 permit. ▪ The mitigation program shall conform with all requirements of the City of Goleta’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan and the City of Goleta Creeks and Watershed Management Plan.	The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ Retaining a qualified biologist prior to initiation of construction activities to prepare an HMMP. ▪ Ensuring final landscape plans do not include removal of sensitive vegetation or aquatic resources for landscaping purposes only. The qualified biologist is responsible for: ▪ Preparing the HMMP. ▪ Submitting the HMMP to the Planning and Environmental Review Director for approval prior to construction. The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Implementing all restoration and mitigation measures described in the approved HMMP during and after construction. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing and approving the HMMP prior to initiation of construction activities.	The project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to prepare an HMMP prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The qualified biologist shall submit the HMMP to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.	The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the HMMP prior to the start of construction activities. The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall ensure compliance with the onsite mitigation requirements and monitor the restoration efforts throughout the 5-year monitoring period.			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
▪ Specification of a 5-year monitoring period for all restoration areas. ▪ Development of a plant palate for each restoration area (arroyo willow thicket/riparian, eucalyptus woodland, non-wetland waters of the United States and State) in keeping with the character and plant composition of the native community being restored. ▪ Restoration for temporary impacts within monarch butterfly winter roosting habitat shall conform with requirements of the City of Goleta’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. ▪ Defined attainable and measurable goals and objectives to be achieved through implementation of the HMMP. ▪ A restoration work plan that details methodologies, a restoration schedule, plant materials (seed), and implementation strategies. Performance standards for the restoration work plan shall include achievement of vegetation cover, species diversity, and soil stability standards. ▪ A detailed maintenance plan to include removal of invasive non-native species. ▪ A monitoring plan that includes methods and analysis of results, goals for success or failure, and an adaptive management plan and suggestions for failed restoration efforts. ▪ Restoration activities using native species from locally collected stock. The qualified biologist shall submit the HMPP to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to initiation of construction activities.	▪ Conducting periodic site inspections to verify implementation of HMMP requirements during construction and restoration phases.					
Cultural Resources						
CUL-1: Architectural Monitoring for Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station						
The project applicant shall retain a Secretary of Interior’s Professionally Qualified architectural historian and/or the City’s Urban Historian (qualified historian) to ensure the project implementation utilizes the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and guidelines from the National Park Service including: ▪ Preservation Brief #9, The Repair of Historic Wood Windows ▪ Preservation Brief #10, Exterior Paint Problems on Historic Woodwork ▪ Preservation Brief #32, The Preservation and Repair of Historic Stuccowork ▪ Preservation Brief #45, Preserving Historic Wood Porches The project applicant shall provide proof of retainment of the qualified historian to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the building permit for the renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. The requirement shall be referenced in the construction plans for the Rio Grande Coffee Shop intended for use by the construction contractor(s). Prior to the start of renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, the qualified historian shall review the replacements, materials, finishes, designs, colors, textures, and other visual qualities for consistency with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. During renovation of the Barnsdall Grande Gas Station, the qualified historian shall conduct weekly spot checks to monitor construction progress for consistency with the Standards for Rehabilitation. Monitoring may be increased or reduced as deemed necessary by the qualified historian with approval by the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee. The qualified historian shall have the authority to halt work if inconsistent with the Standards for Rehabilitation and develop a plan to revise the work for consistency with the Standards for Rehabilitation in consultation with the City and contractor(s). Throughout the renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, the qualified historian shall submit a weekly update to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director to document compliance. The update shall include date of monitoring, project progress, compliance or non-compliance with the Standards for Rehabilitation, and necessary actions to ensure compliance with the Standards for Rehabilitation.	The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ Retaining a Secretary of Interior’s Professionally Qualified architectural historian and/or the City’s Urban Historian (qualified historian) prior to renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. ▪ Providing proof of retainment of the qualified historian to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee). ▪ Including Mitigation Measure CUL-1 in the construction plans for the Rio Grande Coffee Shop intended for use by the construction contractor(s). The qualified historian is responsible for: ▪ Ensuring project implementation follows the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and National Park Service guidelines. ▪ Reviewing replacements, materials, finishes, designs, colors, textures, and other visual qualities prior to the start of renovation for consistency with the Standards for Rehabilitation. ▪ Conducting weekly spot checks during renovation to monitor compliance with the Standards for Rehabilitation (frequency may be adjusted with City approval). ▪ Exercising authority to halt work if inconsistencies are identified and developing a corrective plan in consultation with the City and contractor(s).	Prior to renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, the project applicant shall retain a qualified historian. The qualified historian shall review project plans for replacements, materials, finishes, designs, colors, textures, and other visual qualities for consistency with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation prior to and during renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. Proof of retainment shall be provided to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the building permit for the renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station.	Throughout the renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, the qualified historian shall submit a weekly update to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director to document compliance. The update shall include date of monitoring, project progress, and compliance or non-compliance with the Standards for Rehabilitation, and necessary actions to ensure compliance with the Standards for Rehabilitation. The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review the weekly updates.			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
	Submitting weekly compliance updates to the Planning and Environmental Review Director,					
	The construction contractor is responsible for: - Implementing the approved construction plans and adhering to the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and guidance provided by the qualified historian. - Cooperating with the qualified historian during weekly spot checks and any corrective actions. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: - Reviewing proof of historian retainment prior to Zoning Clearance for the building permit. - Reviewing weekly compliance updates submitted by the qualified historian. - Approving any adjustments to monitoring frequency as recommended by the qualified historian.					
CUL-2: Archaeological Monitoring						
Prior to ground disturbance activities, the project applicant shall retain an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards (qualified archaeologist) and has experience in California prehistoric and historic resources (experience within City of Goleta or Santa Barbara County preferred). The project applicant shall provide proof of retainment of the qualified archaeologist to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The qualified archaeologist shall prepare a Cultural Resource Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan (Plan), conduct archaeological monitoring, and address any inadvertent discoveries identified during project implementation (refer to Mitigation Measure CUL-4). The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the Plan prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The Plan shall outline archaeological and Native American resource monitoring protocols, as well as a program for treatment and mitigation in the case of an inadvertent discovery of cultural resources during project-related ground-disturbance. The Plan shall also provide for the proper identification, evaluation, treatment, and protection of any cultural resources in accordance with CEQA throughout the duration of the project. The Plan shall be incorporated and referenced in all grading and construction plans intended for use by the construction contractor(s). The qualified archaeologist shall manage archaeological monitoring during initial ground disturbance activities, defined as construction-related earth moving of sediments from their place of deposition. This definition excludes movement of sediments after they have been initially disturbed or displaced by project-related construction. The qualified archaeologist shall oversee and establish monitoring efforts as needed (increase, decrease, or discontinue monitoring frequency) based on the observed potential for construction activities to encounter cultural deposits or material. The qualified archaeologist shall ensure all daily monitoring logs are maintained. The requirement for archaeological monitoring shall be noted on all demolition and grading plans. The qualified archaeologist shall prepare an archaeological monitoring report within 60 days following completion of ground disturbance, and shall submit the archaeological monitoring report to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review. The archaeological monitoring report shall document compliance with approved cultural resource mitigation measures, include all monitoring efforts, and include an appendix with the daily monitoring logs. The qualified archaeological	The project applicant is responsible for: - Retaining a qualified archaeologist. - Providing proof of retainment of the qualified archaeologist to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. - Ensuring the Plan is incorporated and referenced in all grading and construction plans intended for use by the construction contractor(s). The qualified archaeologist is responsible for: - Preparing the Plan. - Submitting the Plan to the Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) for review and approval prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. - Managing archaeological monitoring during initial ground disturbance activities. - Adjusting monitoring frequency based on observed potential for encountering cultural deposits. - Maintaining daily monitoring logs. - Preparing an archaeological monitoring report within 60 days following completion of ground disturbance. - Submitting the final archaeological monitoring report the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director	Prior to ground disturbance, the project applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist. The qualified archaeologist shall create a Plan, conduct monitoring, and address any discoveries during project construction. Proof of retainment shall be provided to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The Plan shall outline monitoring protocols and treatment for any discovered cultural resources, ensuring compliance with CEQA. The Plan shall be referenced in all grading and construction plans. The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the Plan prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.	The qualified archaeologist shall manage monitoring during initial ground disturbance, adjusting efforts based on the potential to encounter cultural deposits. Daily monitoring logs shall be maintained. The qualified archaeologist shall prepare an archaeological monitoring report, documenting compliance and monitoring efforts, and shall submit the archaeological monitoring report to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review, within 60 days following completion of ground disturbance. The qualified archaeological shall submit the final archaeological monitoring report to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director and the Central Coast Information Center.			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
shall submit the final archaeological monitoring report to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director and the Central Coast Information Center.	(or designee) and the Central Coast Information Center. The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Implementing all requirements of the approved Plan. ▪ Cooperating with the qualified archaeologist during monitoring and any necessary adjustments to construction activities. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing and approving the Cultural Resource Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. ▪ Reviewing the archaeological monitoring report upon completion of ground disturbance. ▪ Conducting periodic site inspections to verify compliance with archaeological monitoring requirements.					
CUL-3: Workers Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) Training						
All construction personnel and monitors who are not trained archaeologists shall be briefed regarding unanticipated discoveries of archaeological resources prior to the start of construction activities. A basic presentation shall be prepared and presented by the qualified archaeologist, or their designee, to inform all construction personnel working on the project about the archaeological sensitivity of the area. The purpose of the WEAP training is to provide specific details on the kinds of archaeological materials that may be identified during construction and explain the importance of and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. Each worker shall also learn the proper procedures to follow in the event archaeological resources or human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities. These procedures include work curtailment or redirection, and the immediate contact of the qualified archaeologist and if appropriate, Native American representative. If new construction personnel are added to the project, the crew foreman shall ensure the new personnel receive the WEAP training before starting work. The necessity of training attendance shall be stated on all demolition, grading, or construction plans and the project applicant shall maintain records demonstrating construction worker WEAP participation. The project applicant shall submit the records of construction worker WEAP participation to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to construction activities and as-needed after the addition of new personnel.	The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ Retaining a qualified archaeologist (or their designee) to conduct WEAP training for all construction personnel and monitors who are not trained archaeologists prior to the start of construction activities. ▪ Maintaining records of WEAP participation and submitting these records to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) prior to construction activities and as needed when new personnel are added. ▪ Ensuring the necessity of WEAP training attendance is stated on all demolition, grading, and construction plans. The qualified archaeologist (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Preparing and presenting a basic WEAP training presentation. ▪ Conducting WEAP training for all construction personnel prior to the start of work and for any new personnel added during construction. The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Ensuring all construction personnel attend WEAP training prior to starting work.	This measure shall be incorporated into the grading, demolition, and construction plans and the WEAP shall be provided on-site prior to and as-needed during construction.	Records of construction worker WEAP participation shall be kept on file with the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director for the duration of construction.			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
	- Ensuring new personnel receive WEAP training before beginning work on the project. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: - Reviewing and maintaining records of WEAP participation for the duration of construction. - Verifying that WEAP training requirements are incorporated into demolition, grading, and construction plans.					
CUL-4: Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources						
If unanticipated cultural resources are discovered during project-related ground disturbance activities, the following procedures shall be implemented: - In the event that archaeological resources are unexpectedly encountered during ground-disturbing activities, the construction contractor(s) shall halt work within 50 feet of the find and contact the qualified archaeologist. The qualified archaeologist retained pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-2 shall immediately evaluate the resource. - If the resource is determined to be potentially significant, then the qualified archaeologist, project applicant, Native American monitor (if resources are Native American in origin), and City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall meet to discuss the significance of the find. At the meeting, a decision shall be made, with the concurrence by the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc.) for the cultural resource. - Treatment and avoidance of the newly discovered resource(s) shall be consistent with the Plan prepared pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-2. This may include avoidance of the cultural resources through project design, in-place preservation of cultural resources located in native soils, and/or re-burial within the immediate vicinity so they are not subject to further disturbance in perpetuity. If avoidance is infeasible, then treatment shall be implemented pursuant to the Plan. The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall make the final determination based on the provisions of CEQA with respect to archaeological resources and recommendations of the qualified archaeologist. - Further ground disturbance, including but not limited to grading and trenching, shall not resume within the area of the discovery until the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, has determined the appropriate mitigation has been implemented pursuant to the Plan and the qualified archaeologist has notified the construction contractor(s) to resume work. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the 50-foot buffer area and shall be monitored by additional archaeological monitors, if necessary. - If the resource proves to be eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources and significant impacts to the resource cannot be avoided via project redesign, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare a data recovery plan tailored to the physical nature and characteristics of the resource, pursuant to the requirements of the <i>CEQA Guidelines</i> Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C). The data recovery plan shall identify data recovery excavation methods, measurable objectives, and data thresholds to reduce any significant impacts to cultural resources related to the resource. The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the treatment plan and archaeological testing as appropriate. The qualified archaeologist shall submit the resulting documentation to the regional repository of the California Historical Resources Information System pursuant to <i>CEQA Guidelines</i> Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C).	The project applicant is responsible for: - Ensuring the construction contractor and qualified archaeologist retained under Mitigation Measure CUL-2 are available to respond to any inadvertent discoveries during ground-disturbing activities. - Coordinating with the qualified archaeologist, Native American monitor (if applicable), and the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) to determine appropriate treatment measures if cultural resources are discovered. The qualified archaeologist is responsible for: - Immediately evaluating any archaeological resource encountered during ground-disturbing activities within 50 feet of the find. - If the resource is potentially significant, following the protocol outlined in Mitigation Measure CUL-4 - Providing evidence of compliance with this measure to the Planning and Environmental Review Director and CHRIS upon completion of treatment or data recovery. The construction contractor is responsible for: - Halting work within 50 feet of any discovered resource and contacting the qualified archaeologist immediately. - Ensuring no ground disturbance resumes within the discovery area until the Planning and Environmental Review Director determines appropriate mitigation has been implemented, and the qualified archaeologist authorizes resumption of work. - Continuing work outside the 50-foot buffer, with additional archaeological monitors if required.	If unanticipated cultural resources are discovered during ground disturbance, the construction contractor(s) shall halt work within 50 feet of the find and contact the qualified archaeologist. The qualified archaeologist shall evaluate the resource immediately. If the resource is potentially significant, the qualified archaeologist, project applicant, Native American monitor (if applicable), and City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall meet to decide on appropriate mitigation. Treatment and avoidance shall follow the Plan from Mitigation Measure CUL-2. The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall make the final determination based on CEQA provisions. Ground disturbance shall not resume in the area until the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, has verified that mitigation is implemented. Work outside the 50-foot buffer shall continue with additional monitoring if necessary.	The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the data recovery plan (if applicable). The qualified archaeologist shall submit documentation to the California Historical Resources Information System. The qualified archaeologist shall provide evidence of compliance to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director and the California Historical Resources Information System upon completion.			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
The qualified archaeologist shall provide evidence of compliance with this mitigation measure, if a significant archaeological resource is found, to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director and the appropriate California Historical Resources Information System Information Center upon completion of the data recovery plan detailing the significance of the resource and treatment findings.	The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: - Reviewing and approving treatment measures or data recovery plans for discovered cultural resources. - Making the final determination on mitigation measures based on CEQA provisions and archaeologist recommendations. - Authorizing resumption of work within the discovery area once mitigation is complete.					
Geology and Soils						
GEO-1: Geotechnical Design						
The applicant’s project design engineer shall incorporate the recommendations listed below from the <i>Site-Specific Hazards Study and Preliminary Foundation Investigation</i> (Appendix F-1), <i>Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed Club House</i> (Appendix F-2), and the <i>Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed Comfort Station</i> (Appendix F-3) into the project’s grading and building plans. The applicant shall submit the grading and building plans to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee for review and approval prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for the grading and building permits for the project. The applicant shall also retain a licensed geotechnical professional approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee prior to the start of construction. The licensed geotechnical professional shall be responsible for ensuring proper implementation of the recommendations below and providing a report to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee certifying the recommendations below have been incorporated into project design and throughout construction prior to the issuance of a certification of occupancy. Grading (General) - The area to be graded shall be cleared of surface vegetation, including roots and root structures. - If, during the removal and scarification process, excessive root structures are encountered, these areas shall be deep ripped in two directions to the depth of the root structure, after which the disturbed soils and the roots shall be completely removed, and the resulting cavities shall be scarified and processed to receive fill in accordance with recommendations contained in this section. - If, during the grading operations, previously placed undocumented fill material is encountered, this fill material shall be removed under the direction of the project design engineer prior to commencement of the filling operations. - Removed surface soils and/or imported approved fill will be placed in loose lifts of approximately 6 inches, thoroughly mixed, moistened or dried to near optimum moisture content, and compacted to a minimum of 90 percent relative compaction. - Rocks greater than 6 inches in size shall be removed from the soil being spread for compaction. - Import soils, if required for compacted fill, shall be granular, non-expansive soils which are equal to, or superior in quality to, the on-site soils as determined by the project design engineer prior to importation of the fill material to the site. - The compaction standard shall be the latest adoption of the ASTM D-1557 method of compaction. - Positive surface drainage shall direct water away from all slopes and away from the foundation system of the proposed structure. Grading (Clubhouse) - In areas where compacted fill soil is to be placed, the area to receive the fill soil shall be prepared. In the area to be prepared, the loose topsoil and compressible surface soils shall be removed and observed by the project design engineer. Upon approval of excavation,	The project applicant is responsible for: - Retaining a licensed geotechnical professional (approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee) prior to the start of construction to oversee implementation of all geotechnical recommendations and certify incorporation into design and construction. - Submitting grading and building plans (Clubhouse, Comfort Station, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop) that incorporate all recommendations listed in Mitigation Measure GEO-1. - Ensuring the licensed geotechnical professional provides a certification report to the Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy, confirming recommendations were implemented in design and throughout construction. The project design engineer is responsible for: - Incorporating all geotechnical recommendations into the grading, foundation, pavement, and retaining wall plans for each project element (Clubhouse, Comfort Station, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop). The licensed geotechnical engineer is responsible for: - Overseeing implementation of all recommendations during grading, foundations, pavement, and retaining wall construction. - Inspecting footing excavations prior to placement of reinforcing steel and forms. - Advising on backfill compaction methods, especially within sensitive wedges (1:1 zones), and issuing modified compaction recommendations immediately if wall rotation or instability is observed.	Grading and building plans shall be submitted for review and approval by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee before the City issues a Zoning Clearance for the grading and building permits. The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall approve the licensed geotechnical professional prior to the start of construction. The licensed geotechnical professional shall submit the report to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee certifying the recommendations have been incorporated prior to the issuance of a certification of occupancy.	Once during the grading phase of construction, the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall visit the project site to confirm with the licensed geotechnical professional that the construction contractor is implementing the applicable geotechnical recommendations.			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
the exposed ground surface shall be scarified an additional 6 to 8 inches, moistened or dried to near the optimum moisture content, and compacted to 90 percent of the relative compaction. 2. The footings of the proposed structures shall be supported completely on firm undisturbed original ground. The structures shall not be supported over a cut/fill transition unless the foundation is engineered to account for the transition. 3. All fill slopes which are created during the grading operation shall be properly shaped to a maximum slope angle of 2 horizontal to 1 vertical, and compacted by rolling the sheepsfoot roller or similar compaction equipment over the slope face at vertical lift intervals of 30 inches or less. Grading (Comfort Station) 1. The footings of the proposed structures shall be supported completely by a uniform thickness of non-expansive compacted soil. The structures shall not be supported over a cut/fill transition. 2. Beneath the proposed structures and for a minimum distance of 5 feet beyond the exterior perimeters, the loose topsoil and compressible surface soils shall be removed and observed by a representative of our firm. Upon approval of excavation, the exposed ground surface shall be scarified an additional 6 to 8 inches, moistened or dried to near the optimum moisture content, and compacted to 90 percent of the relative compaction. The minimum depth of removal shall be at least 12 inches below the bottom of the proposed footings. Grading (Rio Grande Coffee Shop) 1. It should be noted gas tanks that were buried on the property have been removed and the resulting void was backfilled with an imported yellow sand. If these backfilled areas are located below the proposed structures, backfill soil shall be removed and replaced at 95 percent compaction. 2. The footings of the proposed structures shall either be supported completely by a uniform thickness of non-expansive compacted fill or the foundations shall be designed to penetrate the fill and compressible topsoil such that the structure is supported either completely over fill or completely on firm original ground. The structures shall not be supported over a cut/fill transition unless the foundation is engineered to account for the transition. 3. Beneath the proposed structures and for a minimum distance of 5 feet beyond the exterior perimeters, the loose topsoil and compressible surface soils shall be removed and observed by the project design engineer. Upon approval of excavation, the exposed ground surface shall be scarified an additional 6 to 8 inches, moistened or dried to near the optimum moisture content, and compacted to 90 percent of the relative compaction. The minimum depth of removal shall be at least 12 inches below the bottom of the proposed footings. Foundations (General) 1. All footings shall contain a minimum of two No. 4 horizontal rebar; one placed in the base and one in the stem of the footing. The project design engineer shall specify the foundation steel reinforcement. 2. Concrete slab-on-grade floors shall be placed over a subgrade soil conforming to the <i>Grading</i> recommendations of this mitigation measure. 3. As a minimum, concrete slabs on grade shall be a full 4 inches thick and shall contain No. 3 rebar spaced 24 inches on center each way. The steel reinforcement shall be placed near the center of the slab. Concrete slabs on grade shall be doweled into all adjacent footings using No. 3 rebar spaced 24 inches on center. The traditional or conventional subgrade preparation below a concrete slab-on-grade floor is some variation of the following: A minimum 4- inch coarse, washed concrete sand layer is placed over the soil subgrade. A 10-mil or heavier impervious membrane is placed over the sand layer. These concrete slab-on-grade and sand layer recommendations shall be modified and/or eliminated as needed by the designers for surcharge loads, wheel loads, concentrated loads, or for moisture control. The floor covering supplier or manufacturer will be contacted for their specifications for	- Performing/overseeing R-Value testing (if asphalt pavement selected) to size base and asphalt thicknesses. - Providing a certification report to the Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) prior to certificate of occupancy, confirming full compliance with the recommendations. The construction contractor is responsible for: - Implementing all grading, foundation, pavement, and retaining wall measures in the approved plans The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: - Reviewing and approving grading and building plans for conformance with Mitigation Measure GEO-1 prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading and building permits. - Approving the licensed geotechnical professional prior to construction start. - Receiving and reviewing the geotechnical certification report prior to certificate of occupancy. - Conducting periodic site inspections to verify implementation of geotechnical recommendations during construction.					

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
design features, which will result in a successful bond between the concrete slab and floor covering. Floor flatness and shrinkage crack control must be addressed by a competent contractor experienced in the skill of concrete placement. The owners or their agents shall inform those designing, building, and installing the concrete slab on grade and flooring of the performance and aesthetics expected. 4. The licensed geotechnical engineer shall be requested to inspect the footing excavation prior to placement of reinforcing steel and timber form boards. 5. Floor elevations located lower than the surrounding exterior grades are recommended to be protected from moisture intrusion. The project design engineer shall consider installation of features, such as waterproofing and French drains.						
Foundations (Clubhouse) 1. These recommendations assume the undisturbed native soil will support the proposed footings. If the final graded conditions positions part of the building over the compacted fill soil, extended footings and/or a pile and grade beam foundation may be required over the fill sections. The footing depth below the lowest adjacent grade shall be minimum of 24 inches. The soil encountered at this depth must be firm, non-porous, undisturbed native soil and the footing excavation must penetrate at least 12 inches into the firm soil. An allowable soil bearing value of 2,000 pounds per square foot may be assumed for the 24 inch deep footing described above with a one-third increase for wind or seismic forces. 2. Specification No. 1 shall apply at the basement foundation elevation and at the basement level a 20% increase in allowable soil bearing is allowed for each additional 6 inches of depth below the lowest adjacent grade, up to maximum allowable soil bearing value of 3,000 pounds per square foot. 3. Isolated piers may be utilized and shall extend a minimum of 24 inches below the lowest adjacent ground surface. 4. If footings are to be located on, adjacent to, or within 10 feet of the top of a slope, these footings shall extend to such a depth so that the horizontal distance between the bottom outside edge of the footing and the face of the adjacent slope is a minimum distance of 10 feet The slope setback required by the CBC, Figure 1808.7.1, shall also apply.						
Foundations (Comfort Station) 1. These recommendations assume a uniform thickness of compacted soil will support the proposed footings. 2. Isolated piers may be utilized and shall extend a minimum of 18 inches below compacted ground surface. 3. Based upon compliance with these recommendations, an allowable soil bearing value for compacted soil of 1,500 pounds per square foot for 12-inch-deep footings and 2,000 pounds per square foot for 18-inch-deep footings, with a one-third increase when considering wind or seismic forces, may be assumed.						
Foundations (Rio Grande Coffee Shop) 1. These recommendations assume a uniform thickness of compacted soil will support the proposed footings. 2. Footings below two-story portions of the structure shall extend 18 inches below compacted ground surface. 3. Isolated piers may be utilized and shall extend a minimum of 18 inches below compacted ground surface. 4. Based upon compliance with the above recommendations, an allowable soil bearing value for compacted soil of 1,300 pounds per square foot for 12-inch-deep footings and 1,500 pounds per square foot for 18-inch-deep footings, with a one-third increase when considering wind or seismic forces, may be assumed.						
Pavement (Clubhouse) 1. In the areas to be paved, the top loose surface soils shall be removed from below the proposed final soil subgrade elevation, moistened or dried to at or near the optimum						

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
moisture content, and compacted to 90 percent relative compaction with the top 9 inches being compacted to 95 percent relative compaction where pavement will be subject to vehicle travel or parking. The subgrade area shall be check rolled in order to detect isolated soft spots. Any areas found to be yielding under the wheel loads of the equipment shall be stabilized by removal and compaction.						
2. The Class 2 aggregate base shall be recompacted to a minimum of 95 percent relative compaction in accordance with the ASTM D-1557 test method. Asphalt concrete shall be placed only after the Class 2 aggregate base has been demonstrated to be firm and unyielding.						
3. If asphalt pavement is selected for the finished pavement surface, an R-Value of the subgrade soil shall be performed by a licensed geotechnical professional in order to provide appropriate thickness of Class 2 aggregate base and asphalt concrete.						
4. Maintenance to assist in reducing the potential for rapid deterioration of the asphalt paved areas shall include surface treatment approximately six months to one year after construction and approximately three years from the first treatment. Pavement conditions shall be reviewed at least once a year for cracks, puddling of surface water, and overall appearance. This review should be done in the fall such that cracks may be repaired which may otherwise allow moisture to pass through the pavement and weaken the subgrade.						
5. For concrete slab on grade pavements the slab shall be a minimum of 5.5 inches thick and be placed over a 4 inch thick layer of compacted Class 2 base (at 95 percent relative compaction) and shall be reinforced with No. 3 rebar at 24 inches on center each way and placed at the mid-height of the slab thickness.						
Pavement (Rio Grande Coffee Shop)						
1. In the areas to be paved, the top loose surface soils shall be removed from below the proposed final soil subgrade elevation, moistened or dried to at or near the optimum moisture content, and compacted to 90 percent relative compaction with the top 9 inches being compacted to 95 percent relative compaction where pavement will be subject to vehicle travel or parking. The subgrade area shall be check rolled in order to detect isolated soft spots. Any areas found to be yielding under the wheel loads of the equipment shall be stabilized by removal and compaction.						
2. The Class 2 aggregate base shall be recompacted to a minimum of 95 percent relative compaction in accordance with the ASTM D-1557 test method. Asphalt concrete shall be placed only after the Class 2 aggregate base has been demonstrated to be firm and unyielding.						
3. If asphalt pavement is selected for the finished pavement surface, an R-Value of the subgrade soil shall be performed by a licensed geotechnical professional in order to provide appropriate thickness of Class 2 aggregate base and asphalt concrete.						
4. Maintenance to assist in reducing the potential for rapid deterioration of the asphalt paved areas shall include surface treatment approximately six months to one year after construction and approximately three years from the first treatment. Pavement conditions shall be reviewed at least once a year for cracks, puddling of surface water, and overall appearance. This review should be done in the fall such that cracks may be repaired which may otherwise allow moisture to pass through the pavement and weaken the subgrade.						
Retaining Walls (Clubhouse)						
The following retaining wall recommendations assume a single wall on level ground or a slope of less than 25 degrees. If there is more than one retaining wall, creating a multilevel terraced condition, the upper footing must be at a depth that passes below a 50 percent sloping line projected up from the top of the footing of the retaining wall below.						
Cantilevered: For cantilevered retaining walls, such as site walls and garden walls, which do not form part of the structure, the following shall apply:						
1. The cantilevered retaining wall shall be designed assuming an active soil pressure equivalent to a fluid (EFP) whose weight is 35 pounds per cubic foot for level backfill conditions and 52 pounds per cubic foot for backfill slopes, which are constructed at an angle of up to 27 degrees. These values are based on Coulomb’s Equation and the following						

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
assumed backfill soil values: internal angle of friction equal to 34 degrees, cohesion equal to 0, and a total unit weight of soil equal to 125 pounds per cubic foot. The EFP value does not include surcharge loads and is based on a free-draining condition. The free-draining condition must be created by placing the backfill specified in the <i>Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed Club House</i>. 2. Retaining walls may be designed using pseudostatic analyses based on a modified Seed Whitman (1970) approach. The need to apply the lateral seismic load is to be determined by the project design engineer or by the building code. The seismic earth force was estimated using the modified Seed Whitman (1970) method, assuming a horizontal peak ground acceleration of 1.142g, and assuming drained backfill conditions. The peak horizontal ground acceleration (PGAm) was determined in accordance with Section 1803.5.12 of the 2019 CBC, Paragraph 2.2. The seismic earth resultant force (ΔPae), acting on the stem of the retaining wall, may be estimated as $\Delta Pae = 34.4H^2$. The resultant force (ΔPae) may be assumed to act at 0.33H above the base of the wall2. $K_h = 0.765$. 3. The bottom of the retaining wall footing shall extend a minimum distance of 24 inches below the lowest adjacent undisturbed natural grade or 12 inches into firm, undisturbed original ground (whichever is deeper) and shall be designed assuming an allowable soil bearing value of 2,000 pounds per square foot. For footings placed on slopes, the base of the toe or keyway placed at the toe shall extend to such a depth that there exists 10 horizontal feet between the bottom of the footing and the daylight line of the adjacent slope. The key may be placed adjacent to the downhill edge of the retaining wall footing in order to attain the recommended downhill grade footing embedment. The slope setback required by the CBC, Figure 1808.7.1, shall also apply. 4. A passive soil pressure equivalent to a fluid whose weight is 350 pounds per cubic foot and a coefficient of friction against sliding of 0.35 may be assumed for the footing excavation described in the recommendation above. 5. The use of equipment to compact soil within the wedge of backfill defined by a 1:1 line projected up from behind the retaining wall to the surface shall be limited to handheld rammer plate compactors, such as a Wacker BS 45Y. A string line shall be placed along the top of the wall to monitor possible rotation of the wall due to the compaction surcharge. If the wall begins to bow or lean away from the backfilling operations, the compaction process shall stop and the licensed geotechnical professional shall be notified immediately such that modified compaction recommendations can be given at that time. 6. The finish covering on the face of the wall, such as stucco or paint, may be adversely affected by moisture intrusion from the backfill through the back of the wall. To prevent this, the back of the wall and footing shall be waterproofed. All waterproofing and application of waterproofing shall be in accordance with the specifications of the product supplier. 7. Retaining wall backfill shall be a clean, coarse sand or gravel wrapped in a filter fabric. The gravel shall be separated from adjacent native soil by a filter fabric. The retaining wall shall be serviced by appropriately placed weep holes or a perforated drain. This drainage feature must include at least 2 cubic feet of gravel wrapped in filter fabric. Lower quality native backfill material may be utilized outside the triangular wedge, which extends upwards from the inside edge of the retaining wall and is a minimum width of 60 percent of the wall height at ground surface. The sand between the wall and native soil shall have a Sand Equivalent of 20 or greater and an Expansion Index equal to 0. To avoid excessive amounts of sand and gravel backfill, the construction contractor is prohibited to cut a vertical excavation 2 to 4 feet beyond the back of the retaining wall footing or stem. Cuts shall only occur to the point needed to install the drainpipe and slope the excavation back as specified. 8. It is assumed that the rough grade excavation behind the retaining wall is to be cut at a temporary slope angle of 1 horizontal to 1 vertical in order to comply with Cal-OSHA safety requirements. 9. All soil backfill shall be compacted to a minimum of 90 percent relative compaction. It should be noted, retaining walls designed assuming active soil conditions are anticipated to						

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
deflect seasonally. In addition, surface features which obtain their support from retaining wall backfill materials are anticipated to express differential movement with respect to the retaining wall as the wall may be resting upon a thinner depth of fill or undisturbed original ground, and the surface features may be resting upon a considerable thickness of compacted fill, which has settlement characteristics differing from that of original ground. The differential movement between the wall and slab patio may be undesirable. In order to hide or prevent such differential movement, an alternate design may be required, such as, but not limited to, placing a planter between the wall and slab, or connecting the slab to the wall, creating a retaining wall which is pinned at the top, not cantilevered. Partially Restrained: For restrained or partially restrained retaining walls or cantilevered retaining walls which form a portion of the foundation system of the structure, the wall shall be designed as a braced wall utilizing at-rest pressures in accordance with the following recommendations: 1. The retaining wall shall be designed assuming an at-rest soil pressure equivalent to a fluid (EFP) whose weight is 60 pounds per cubic foot for level backfill conditions and 73 pounds per cubic foot for backfill slopes, which are constructed at an angle of up to 27 degrees. These values are based on the same assumed conditions stated in Recommendation No. 1 under the Cantilevered section. The at-rest condition for a level backfill is based on the following equation: $EFP = K_o \gamma$ where $K_o = 1 - \sin \phi$, γ is the total unit weight of soil, and ϕ is the internal angle of friction. 2. The retaining wall footing shall conform to the <i>Foundations</i> recommendations and may be designed assuming an allowable soil bearing value of 2,000 pounds per square foot. For footings placed on or adjacent to slopes, the base of the toe or keyway placed at the toe shall extend to such a depth that there exists 10 horizontal feet between the bottom of the footing and the daylight line of the adjacent slope. 3. A passive soil pressure equivalent to a fluid whose weight is 350 pounds per cubic foot and a coefficient of friction against sliding of 0.35 may be assumed for the footing excavation described in the recommendation above. 4. The retaining wall shall be serviced by a perforated drain which is located a minimum of 12 inches below top of the adjacent interior concrete slab-on-grade floor. 5. Walls, foundations, and connections between walls and foundations forming interior finished rooms of the structure shall be waterproofed by the proper application of a moisture barrier. All waterproofing products shall be applied in strict conformance with the manufacturer's recommendations. 6. It is assumed that the rough grade excavation behind the retaining wall is to be cut at a temporary slope angle of 1 horizontal to 1 vertical in order to comply with Cal-OSHA safety requirements. 7. Footings located near the retaining wall stem and in the zone of the granular backfill material shall extend through the retaining wall backfill, shall be supported on the firm underlying undisturbed ground, and below a 1 horizontal to 1 vertical line projected upward from the base of the wall; whichever is deeper. As an alternative, the footing can be designed to span across the backfill area and be supported by footings able to receive the reaction load of the spanning member. This may include tying into the retaining wall for support, if that portion of the retaining wall has been designed to receive the additional load. 8. Retaining wall backfill shall include 2 cubic feet per linear foot of wall of 3/8- to 1- inch gravel placed around a 4-inch perforated rigid PVC drainpipe. The perforations of the pipe shall be placed down at the positions of 5 and 7 o'clock. A filter fabric shall separate the gravel from the other backfill soils. 9. Retaining wall backfill above the drainpipe shall be a clean, coarse sand or gravel, creating an inverted triangular wedge. Lower quality native backfill material may be utilized outside the triangular wedge which extends upwards from the outside edge of the pipe/gravel at the base of the retaining wall and is a minimum width of 60 percent of the wall height at ground surface. Clean, coarse sand is acceptable when the Sand Equivalent is greater than						

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
20 and the Expansion Index equals 0. To avoid excessive amounts of sand and gravel backfill, do not allow the excavation contractor to cut a vertical excavation 2 to 4 feet beyond the back of the retaining wall footing or stem. Cut only to the point needed to install the drainpipe and slope the excavation back as specified. 10. The use of equipment to compact soil within the wedge of backfill defined by a 1:1 line projected up from behind the retaining wall to the surface shall be limited to handheld rammer plate compactors, such as a Wacker BS 45Y. A string line shall be placed along the top of the wall to monitor possible rotation of the wall due to the compaction surcharge. If the wall begins to bow or lean away from the backfilling operations, the compaction process shall stop and the licensed geotechnical professional shall be notified immediately such that modified compaction recommendations can be given at that time. 11. The project design engineer designing the retaining wall shall address the following conditions: a. When a retaining wall is backfilled without a top restraint, such as a wood floor diaphragm, the stem of the retaining wall acts as a cantilever. b. Depending on the rigidity of the top restraint, the wall may act as a beam spanning between the top and bottom points, reversing the tension side of the stem to the front of the wall as opposed to the back as in the case of a cantilever condition. c. Structure members deflect when loaded. The users guide to the widely used computer program RetainPro recommends the deflection of the wall be checked because the program does not calculate deflection. Refer to Section 9 titled “Related Design Considerations” in the manual titled “Basics of Retaining Wall Design”, Page 50. As an estimate, the Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute (CRSI) manual estimates concrete reinforced stems of cantilevered retaining walls will deflect a horizontal distance at the top of the wall equal to the height of the wall divided by 240. The appropriate deflection equation and values corresponding to load, condition, and material shall be employed to determine the deflection corresponding to the lateral loads recommended herein such that appropriate connections, tiebacks, bracing, or construction joints can be placed within the structural design to properly account for the deflection. The total deflection may not occur during the backfilling operation, but rather sometime after the frame structure is built over and adjacent to the retaining wall. Adjacent Loads (General) 1. Where footings are placed at varying elevations, the effect of adjacent loads will be calculated using the widely published Formulas for Stresses in Semi-infinite Elastic Foundations or the Boussinesq figures and equations for both vertical and horizontal surcharge loads. Settlement (General) 1. It is the intent of the recommendations contained in this report to achieve angular distortions of approximately 1/480. A total settlement of approximately 1 inch or less is anticipated for foundations supported on the undisturbed native soil and approximately 1 percent to 1.5 percent of the fill height is the anticipated total settlement at areas where compacted fill soil is placed in accordance with the <i>Grading</i> measures provided in this mitigation measure. The soil bearing values and estimated settlements contained in this report are preliminary and can be modified after the foundation and grading plans are substantially complete.						
GEO-2: Paleontological Resources Impact Plan and Monitoring						
Prior to the commencement of any grading activities, the project applicant shall retain a qualified professional paleontologist as defined in the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology’s <i>Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources</i> (2010). The qualified professional paleontologist shall prepare a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program consistent with the guidance provided in the <i>Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources</i> . The Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program shall be reviewed and approved by the City’s Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee prior to the issuance of a	The project applicant is responsible for: - Retaining a qualified professional paleontologist prior to commencement of grading activities. - Providing proof of retainment to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review	The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall approve the Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program prior to the issuance of a Zoning Clearance for a grading permit. The qualified professional	The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall review and approve the form provided by the qualified professional paleontologist certifying WEAP training was completed. The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall confirm the qualified			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
Zoning Clearance for a grading permit. The Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program shall include, but not be limited to, the following: ▪ Worker Environmental Awareness Program Training. The qualified professional paleontologist shall conduct WEAP training for construction personnel regarding the appearance of fossils and the procedures for notifying paleontological staff should fossils be discovered by construction staff. A basic presentation shall be prepared and presented by the qualified professional paleontologist to inform all construction personnel working on the project about the paleontological sensitivity of the area. Each worker shall also learn the proper procedures to follow in the event paleontological resources or unique geologic features are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities. These procedures include halting construction and resource assessment. If new construction personnel are added to the project, the construction contractor shall ensure the new personnel receive the training before starting work. The qualified professional paleontologist shall ensure construction personnel sign a form affirming they received WEAP training. The qualified professional paleontologist shall submit this form to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee. ▪ Monitoring. The qualified professional paleontologist shall identify the locations on the project site where paleontological monitoring is required. The qualified professional paleontologist, or a paleontological resource monitor designated by the qualified professional paleontologist, shall observe initial grading and drilling activities on-site in areas underlain by late Pleistocene marine terrace deposits, the Sisquoc Formation, and the Monterey Formation. No monitoring is required for ground disturbing activities in areas of artificial fill, subject to the discretion of the qualified professional paleontologist. ▪ Discovery of Paleontological Resources. In the event that fossils are unearthed during grading, the qualified professional paleontologist or designated paleontological resource monitor will temporarily halt and/or divert grading activity within a 50-foot radius of the find to allow for recovery of the resource. ▫ Fossil Salvage. The qualified professional paleontologist shall salvage (i.e., excavate and recover) the fossil to protect it from damage/destruction. Bulk matrix sampling may be necessary to recover small invertebrates or micro vertebrates from paleontologically sensitive deposits. After the fossil(s) is (are) salvaged, construction activity may resume. ▫ Fossil Preparation and Curation. Fossils shall be identified to the lowest (i.e., most-specific) possible taxonomic level, prepared to a curation-ready condition, and curated in a scientific institution with a permanent paleontological collection along with all pertinent field notes, photos, maps, and data required by the curating institution. Fossils of undetermined significance at the time of collection may also warrant curation at the discretion of the qualified professional paleontologist. ▫ Final Paleontological Mitigation Report. Upon completion of ground-disturbing activities (or laboratory preparation and curation of fossils, if necessary), the qualified professional paleontologist shall prepare a final report describing the results of the paleontological monitoring efforts. The report shall include a summary of the field and laboratory methods employed; an overview of project geology; and, if fossils were discovered, an analysis of the fossils, including physical description, taxonomic identification, and scientific significance. The report shall be submitted to the City’s Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee and, if fossil curation occurred, the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History.	Director (or designee) prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. ▪ Ensuring the PRIMP is incorporated into construction plans and implemented during grading. The qualified paleontologist is responsible for: ▪ Preparing a PRIMP consistent with SVP guidelines. The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Ensuring all personnel attend WEAP training prior to grading and that new personnel receive training before starting work. ▪ Halting work immediately within 50 feet of any fossil discovery and notifying the paleontologist. ▪ Complying with all fossil recovery and monitoring requirements outlined in the PRIMP. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing and approving the PRIMP prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. ▪ Reviewing WEAP training records and final paleontological mitigation report. ▪ Conducting periodic site inspections to verify compliance with paleontological monitoring and fossil recovery protocols.	paleontologist shall conduct WEAP training prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities and submit the signed form to the Planning and Environmental Review Director within 24 hours following the completion of WEAP training. The qualified professional paleontologist or designated paleontological resource monitor shall observe initial grading and drilling activities throughout construction on-site in areas underlain by late Pleistocene marine terrace deposits, the Sisquoc Formation, and the Monterey Formation. If a fossil is discovered, the qualified professional paleontologist shall submit the Final Paleontological Mitigation Report to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee within 90 days of completion of salvage and preparation. If curation occurred, the qualified professional paleontologist shall also submit the Final Paleontological Mitigation Report to the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History.	professional paleontologist or designated paleontological resource monitor observed grading and drilling activities. The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall review and approve the Final Paleontological Mitigation Report, if applicable.			
Hazards and Hazardous Materials						
HAZ-1: Asbestos Containing Materials Abatement						
Prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance associated with the demolition permit, the project applicant shall prepare an asbestos abatement plan addressing the items/topics listed below. The asbestos abatement plan shall be reviewed and approved by SBCAPCD. Proof of SBCAPCD approval shall be provided to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee. During project construction and demolition activities, the project applicant shall follow the measures outlined in the asbestos abatement plan, which shall be undertaken by	The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ Preparing an Asbestos Abatement Plan addressing all required topics prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance associated with the demolition permit.	The project applicant shall prepare the asbestos abatement plan, obtain SBCAPCD’s approval, and contract with an abatement contractor prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance	The City of Goleta’s Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, shall verify SBCAPCD has approved the asbestos abatement plan prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance. The City of Goleta’s Director			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
properly trained and licensed asbestos contractors currently registered with Cal/OSHA and/or OSHA (herein referred to as “abatement contractors”). Abatement contractors shall be selected and vetted by the project applicant and reviewed by SBCAPCD ten working days prior to starting demolition as part of the Notification for Renovation and Demolition Form ENF-28 submittal. Project-specific requirements to be addressed in the asbestos abatement plan include the following: ▪ Disturbance activities shall be performed only by abatement contractors using appropriate controls to prevent fiber emissions during the removal process. This may include, but is not limited to, the use of wet methods (water mist), negative pressure containment, high efficiency particulate air filtration, and other engineering controls, as deemed appropriate, to keep fibers from being dispersed in accordance with current federal, State, and local regulations. Presumed asbestos containing roofing materials shall be sampled by abatement contractors prior to demolition to determine proper handling and disposal requirements. ▪ Windows with trace (defined as less than 1 percent) asbestos in putty shall be removed intact to avoid disturbance of the putty, if possible. Other materials with trace asbestos shall be point counted to determine the asbestos concentrations; if asbestos concentrations are not determined, these materials shall be managed as ACMs. ▪ Workers performing removal shall be properly protected to prevent exposure, including the use of respiratory protection with high efficiency particulate air filtration, protective suits, or other protective equipment deemed necessary by abatement contractors. Disturbance of greater than 100 square feet of any ACMs or asbestos-containing construction materials must be performed by trained and licensed abatement contractors. ▪ Asbestos containing waste materials must be properly contained and transported for off-site disposal at a permitted landfill or disposal facility. Friable asbestos with greater than 1 percent asbestos content is considered hazardous waste per current federal and State regulations and must be transported and disposed of using proper manifest documentation. Non-friable asbestos is categorized as non-hazardous, asbestos containing waste and can typically be disposed to the local Class III landfill with prior approval from landfill operators. As noted, materials with less than 1 percent total asbestos can be disposed of as construction debris if proper lab analysis is provided. ▪ Proper removal techniques must be followed to prevent the dissemination of asbestos fibers. All required notification and permitting shall be administered by the abatement contractor, and proper completion shall be verified by the City’s Director of Planning and Environmental Review. ▪ If suspect materials are found during site work, the area shall be isolated, and any suspect materials tested to confirm or deny the presence of asbestos, lead, or other hazards, as determined appropriate by the abatement contractor.	▪ Submitting the Asbestos Abatement Plan to Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) for review and approval. ▪ Providing proof of SBCAPCD approval to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) prior to demolition. ▪ Retaining and vetting properly trained and licensed asbestos abatement contractors registered with Cal/OSHA and/or OSHA. ▪ Submitting contractor information to SBCAPCD ten working days prior to demolition as part of the Notification for Renovation and Demolition Form ENF-28. ▪ Ensuring all measures outlined in the approved Asbestos Abatement Plan are implemented during demolition and construction activities. The asbestos abatement contractor(s) is responsible for: ▪ Implementing the provisions of the Asbestos Abatement Plan during construction activities. The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Coordinating with asbestos abatement contractors to ensure compliance with the approved Asbestos Abatement Plan. ▪ Halting work and isolating areas if suspect materials are encountered until testing and clearance are completed. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing proof of SBCAPCD approval of the Asbestos Abatement Plan prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the demolition permit. ▪ Verifying proper completion of asbestos abatement measures during demolition and construction activities.	associated with the demolition permit.	of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, shall spot-check compliance with the asbestos abatement plan during demolition activities and verify compliance documentation following the proposed project’s demolition activities.			
HAZ-2: Lead-Based Paint Abatement						
Prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance associated with the demolition permit, the project applicant shall prepare an LBP abatement plan. This plan can be combined with the plan required in Mitigation Measure HAZ-1. The LBP abatement plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee. During proposed project construction and demolition activities, the project applicant shall follow the measures outlined in the LBP abatement plan. These requirements shall be undertaken by properly trained contractors that utilize lead-safe work practices (or “abatement contractors”). Abatement contractors shall be selected and vetted by the project applicant and reviewed by the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director. Prior to abatement, the applicant shall notify CDPH of lead-based abatement activities through submittal of CDPH Form 8551, and provide evidence of the notification to the City of Goleta’s	The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ Preparing an LBP Abatement Plan prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance associated with the demolition permit. ▪ Combining the LBP Abatement Plan with the Asbestos Abatement Plan required under Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, if desired. ▪ Submitting the LBP Abatement Plan to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental	The project applicant shall prepare the LBP abatement plan, notify CDPH, and contract with an abatement contractor prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance associated with the demolition permit.	The City of Goleta’s Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, shall approve the LBP abatement plan and verify CDPH has been notified prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance. The City of Goleta’s Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, shall check the abatement contractor’s monitoring log to ensure project-specific			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee. Project-specific requirements of the LBP abatement plan include the following: - Any disturbance by abatement contractors that might generate dust or create a lead exposure hazard shall be performed by lead-trained workers using lead-safe work practices. Lead safe work practices include appropriate containment, wet methods, and use of hand tools or similar methods that will minimize the generation of airborne dust emissions and potential lead hazards. - To prevent lead exposure hazard due to the generation of lead dust and debris, lead-painted components (e.g., windows, doors, baseboards) or similar lead-containing items shall be removed intact and segregated from the overall waste stream by abatement contractors. - Lead-containing waste is classified as hazardous waste if total lead concentration exceeds 1,000 milligrams per kilogram (or parts per million) or if soluble lead concentration exceeds 5.0 milligrams per liter. Proper waste characterization testing or waste profiling shall be conducted prior to disposal of lead containing waste. If practicable, lead wastes shall be segregated to minimize the volume of possible hazardous waste. If lead-containing and non-lead waste materials are comingled during demolition, composite samples of representative waste shall be analyzed by a certified lab to determine proper disposal requirements.	Review Director (or designee) for review and approval prior to demolition. - Notifying the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) of lead-based abatement activities by submitting CDPH Form 8551 and providing proof of notification to the Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee). - Selecting and vetting properly trained contractors that utilize lead-safe work practices for all LBP abatement activities. The abatement contractor(s) is responsible for: - Implementing the provisions of the LBP Abatement Plan during construction activities. The construction contractor is responsible for: - Coordinating with abatement contractors to ensure compliance with the approved LBP Abatement Plan. - Ensuring all demolition and removal activities follow lead-safe work practices to prevent lead exposure hazards. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: - Reviewing and approving the LBP Abatement Plan prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the demolition permit. - Reviewing proof of CDPH notification (Form 8551) prior to demolition. - Conducting periodic inspections to verify compliance with lead-safe work practices during demolition and construction activities.		recommendations are enacted during proposed project demolition activities.			
HAZ-3: Corrective Action Plan/Soil and Groundwater Management Plan Revision						
Prior to commencement of grading activities at the project site, the project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant approved by Santa Barbara County EHS to revise the existing CAP/SGMP prepared for the project site such that the CAP/SGMP addresses potential contamination in the maintenance yard, and addresses Santa Barbara County EHS's comments on the CAP/SGMP. The revised CAP/SGMP shall address: - On-site handling and management of impacted soils or other impacted wastes (e.g., stained soil, and soil or groundwater with solvent or chemical odors) if such soils or impacted wastes are encountered; - The notification process if an unknown well or leaking well is discovered (e.g., notification of the Santa Barbara County Petroleum Unit, as well as the California Department of Conservation Geologic Energy Management Division); and, - Specific actions to reduce hazards to construction workers and off-site receptors during the construction phase. The CAP/SGMP must establish engineering controls and soil management practices to ensure construction worker safety, ensure the health of future workers and visitors, and prevent the off-site migration of contaminants from the proposed project. These measures and practices shall include, but are not limited to:	The project applicant is responsible for: - Retaining a qualified environmental consultant approved by Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Services (EHS) prior to commencement of grading activities. - Providing proof of Santa Barbara County EHS approval of the CAP/SGMP to the Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to construction activities. - Implementing the approved CAP/SGMP during demolition, grading, and construction at the project site. The qualified environmental consultant is responsible for: - Establishing engineering controls and soil management practices to ensure worker		Prior to commencement of construction and grading activities at the project site, the project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant approved by Santa Barbara County EHS to revise the existing CAP/SGMP prepared for the proposed project. The project applicant shall submit proof of Santa Barbara County EHS' approval of the CAP/SGMP to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to construction activities. The project applicant shall implement the CAP/SGMP			The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review the CAP/SGMP and have the authority to propose and include modifications prior to submittal to Santa Barbara County EHS. Once Santa Barbara County EHS has reviewed the CAP/SGMP, the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall verify Santa Barbara County EHS' approval of the CAP/SGMP and that Santa Barbara County EHS's comments on the CAP/SGMP have been appropriately addressed by the qualified environmental consultant. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
▪ Stockpile management, including stormwater pollution prevention and the installation of best management practices. ▪ Proper disposal procedures of contaminated materials. ▪ Investigation procedures for encountering known and unexpected odorous or visually stained soils, other indications of hydrocarbon piping or equipment, and/or debris during ground-disturbing activities. ▪ Monitoring and reporting. ▪ An environmental health and safety plan for contractors working at the project site that addresses the safety and health hazards of each phase of site construction activities with the requirements and procedures for employee protection. ▪ The environmental health and safety plan shall outline proper soil handling procedures and health and safety requirements to minimize worker and public exposure to hazardous materials during construction. The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review the CAP/SGMP and have the authority to propose and include modifications prior to submittal to Santa Barbara County EHS. Santa Barbara County EHS shall review and approve the CAP/SGMP prior to construction (demolition and grading) activities at the project site. The project applicant shall submit proof of Santa Barbara County EHS’s approval of the CAP/SGMP to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to construction activities. The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall verify Santa Barbara County EHS’s approval of the CAP/SGMP and shall review the final CAP/SGMP prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The project applicant shall implement the CAP/SGMP during demolition, grading, and construction at the project site.	safety and prevent off-site migration of contaminants. The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Implementing all measures outlined in the approved CAP/SGMP during demolition, grading, and construction. ▪ Following the environmental health and safety plan and soil handling procedures to minimize worker and public exposure to hazardous materials. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Verifying Santa Barbara County EHS approval of the CAP/SGMP prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. ▪ Conducting periodic site inspections to confirm implementation of CAP/SGMP measures during construction.	during demolition, grading, and construction at the project site.	review the final CAP/SGMP prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance of construction or grading permits, and shall review project construction plans to ensure applicable recommendations from the CAP/SGMP are integrated into construction plans.			
HAZ-4: Sub-slab Vapor Mitigation System						
Where soil vapor is known and is identified to be present at chemical concentrations exceeding regulatory screening thresholds for sub-slab/soil vapor intrusion, the project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant (PG or PE) or other qualified person to prepare a Sub-slab Vapor Mitigation System Design for the proposed project. The plan shall include, but is not limited to, design specifications, material specifications, installation requirements, and monitoring requirements. Santa Barbara County EHS shall review and approve the Sub-slab Vapor Mitigation System Design prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for building permits. The project applicant shall incorporate a sub-slab vapor barrier into the project’s building plans, the implementation of which shall prevent the potential for soil vapor VOCs from migrating to indoor air. The project’s building plans, which shall include engineering measures or institutional controls, shall be submitted by the qualified environmental consultant to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for building permits.	The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ Retaining a qualified environmental consultant (PG, PE, or other qualified person) to prepare a Sub-slab Vapor Mitigation System Design if soil vapor concentrations exceed regulatory screening thresholds for vapor intrusion. ▪ Incorporating the approved sub-slab vapor barrier and any engineering measures or institutional controls into the project’s building plans. ▪ Submitting the building plans (including vapor mitigation measures) to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for building permits. The qualified environmental consultant is responsible for: ▪ Preparing the Sub-slab Vapor Mitigation System Design consistent with regulatory requirements and best practices. ▪ Submitting the design to Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Services (EHS) for review and approval prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for building permits. ▪ Providing the approved design and building plans to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee).	The project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant (PG or PE) or other qualified person to prepare a Sub-slab Vapor Mitigation System Design for the proposed project prior to construction. The project applicant shall incorporate a sub-slab vapor barrier during construction.	Santa Barbara County EHS shall review and approve the Sub-slab Vapor Mitigation System Design prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for building permits. The qualified environmental consultant shall submit the project’s building plans, which shall include engineering measures or institutional controls, to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for building permits.			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
	The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Implementing the approved Sub-slab Vapor Mitigation System during building construction in accordance with design specifications and installation requirements. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing the building plans to confirm incorporation of the vapor mitigation system prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for building permits. ▪ Verifying Santa Barbara County EHS approval of the Sub-slab Vapor Mitigation System Design. ▪ Conducting periodic inspections to ensure proper installation and compliance with approved design.					
HAZ-5: Groundwater Disposal						
If disposal of contaminated groundwater is required during construction of the proposed project, Santa Barbara County EHS shall be consulted to determine if the treated groundwater can be disposed of through one of their waste discharge permit options. Based on the concentrations of chemical constituents of contaminated groundwater, an individual NPDES permit and/or waste discharge requirements may be required to be obtained for dewatering activities. If disposal of contaminated groundwater is required, proof of consultation with Santa Barbara County EHS and compliance with Santa Barbara County EHS’s disposal requirements shall be submitted to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director.	The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ Consulting with Santa Barbara County EHS if disposal of contaminated groundwater is required during construction. ▪ Determining, in coordination with EHS, whether treated groundwater can be disposed of under an existing waste discharge permit option or if an individual NPDES permit and/or waste discharge requirements must be obtained for dewatering activities. ▪ Submitting proof of consultation with Santa Barbara County EHS and evidence of compliance with EHS disposal requirements to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) prior to disposal activities. The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Implementing disposal procedures in compliance with Santa Barbara County EHS requirements and any applicable permits. ▪ Coordinating with the project applicant and consultant to ensure proper handling and disposal of contaminated groundwater. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing proof of consultation with Santa Barbara County EHS and verifying compliance with disposal requirements prior to construction activities involving groundwater disposal.	If dewatering is required, the project applicant shall consult with Santa Barbara County EHS and provide proof of consultation and compliance with EHS’s disposal requirements to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance.	If disposal of contaminated groundwater is required, the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall verify consultation with Santa Barbara County EHS and compliance with Santa Barbara County EHS’s disposal requirements has occurred prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance.			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
	Conducting periodic inspections to confirm adherence to approved disposal procedures during construction.					
HAZ-6: Well Access for Service or Reabandonment						
The property owner shall grant access to all wells located on the project site to any public agency or legal inheritor of the wells for the purposes of inspection, maintenance, service, or reabandonment such that future remediation or abandonment of existing wells is not impeded by project-related redevelopment. This access shall be maintained in perpetuity and shall not be restricted by any physical or legal barriers resulting from project construction or operation.	The property owner is responsible for: - Granting unrestricted access to all wells located on the project site to any public agency or legal inheritor of the wells for purposes of inspection, maintenance, service, or re-abandonment. - Ensuring this access is maintained in perpetuity and is not impeded by project-related redevelopment. - Preventing any physical or legal barriers that could restrict access to wells during or after project construction and operation. The construction contractor is responsible for: - Ensuring project design and construction activities do not create physical barriers that restrict future access to wells. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: - Verifying that project plans and final site design maintain permanent access to wells prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance and during site inspections.	Prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit, the project applicant shall provide documentation to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director demonstrating that the property owner has agreed to grant access to all wells on the project site to any public agency or legal inheritor of the wells for the purposes of inspection, maintenance, service, or reabandonment. This documentation shall also reference the indemnification provisions outlined in the Condition of Approval.	The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall verify that the required documentation has been submitted and that it includes provisions for both access and indemnification prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.			
HAZ-7: Regulatory Agency Notification and Oversight						
Given the project site is listed as an open Santa Barbara County EHS Cleanup Program Site (EHS case #375) and a closed LUST Cleanup Site (EHS case #51238, Central Coast RWQCB case #213), the EHS case #375, EHS case #51238, and Central Coast RWQCB case #213 shall continue to be utilized for agency oversight of assessment and remediation of the project site. The project applicant shall submit the following documents to the Santa Barbara County EHS project manager of the open Cleanup Program Site case, and the Santa Barbara County EHS and Central Coast RWQCB project managers of the closed LUST Cleanup Site case. The Santa Barbara County EHS project manager and Central Coast RWQCB project manager shall review and approve the following documents prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit at the project site: - Current development plan (e.g., architectural drawings and project description) and any modifications to the development plan - All environmental assessment documents completed for the project site, including the Environmental Impact Report for the Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project (this EIR) - All future hazardous material reports completed for the project site Upon submittal of the listed information, and in accordance with the regulatory agency’s voluntary oversight agreement, the regulatory agency may require additional actions such as: development of subsurface investigation workplans; completion of additional soil, soil vapor, and/or groundwater subsurface investigations; installation of soil vapor or groundwater monitoring wells; soil excavation and off-site disposal; completion of human health risk assessments; and/or completion of remediation reports or case closure documents. The project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant (PG or PE) to conduct any required subsurface soil, soil vapor, groundwater investigations, or human health risk	The project applicant is responsible for: - Continuing regulatory oversight under EHS case #375 and EHS case #51238 / RWQCB case #213. - Submitting the current development plan, environmental assessment documents, and future hazardous materials reports to Santa Barbara County EHS and RWQCB prior to Zoning Clearance for grading. - Retaining a qualified environmental consultant (PG or PE) to complete any required investigations, monitoring well installations, risk assessments, or remediation actions per agency direction. - Providing proof of agency approvals (EHS and RWQCB) for all required documents and actions to the City before Zoning Clearance. The qualified environmental consultant is responsible for: - Preparing and implementing agency-approved workplans for subsurface investigations, monitoring wells, soil	Prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit at the project site, the project applicant shall submit the abovementioned documents to the Santa Barbara County EHS project manager of the open Cleanup Program Site case, and the Santa Barbara County EHS and Central Coast RWQCB project managers of the closed LUST Cleanup Site case. Prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit, the project applicant shall also retain a qualified environmental consultant to conduct any required subsurface soil, soil vapor, groundwater investigations, or human health risk assessments in accordance with a sampling plan that shall be reviewed and approved by Santa Barbara County EHS or the Central Coast RWQCB.	If required workplans, investigations, or other mitigation actions require regulatory agency remediation reports or case closure documents, the qualified environmental consultant shall submit these documents to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee for review and approval prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
assessments in accordance with a sampling plan that shall be reviewed and approved by the regulatory agency. In the event the regulatory agency identifies the need for installation of soil vapor or groundwater monitoring wells to reduce potential hazards to the public or the environment, the project applicant shall identify soil vapor or groundwater monitoring wells on the final project plans for review and approval by the regulatory agency. In the event the regulatory agency identifies the need for soil excavation and off-site disposal to reduce potential hazards to the public or the environment, the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review the final grading plans to ensure soil excavation and off-site disposal are included, and shall approve the final grading plans prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. If required workplans, investigations, or other mitigation actions require regulatory agency remediation reports or case closure documents, the qualified environmental consultant shall submit these documents to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The project applicant shall also provide proof of Santa Barbara County EHS’s and Central Coast RWQCB’s approval of the current development plan, environmental assessment documents, hazardous material reports, and additional workplans, investigations, human health risk assessments, remediation reports, or case closure documents (as applicable) to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.	excavation, risk assessments, and remediation reports. ▪ Submitting remediation reports or case closure documents to the City for review prior to Zoning Clearance. The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Implementing approved investigation, excavation, and disposal measures shown on final plans. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing grading plans if soil excavation/disposal is required. ▪ Verifying receipt of agency approvals and remediation documentation prior to Zoning Clearance. Santa Barbara County EHS and the Central Coast RWQCB are responsible for: ▪ Reviewing and approving the current development plan, environmental assessment documents, and future hazardous materials reports.					
Hydrology and Water Quality						
HYD-1: Dry Season Construction in Devereaux Creek						
Prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit, the project applicant shall include within the construction contract the requirement that work related to culvert removal and bridge installation and maintenance at Devereaux Creek must occur during the dry season (June 1 to October 15) when water flows are low. The construction contractor shall only conduct work related to culvert removal and bridge installation/maintenance at Devereaux Creek during the dry season.	The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ Including in the construction contract the requirement that culvert removal and bridge installation/maintenance at Devereux Creek occur only during the dry season (June 1–October 15) when water flows are low. ▪ Submitting construction plans with this requirement to the City prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Performing all culvert removal and bridge installation/maintenance activities only during the dry season (June 1–October 15). The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing construction plans to confirm inclusion of the dry season restriction prior to Zoning Clearance. ▪ Conducting site inspections to verify compliance during construction.	The construction contract shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. During construction, the construction contractor shall schedule culvert removal and bridge installation to occur during the dry season. The construction contractor shall provide the Planning and Environmental Review Director with a minimum of a 7-day notice for when culvert removal and bridge installation are scheduled to occur.	The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall visit the site during scheduled culvert removal and bridge installation to confirm such activities are taking place during the dry season.			The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ a The qualified environmental consultant is responsible for: ▪ a The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ a The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ a
Noise						
NOI-1: Construction Noise Reduction						

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
The construction contractor shall prepare and submit a Construction Noise Control Plan to the City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee for review and approval prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for a grading permit/demolition permit. The Construction Noise Control Plan shall specify the noise reduction measures to be implemented during project construction that uses heavy-duty equipment within 400 feet of residences, which may include improvements to the golf course (e.g., grading of the course), maintenance yard, Barnsdall area, and Hollister Avenue to ensure noise levels do not exceed 65 dBA at nearby sensitive receptors at the nearest residences. The measures specified in the Construction Noise Control Plan shall be included on the building and grading plans and shall be implemented by the construction contractor during construction. Measures in the Construction Noise Control Plan may include, but would not be limited to, the following: ▪ Prior to the start of and for the duration of construction, the contractor shall properly maintain and tune all construction equipment in accordance with the manufacturer’s recommendations to minimize noise emissions. ▪ Prior to use of any construction equipment, the contractor shall fit all equipment with properly operating mufflers, air intake silencers, and engine shrouds no less effective than as originally equipped by the manufacturer. ▪ Staging and delivery areas shall be located as far as feasible from existing residences. ▪ Installation of temporary sound barriers/blankets to break the line of sight between construction equipment and residences within 400 feet of heavy-duty equipment operation. The barriers shall be constructed with a solid material that has a density of at least 1.5 pounds per square foot with no gaps from the ground to the top of the barrier. ▪ To the extent consistent with applicable safety regulations, trucks operating with reverse motions alarms shall be outfitted with SAE J994 Class D or equivalent alarms (ambient-adjusting, or “smart alarms” that automatically adjust the alarm to 5 dBA above the ambient near the operating equipment), or switch off back-up alarms and replace with human spotters in compliance with all safety requirements and laws. ▪ A construction notification sign shall be posted at the job site, clearly visible to the public, that includes permitted construction days and hours, as well as the telephone numbers of the City of Goleta’s and the contractor’s authorized representatives that are assigned to respond in the event of a noise complaint. ▪ If the authorized contractor’s representative receives a complaint, either City code enforcement or a contractor-retained and Goleta-approved noise consultant shall conduct noise measurements at the properties that registered the complaint. The noise measurements shall be conducted for a minimum of one hour to determine if noise levels are compliant with City’s 65 dBA standard. The consultant shall prepare a letter report for code enforcement summarizing the measurements, calculation data used in determining impacts, and potential measures to reduce noise levels to the maximum extent feasible.	The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ Including the requirement for a Construction Noise Control Plan in the construction contract. ▪ Submitting the plan to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) for review and approval prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for grading/demolition permits. ▪ Ensuring the plan is incorporated into building and grading plans. The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Preparing the Construction Noise Control Plan specifying measures to keep noise less than 65 dBA at nearby residences within 400 feet during heavy equipment use. ▪ Implementing the measures of the Construction Noise Control Plan. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing and approving the Construction Noise Control Plan prior to Zoning Clearance. ▪ Verifying incorporation of noise measures into construction plans. ▪ Reviewing complaint response reports and conducting site inspections for compliance.	The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall approve the Construction Noise Control Plan prior to issuance of the zoning clearance for the grading permit/demolition permit. The measures specified in the Construction Noise Control Plan shall be included on the building and grading plans.	The City shall monitor compliance with the requirements of the Construction Noise Control Plan periodically during construction and shall promptly investigate and respond to all noise complaints.			
NOI-2: Construction Vibration Reduction Measures						
Prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for grading and building permit, the City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall verify that the construction plans include the following requirements: ▪ For paving activities within 42 feet of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, a static roller shall be used in lieu of a vibratory roller. ▪ For grading and earthwork activities within 20 feet of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, off-road equipment shall be limited to 100 horsepower or less.	The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ Including the requirements of Mitigation Measure NOI-2 in the construction plans and contract prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for grading and building permits: The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Implementing the requirements of Mitigation Measure NOI-2 during paving and grading activities near the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for:	The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall confirm the requirements are included on the grading and building permits prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for grading and building permits.	The City shall monitor compliance with the requirements of the vibration reduction measure periodically during grading and construction activities within 50 feet of Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station.			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
	▪ Verifying that these requirements are included in the construction plans prior to Zoning Clearance. ▪ Conducting site inspections to confirm compliance during construction.					
Tribal Cultural Resources						
TCR-1: Native American Monitoring						
At least 30 days prior to the commencement of project-related ground-disturbing activities, including, but not limited to, site clearing, grubbing, trenching, and excavation, the project applicant shall secure a tribal monitoring agreement with Native American Tribes. Should more than one of the Tribes wish to provide monitoring for the project, they may do so on a rotating basis to provide equal representation onsite during ground-disturbing activities. The tribal monitoring agreement shall be consistent with the processes and procedures outlined in the Cultural Resource Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan (Plan) prepared under Mitigation Measure CUL-1, and the project applicant shall submit the tribal monitoring agreement to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to the commencement of project-related ground-disturbing activities. The Native American monitor(s) shall have the authority to temporarily divert, redirect, or halt ground-disturbing activities to allow recovery of cultural resources, in coordination with the qualified archaeologist retained under Mitigation Measure CUL-2. The project applicant shall notify the retained Native American monitor(s) of scheduled ground disturbance at least five business days in advance. Work may proceed if the retained Native American monitor(s) are unavailable at the time of ground disturbance. Native American monitoring may be reduced or terminated in consultation with the project applicant and the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, as warranted by conditions such as encountering bedrock, the presence of fill soil, or negative findings during initial ground disturbance. The Native American monitor(s) shall maintain monitoring logs throughout project-related ground-disturbing activities and submit the monitoring logs to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director after each phase of construction (e.g., site clearing, grubbing, trenching) has concluded.	The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ Securing a tribal monitoring agreement with Native American Tribes at least 30 days prior to ground-disturbing activities (e.g., clearing, grubbing, trenching, excavation). ▪ Submitting the agreement to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director before work begins. ▪ Notifying the Native American monitor(s) at least five business days in advance of scheduled ground disturbance. ▪ Coordinating with the qualified archaeologist to ensure monitoring follows the Cultural Resource Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan (CUL-1). The Native American monitor(s) is responsible for: ▪ Monitoring ground-disturbing activities and maintaining monitoring logs. ▪ Submitting logs to the City after each construction phase (e.g., clearing, trenching). ▪ Having authority to temporarily halt or redirect work to allow recovery of cultural resources, in coordination with the qualified archaeologist. ▪ Participating on a rotating basis if multiple Tribes request monitoring. The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Allowing access for Native American monitors during ground-disturbing activities. ▪ Complying with any temporary work stoppages or redirections requested by monitors. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing and approving the tribal monitoring agreement prior to ground disturbance. ▪ Verifying receipt of monitoring logs after each construction phase.	At least 30 days before ground-disturbing activities begin, the project applicant shall secure a tribal monitoring agreement with the Native American Tribes. The agreement shall align with the Cultural Resource Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan from Mitigation Measure CUL-2 and shall be provided to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to the commencement of project-related ground-disturbing activities. The project applicant shall notify the Native American monitor(s) at least five business days before ground disturbance. Work can proceed if the Native American monitor(s) are unavailable.	The Native American monitor(s) shall maintain monitoring logs throughout project-related ground-disturbing activities and submit the monitoring logs to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director after each phase of construction has concluded. Monitoring logs shall be kept on file with the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director for the duration of construction.			
TCR-2: Final Disposition of Unanticipated Tribal Cultural Resources						
Inadvertent discoveries of archaeological resources found during construction shall be immediately evaluated by the qualified archaeologist (retained under Mitigation Measure CUL-	The project applicant is responsible for:	Inadvertent discoveries of archaeological resources during	The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
2) for their potential to qualify as tribal cultural resources, and shall be treated in accordance with the Cultural Resource Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan (Plan) prepared under Mitigation Measure CUL-2. The appropriate treatment method, which may include one or more of the following treatments, shall be determined by the qualified archaeologist in consultation with the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, and the Native American monitor(s). The qualified archaeologist shall provide the data recovery plan prepared pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-4 to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to initiation of the appropriate treatment. ▪ Preservation-in-place of the cultural resources, if feasible. Preservation in place means avoiding the resources, leaving them in the place where they were found with no development affecting the integrity of the resources. ▪ Reburial of the resources in the immediate vicinity of the project site. The measures for reburial may include the following in accordance with the Plan: a) measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts in perpetuity; b) reburial shall not occur until all legally required cataloging and basic recordation have been completed, with an exception that sacred items, burial goods, and Native American human remains are excluded; c) any reburial process shall be culturally appropriate; and d) listing of contents and location of the reburial shall be included in the data recovery plan prepared pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-4. ▪ If preservation in place or reburial is not feasible, then the resource(s) may be curated in a culturally appropriate manner as described in the Plan prepared pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-2 at a Santa Barbara County curation facility that meets the California Office of Historic Preservation Guidelines for the Curation of Archaeological Resources, ensuring access and use pursuant to these guidelines. The collection and associated records shall be transferred, including title, and are to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence of curation in the form of a letter from the curation facility stating that subject archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid, shall be provided to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director by the project applicant. No destructive or invasive testing on sacred items, burial goods, and Native American human remains shall be permitted. Results concerning finds of any inadvertent discoveries shall be included in the data recovery plan prepared pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-4.	▪ Ensuring the qualified archaeologist (retained under CUL-2) and Native American monitor(s) are available during ground-disturbing activities to address inadvertent discoveries. ▪ Providing the data recovery plan (prepared under CUL-4) to the City for review and approval prior to treatment of any discovered resources. The qualified archaeologist is responsible for: ▪ Immediately evaluating any inadvertent discovery for potential qualification as a tribal cultural resource. ▪ Determining appropriate treatment in consultation with the City and Native American monitor(s). ▪ Including treatment details and results in the data recovery plan and submitting evidence of curation (if applicable) to the City. ▪ Ensuring no destructive or invasive testing on sacred items, burial goods, or Native American human remains. The Native American monitor(s) is responsible for: ▪ Participating in treatment decisions and ensuring cultural appropriateness of reburial or curation. The Planning and Environmental Review Director (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing and approving the data recovery plan prior to implementation of treatment. ▪ Verifying receipt of curation documentation when applicable.	construction shall be immediately evaluated by the qualified archaeologist for their potential to qualify as tribal cultural resources and treated according to the Cultural Resource Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan from Mitigation Measure CUL-2. The qualified archaeologist shall provide the data recovery plan prepared pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-4 to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to initiation of the appropriate treatment.	designee, shall consult with the qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor(s) to determine the appropriate treatment process. The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall also review and approve the data recovery plan prior to initiation of the appropriate treatment. The qualified archaeologist shall submit evidence of completion of the appropriate treatment method, to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director within 30 days of completion.			
Utilities and Service Systems						
UTIL-1: Additional Diversion Requirements						
Demolition debris generated by removal of the existing concrete golf cart paths shall be recycled at a minimum 98 percent diversion rate. All other materials (non-concrete materials) shall be recycled at a minimum 65 percent diversion rate. The project applicant’s Waste Management Plan, required in accordance with Chapter 8.10, Article IV of the City’s Municipal Code, shall include a measure that requires the construction contractor to recycle all concrete debris from the existing concrete golf cart path removal. The Waste Management Plan shall be submitted to the City Director of Public Works or designee for review and approval prior to the start of construction. During construction, the City Director of Public Works or designee shall assign a monitor to inspect the project site on a quarterly basis to ensure the requirements of the Waste Management Plan are being implemented. In addition, the project applicant shall retain proof of 98 percent diversion rate of the demolition waste generated from the concrete golf cart paths via waste tonnage data, supported by original or certified photocopies of receipts and weight tickets on other records of measurement from recycling companies, deconstruction contractors, and/or landfill and disposal companies, and submit these to the City Director of Public Works or designee for review and approval prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.	The project applicant is responsible for: ▪ Preparing a Waste Management Plan. ▪ Submitting the Waste Management Plan to the City Director of Public Works (or designee) for review and approval prior to construction start. ▪ Retaining proof of diversion rates (receipts, weight tickets, certified records) and submitting to the City prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy. The construction contractor is responsible for: ▪ Recycling all concrete debris from golf cart path removal and meeting diversion requirements for other materials.	The project applicant shall prepare and submit the Waste Management Plan to the City Director of Public Works or designee prior to the start of construction. The project applicant shall submit proof of achieving a 98 percent diversion rate of the demolition waste generated from the concrete golf cart paths to the City Director of Public Works or designee following the completion of construction. The City Director of Public Works or designee shall review and approve the applicant-provided	A monitor chosen by the Director of Public Works Department, or designee, shall inspect the project site on a quarterly basis from the start of construction activities. The City Director of Public Works shall review diversion documentation prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility	Plan Requirement and Timing	Monitoring Action	Compliance Verification Initial	Compliance Verification Date	Compliance Verification Comments
	▪ Implementing measures outlined in the approved Waste Management Plan during construction. The City Director of Public Works (or designee) is responsible for: ▪ Reviewing and approving the Waste Management Plan prior to construction. ▪ Assigning a monitor to conduct quarterly site inspections to verify compliance. ▪ Reviewing diversion documentation prior to issuing the certificate of occupancy.	proof prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.				

This page intentionally left blank.

Attachment 2

SANDPIPER GOLF COURSE RENOVATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT RESOLUTION

Exhibit A – Plans

Exhibit B – General Plan Consistency

Exhibit C – Zoning Consistency

Exhibit D – Conditions of Approval

RESOLUTION NO. 26-__

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GOLETA, CALIFORNIA RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GOLETA, CALIFORNIA, APPROVE ALTERNATIVE 4: EXTENDED BICYCLE PATH DEVELOPMENT PLAN WITH ADJUSTMENTS, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (IN CONCEPT) FOR THE SANDPIPER GOLF COURSE REDEVELOPMENT AND NEW CLUBHOUSE PROJECT WITH HEIGHT AND SETBACK ADJUSTMENTS AND DENY THE ORIGINAL PROJECT AT 7925 HOLLISTER AVENUE, GOLETA; APN 079-210-059; CASE NOS. 22-001-DP (IN CONCEPT)/CDPH; 22-0009-DP-CUP; 22-0032-DRB

WHEREAS, on November 21, 2022, Mr. Steve Welton, of Suzanne Elledge Planning and Permitting, representative for the Property Owner Sandpiper Golf Trust, LLC, “Owner”) submitted an application for the renovation of an existing golf course, and

WHEREAS, the application submitted included a request for a General Plan Amendment to vacate Environmental Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) adjacent to Devereux Creek, the golf course pond, and to remove special status species (red-legged frog) from Figure 4-1 within the Conservation Element and Figure 3.5 within the Open Space Element (Case No. 22-0009-GPAM), a Development Plan/Coastal Development Plan in concept (Case No. 22-001-DP), a Conditional Use Permit (Case No. 22-0009-CUP) and Design Review (Case No. 22-0032-DRB); and

WHEREAS, the proposed project involves the demolition and replacement of existing golf course structures, modifications to and re-routing of the existing 18-hole golf course, restoration and adaptive reuse of the historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station and construction of a new coffee shop, abandonment of existing on-site wastewater treatment systems and new connections to the Goleta West Sanitary District through a service boundary agreement, construction of a decomposed granite path on City right of way to act as a sidewalk on Hollister Avenue, and various improvements adjacent to Hollister Avenue (“Original Project”); and

WHEREAS, the 193-acre project site is located at 7925 Hollister Avenue (Assessor’s Parcel Number 079-210-059) in Goleta, California (“Project site”) in the Coastal Zone; and

WHEREAS, on February 15, 2024, the Original Project was deemed complete; and

WHEREAS, on November 19, 2024, the City Council amended the City General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan to no longer require applicant initiated General Plan Amendments to modify Figures 3-5 and 4-1 when site-specific biological studies provide substantial evidence that an area previously shown as an ESHA on General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Figure 3-5 and Figure 4-1 do not contain habitat that meets the definition of an ESHA. Based on this change, the requested GPA that was part of the original application became moot; and

WHEREAS, following the Original Project being deemed complete, City staff determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was necessary, allowing the City to forgo the Initial Study process pursuant to California Code Regulations, Title 14, Section 15063(a); and

WHEREAS, the City, as the lead agency for the Original Project, reviewed the Project's environmental impacts in accord with California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §§ 21000 et seq., "CEQA"), the regulations promulgated thereunder (14 Cal. Code of Regulations §§ 15000 et seq., the "CEQA Guidelines"), and the City's Environmental Review Guidelines ("Goleta Guidelines"); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15087(e), a Draft EIR was circulated for the 45-day public review and comment period from October 16, 2025, through December 1, 2025, and was made available online at the City of Goleta website and hardcopies were made available for review at City Hall, at the Goleta Public Library Express, and at the Goleta Community Center ; and

WHEREAS, the Draft EIR prepared in connection with the Original Project sufficiently analyzes the Original Project's potentially significant environmental impacts, in addition to four alternatives to the Project, examining the environmental impacts of each alternative as well as the ability of the alternatives to meet Project objectives; and

WHEREAS, Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path would include the proposed renovations of the existing golf course, demolition and reconstruction of other existing golf course structures, and other proposed site improvements, however, the design of a proposed sidewalk to be located in the right-of-way area adjacent to the project site and Hollister Avenue would be modified to be constructed of concrete and to extend eastward of the project site to connect with an existing bicycle path; and

WHEREAS, in contrast to the Original Project, Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path would further promote the use of alternative transportation methods by connecting to an existing Class I pathway; would increase access to the Ellwood Mesa Open Space, Sperling Preserve, and access to existing vertical accessways to the Pacific Ocean; would meet the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies related to costal access and active transportation; and would also comply with the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, whereas the proposed project would not. Compliance with the Bicycle and Pedestrian

Master Plan would be achieved because that Plan identifies a Class I multi-use pathway to be constructed along Hollister Avenue.

WHEREAS, the City received 46 comment letters on the Draft EIR during the public review period; and

WHEREAS, the City prepared a Final EIR and on April 16, 2026, released the Final EIR ("Final EIR") for public review at least ten (10) days prior to the City's Planning Commission consideration of the Final EIR and the Project on April 27, 2026. The Final EIR in Resolution No. 26-__ is incorporated herein by reference into this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, on April 27, 2026, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing, at which time the Planning Commission considered the entire administrative record, Final EIR, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"), including staff reports and oral and written testimony from interested persons;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF GOLETA, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Findings of Fact

The Planning Commission finds as follows:

- A. The project site is 193 acres and consists of a golf course and supporting structures that were developed in 1972. The property has a General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan land use designation of Open Space – Active Recreation and is located in the Coastal area of the City. Exhibit B contains a General Plan Consistency analysis for the project.
- B. The project site is bordered by the Pacific Ocean to the south, a former oil processing facility to the west, Hollister Avenue to the north, and residential and open space areas to the east.
- C. The site has been developed as a golf course, including a clubhouse and other accessory and support structures. The project would result in a reduction in the amount of irrigated turf located on the project site, and the demolition and replacement of existing buildings. Development of the project would require approximately 86,500 cubic yards of soil cut and approximately 56,000 cubic yards of soil fill.
- D. The Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station is located on the northeastern portion of the project site adjacent to Hollister Avenue. The gas station was designated as a historic landmark by the County of Santa Barbara in 1990, is listed on the Goleta Historic Resources Inventory, and is a City-designated Historic Landmark.

- E. The project includes requests for a Development Plan and Conditional Use Permit in concept for the renovation of the golf course, demolition and reconstruction of existing structures on the golf course, restoration of the historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, which would be used in conjunction with the construction and operation of a new coffee shop, dedication of public open space in Bell Canyon located along the western portion of the project site, and various public access improvements to and adjacent to Hollister Avenue.
- F. The project includes a Development Plan Adjustment request to allow the proposed encroachment of eight parking spaces into the required front yard setback, and to allow minor portions of the proposed clubhouse roof to exceed a height of 25 feet.
- G. As part of the project, changes are proposed to General Plan Figure CE 4-1 and Figure OS 3.5 based on the provision of a site specific biological survey/study in accordance with General Plan Policy CE 1.5 as amended. Based on information included in the Final EIR prepared for the project, including Section 4.3 (Biological Resources); EIR Figure 4.3-2 (*Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area on the Project Site*); EIR Appendix D-1 (*Biological Resources Assessment Report for the Sandpiper Golf Club Project*); and EIR Appendix D-2 (*Memorandum Describing Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs) for the Sandpiper Golf Club Project*), substantial evidence has been provided supporting a determination that certain project site areas depicted on Conservation Element Figure CE 4-1 (Special Status Species and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area) and Open Space Element Figure OS 3.5 (Open Space) no longer support ESHA resources. In addition to the designation of these ESHA resources, the Final EIR determined that with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures, the project's potential impacts to all project site ESHA resources would be reduced to a less than significant level. The following changes to Figures 4-1 and 3.5 are requested:
- i. Removal of ESHA designations adjacent to Devereux Creek in areas where the creek is contained within a pipe.
 - ii. Removal of the golf course pond as designated ESHA.
 - iii. Removal of the special-status species designation (California Red-Legged Frog) adjacent to the golf course pond.
 - iv. Adding purple needle grass to the southeast corner of the parcel as ESHA.
 - v. Adding Santa Barbara honeysuckle at the southeast property line as ESHA.
 - vi. Adding sage scrub adjacent to Devereux creek as ESHA.
 - vii. Adding three special-status species designations (raptor nests) adjacent to Devereux creek.

- viii. Adding wooly seablite and cliff malacthrix within sage scrub in various locations as ESHA.
- ix. Adding black walnut to ESHA within Bell Canyon.
- x. Adding a coastal wetland in the middle of site adjacent to the ocean as ESHA.

H. The property has existing ingress and egress from Hollister Avenue that meets Fire Department requirements.

I. The factual findings in this Section are based upon substantial evidence found within the entirety of the administrative record.

SECTION 2. Environmental Assessment Findings

Resolution No. ____ recommends certification of the Final EIR (SCH No. 2024120923), adoption of findings under CEQA, adoption of the MMRP, and, among other things, properly assesses the environmental impact of the Project in accordance with CEQA. Resolution No. ____ is incorporated herein by reference.

SECTION 3. Common Findings

The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council make the findings of Section 17.52.070 of the GMC.

- a. *There are adequate infrastructure and public services available to serve the proposed development, including water and sewer service, existing or planned transportation facilities, fire and police protection, schools, parks, and legal access to the lot.*

There are adequate public services to serve the project, including but not limited to services provided by the Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District, Goleta Water District, Goleta West Sanitary District, Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department, Goleta Union School District and Santa Barbara Unified School District, and these agencies and districts have adequate personnel and capacity to serve the Project. The project would not result in population growth that would adversely affect existing park and recreation facilities. Access to the site would be from approved driveway connections to Hollister Avenue. Existing streets adjacent to the project have adequate capacity to serve the project, and the project would not impede the potential for the construction of a future roundabout adjacent to the project site at the intersection of Hollister Avenue and Cathedral Oaks Road.

- b. *The proposed project conforms to the applicable regulations of this Title and any zoning violation enforcement on the subject premises has been resolved as permitted by law.*

As set forth in the Zoning Consistency Analysis (Exhibit C) of this Resolution, the project is consistent with applicable Goleta Municipal Code (Title 17) with minor adjustments related to front yard setbacks and structure height requirements. There are no active zoning violations on the project site.

- c. *The proposed development is located on a legally created lot.*

The project site parcel was created by Parcel Map No. 10,456, which was recorded on January 18, 1967.

- d. *The development is within the project description of an adopted or certified CEQA document or is statutorily or categorically exempt from CEQA.*

The proposed golf course renovation and construction of new structures on the project site are within the project description of the Final EIR prepared for the project, and the environmental impacts of those activities can be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of identified mitigation measures. The analysis of Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path, also included in the Final EIR, determined that impacts of Alternative 4 would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation measures identified for the original project.

SECTION 4. Development Plan with Adjustment Findings for Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path.

The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council make the findings of Section 17.59.030 and 17.59.040 of the GMC.

§ 17.59.030 Required Findings.

- a. *The project as proposed is consistent with the General Plan.*

For the reasons set forth in General Plan Consistency Analysis (Exhibit B) to this Resolution, and as set forth in the entire administrative record including the Final EIR, Alternative 4 conforms with the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan.

- b. *The site for the project is adequate in size, shape, location, and physical characteristics to accommodate the intensity, except as it relates to the minimum allowed dwelling unit density for the site, of development proposed.*

For over the past 50 years, the Project site has been developed as a golf course and the proposed project would not make substantial changes to the size, shape, location or physical characteristics of the existing facility. The site is adequate in size, shape, location, and physical characteristics to accommodate the renovation of the existing golf course and the development of proposed new buildings on the 193-acre site. The type, scale, and scope of the proposed renovations would not affect the density and intensity of uses already occurring on the site.

- c. *Any significant environmental impacts are mitigated to the maximum extent feasible.*

The project EIR determined that mitigation measures were required to mitigate impacts to a less than significant level for the following resource areas: Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Utilities and Service Systems. Implementation of the identified mitigation measures in accordance with the specifications included in the project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan would ensure that significant environmental impacts are mitigated to the extent feasible.

- d. *The project will not conflict with any easements required for public access through, or public use of a portion of the property.*

A City of Goleta road right-of-way (ROW) easement is located along the northern portion of the project site adjacent to Hollister Avenue. As part of the project and part of a future action to be done after entitlements from other entitlement agencies are approved and compliance with certain Conditions of Approval, including but not limited to Nos. 22-26, the City Council would hold a hearing under the Streets & Highways Code to consider the vacation of 14,651 square feet of excess road ROW to the property owner (*i.e.*, the Sandpiper Golf Course). The ROW area to be retained by the City may be used in the future for the construction of a possible future roundabout at the Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oak intersection. With the future vacation of the right of way, Alternative 4 Project meets this finding.

§ 17.59.040 Adjustments to Development Standards.

- a. *The adjustment for height is justified and consistent with the intent of applicable General Plan policies.*

The proposed clubhouse building has a unique design that includes a curvilinear form to the structure's roof such that it resembles rolling terrain. A portion of the roof would have a maximum height of 29 feet above surrounding grade. This exceedance would be similar to the maximum height of the existing clubhouse building, which is 28'6" above surrounding grade.

The impact analysis included in the project's Final EIR concluded that the additional building height would not result in significant visual or other environmental impacts. For the reasons set forth in General Plan Consistency Analysis (Exhibit B) attached to this Resolution, and as set forth in the entire administrative record including the Final EIR, the requested height adjustment is consistent with applicable General Plan policies.

- b. The setback adjustment relative to the parking lot is justified and consistent with the intent of applicable General Plan policies.*

The 8 vehicle parking spaces that would encroach into the required front yard setback would be located adjacent to Hollister Avenue or the proposed main driveway entrance to the project site. Adequate area would be provided adjacent to the parking spaces to provide landscape screening of parked vehicles. The impact analysis included in the project's Final EIR concluded that the additional building height would not result in significant visual or other environmental impacts. For the reasons set forth in General Plan Consistency Analysis (Exhibit B) attached to this Resolution, and as set forth in the entire administrative record including the Final EIR, the requested height adjustment is consistent with applicable General Plan policies.

SECTION 5. Conditional Use Permit Findings for Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path.

The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council make the findings of Section 17.57.050 of the GMC.

- a. The use as proposed is consistent with the General Plan.*

Alternative 4 would complete and extend a proposed multi-use pathway identified by the City's General Plan and Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan such that it would connect with an existing bicycle path located east of the project site. The path developed under Alternative 4 would be constructed of concrete, which would be consistent with the Class I path construction standards identified by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. In addition, with the implementation of Alternative 4, the project would:

1. Facilitate lateral pedestrian connectivity along Hollister Avenue that improves public access for all Goleta residents to vertical access points toward the shoreline, consistent with Policies OS 2.2 (Planned Vertical Accessways) and OS 2.4 (Mitigation of Impacts to Vertical Coastal Access).
2. Provide an extended bicycle path that connects to existing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. The alternative design would encourage additional alternative modes of transportation, and reduce consumption of non-

renewable energy sources consistent with General Plan Policies. VH 3.5 (Pedestrian-Oriented Design), TE 1.1 (Alternative Modes), TE 2.3 (Diversion of Automobile Trips to Alternative Modes), and TE 10.4 (Pedestrian Facilities in New Development).

3. Be consistent with Policies TE 10 (Pedestrian Circulation) and TE 11 (Bikeways Plan), which implement the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. These policies require pedestrian or bicycle linkages that are safe and convenient for all Goleta residents. A goal of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan is to provide additional active modes of transportation (bicycle and walking) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by reducing vehicle miles traveled. To meet this objective, the Master Plan identifies a need for a Class I multi-use pathway along Hollister Avenue from Cathedral Oaks Road to Elderberry Drive. The Alternative 4 pathway design supports the use of alternative modes of transportation; reduces transportation-related air emission, energy use, and greenhouse gas emissions; enhances access to recreation facilities by providing a safe path that provides connections to beach access points at the Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve, promotes bicycle commuting to the project site by project employees, and promotes the use of alternative transportation methods by project area residents to access land uses in and near Goleta such as the Camino Real shopping area and UCSB..
- b. The use will not be more injurious to the health, safety, and general welfare of the surrounding neighborhood due to noise, dust, smoke, or vibration than from uses allowed in the district.*

As described in the project's Final EIR, Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path would have the potential to result in significant short-term construction-related noise impacts to sensitive receptors located near the project site, and short-term construction-related vibration impacts to the historic Barnsdall gas station building. These short-term impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation measures identified by the Final EIR.

As described in the project's Final EIR, Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path would have the potential to result in significant short-term construction-related dust emission impacts. This potential short-term impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level implementing standard Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District fugitive dust control measures identified by the Final EIR.

The proposed project and Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path would not be a substantial source of smoke impacts.

Therefore, the implementation of Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path would not be more injurious to the health, safety, and general welfare of the surrounding neighborhood due to noise, dust, smoke, or vibration than from uses allowed in the district.

SECTION 6. **Design Review Findings.** The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council makes the findings of Section 17.58.080 of the GMC:

- A. The development will be compatible with the neighborhood, and its size, bulk and scale will be appropriate to the site and the neighborhood.*

The Alternative 4 project would result in the construction of a new golf course clubhouse, maintenance facilities, coffee shop building, and comfort station. The visible portions (i.e., floor area provided above surrounding grade) of the new buildings would generally have a size, bulk and scale that is similar to the existing buildings they would replace. After golf course construction and renovation activities are completed, the visual character of the project site, including south-facing views of the Pacific Ocean from Hollister Avenue, and north-facing views of the Santa Ynez Mountains, would be preserved.

The renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station would not increase the size of the historic structure, and the proposed 695 square foot, single-story coffee shop building would have the appearance of the 1920's automobile service bay. Therefore, these project elements would have an appearance and scale that is consistent with existing project site conditions and are appropriate for the surrounding neighborhood.

- B. Site layout, orientation, and location of structures, including any signage and circulation, are in an appropriate and harmonious relationship to one another and the property.*

The proposed golf course clubhouse, maintenance buildings, comfort station, and vehicle parking areas would replace existing structures and would be located at or near the locations of the existing structures. Therefore, the project would not substantially change existing relationships between these golf course structures.

The Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station would not be relocated, and the proposed 695 square foot coffee shop building would have the appearance of the 1920's automobile service bay. Therefore, the proposed coffee shop building would have a harmonious relationship to historic gas station building and the historic use of this portion of the project site.

No new signage for the project site has been proposed at this time.

- C. The development demonstrates a harmonious relationship with existing adjoining development, avoiding both excessive variety as well as monotonous repetition, but allowing similarity of style, if warranted.*

The new clubhouse building would have sloped turf walls and a turf roof. The design of the clubhouse would emulate the natural topography of the project site by integrating the structure within the green landscape and complementing the grassy hills, bluffs, and ocean waves. The appearance of the proposed comfort station would be similar to the design of the proposed clubhouse building, and the proposed maintenance buildings would have a size and appearance this is generally similar to the existing structures that are to be replaced. Therefore, relationships with adjoining development would not change substantially.

The restoration of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station would retain the historic appearance of the building. The proposed coffee shop building would be a single-story structure and would have the appearance of a 1920's automobile service bay. Therefore, the new development would be compatible with the historic gas station and nearby residential development to the north and east.

- D. There is harmony of material, color, and composition on all sides of structures.*

The new project site buildings would have design characteristics that are similar on all sides of the structures.

- E. Any outdoor mechanical or electrical equipment is well integrated in the total design and is screened from public view to the maximum extent practicable.*

Mechanical equipment associated with the proposed clubhouse building, such as golf cart storage and, golf cart maintenance facilities, would be located in the subterranean basement and would not be visible to the public. Storage and mechanical operation areas at the proposed maintenance facility, such as trash and recycling storage, landscape material storage, pump equipment, and golf cart washing areas, would be screened by fencing and landscaping.

- F. The site grading is minimized and the finished topography will be appropriate for the site.*

Project grading would require approximately 86,500 cubic yards (CY) of cut and 56,000 CY of soil fill over the 192 acre site. After compaction and shrinkage, the remaining soil (30,500 CY) would be distributed around graded areas to achieve the proposed golf course design. The greatest area of fill would be located at a proposed level area "event lawn" to be located near the clubhouse. The greatest area of cut would be located at the 18th fairway,

which would reduce the height and steepness of the slope. The use of retaining walls would be limited, except for adjacent to the proposed clubhouse basement. Therefore, grading would be minimized and appropriate for the site.

- G. Adequate landscaping is provided in proportion to the project and the site with due regard to preservation of specimen and protected trees, and existing native vegetation.*

The proposed planting palette would supplement existing project site vegetation and would include a variety of native plants and shrubs compatible with the project site's coastal climate. Proposed landscaping would primarily consist of low-level shrubbery that would not obscure views of the Pacific Ocean. Ground disturbance in environmentally sensitive areas would be minimized to the extent possible and areas that are disturbed would be restored.

The project would remove 39 non-native trees from the project site and one oak tree located in the Hollister Avenue right-of-way. The oak tree would be replaced with a 72-inch box oak tree to be located on the project site. The project would plant 116 trees to replace removed trees and trees that may be disturbed by construction activities.

- H. The selection of plant materials is appropriate to the project and its environment, and adequate provisions have been made for long-term maintenance of the plant materials.*

The renovation of the golf course includes the installation of new drought-tolerant turf and irrigation system. The project would reduce the amount of irrigated turf from 125 acres to 62 acres. The remaining 63 acres would be converted to native landscaping. Long-term maintenance of landscaping would be conducted in accordance with a Turf and Pest Management Plan that would be implemented by maintenance staff.

- I. All exterior lighting, including for signage, is well designed, appropriate in size and location, and dark-sky compliant.*

The golf course will continue to be unlit except for some low level cart path lights for safety. A variety of new lighting fixtures would be installed at the project site to aid users in the evening or early morning to primarily access the clubhouse and associated parking. The largest area of exterior lighting on the project site would be within the main parking lot located adjacent to the proposed clubhouse. Average lighting levels in the parking lot would be 1.1 foot-candles. All proposed lighting would be directed downward and has been designed to conform with Goleta Municipal Code Chapter 17.35.

- J. The project architecture will respect the privacy of neighbors, is considerate of private views, and is protective of solar access off site.*

Residential uses are located north of the project site along the north side of Hollister Avenue, and adjacent to the project site to the east. The visible portions (i.e., floor area provided above surrounding grade) of the proposed clubhouse, maintenance buildings, and comfort station would generally be similar in size and scale to the existing buildings they would replace. Therefore, the proposed structures would not substantially change the visual character of the project site, or adversely affect existing private views. The renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station would not increase the size of the historic structure, and the proposed single-story, 695 square foot coffee shop building would not adversely affect views from residences located along the north side of Hollister Avenue. Therefore, the proposed structures are considerate of private views.

- K. The proposed development is consistent with any additional design standards as expressly adopted by the City Council. (Ord. 20-03 § 6).*

There are no additional design standards adopted by the City Council that are applicable to this project.

SECTION 7. Alterations to a Historic Resource (Barnsdall Rio Grand Gas Station). The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council makes the findings of Section 17.33.080 (D) (2) (b) in regard to the Secretary of Interior Standards (SOIS).

- A. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships. (SOIS 1)*

The Barnsdall-Rio Grande Gasoline Station historically functioned as a gas station with a detached building located just to the west that housed a restaurant. The project would return these historic uses related to transportation with the gas station converted to retail use, the construction of a detached and complimentary designed building housing a coffee shop to the east of the gas station, and the installation of electric charging stations for bicycles. The project would alter the setting of the gas station by building over portions of the original driveway and relocating two flagpole bases. Some of the driveway's concrete curbing would be retained. The remainder of the asphalt paving would be replaced with surfacing materials and plantings, while maintaining the driveway's ovoid form and configuration. The proposed interior alterations would not remove significant historical fabric as the building's tower was a utilitarian space without character-defining architectural embellishments. Exterior alterations would include resizing the restroom door openings to meet ADA requirements and replacing windows on the east and

west elevations with single doors to provide additional access to the building's interior. Therefore, the Project would use the Barnsdall-Rio Grande Gasoline Station building and property in a manner that requires minimal changes to historical features, consistent with the requirements of Standard 1.

- B. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided. (SOIS 2)*

The project would remove or alter several hardscape features including sections of concrete curbing, deteriorated asphalt paving, two windows on the gas station buildings, and resizing two restroom doors located on the building's side elevations. The façade of the building, its footprint, and primary design features and materials would be retained, repaired, or recreated. Repurposing the original location of the gas pumps as an electric bicycle charging station would maintain the historic use of the resource as a transportation-related property. Changes to the driveway would alter the appearance of this feature while maintaining its configuration and function as the historic property's dominant circulation element. The placement of the new café building and trellis would maintain a distinct separation between the historic building and new construction, which would minimize impacts to the station's setting. Therefore, the Project meets the requirements of Standard 2.

- C. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken. (SOIS 3)*

The project does not propose the addition of building materials from other historic properties or conjunctural features. Therefore, the project meets the requirements of Standard 3.

- D. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved. (SOIS 4)*

The project does not proposed changes to design features that have achieved historic significance in their own right. Therefore, the project meets the requirements of Standard 4.

- E. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved. (SOIS 5)*

Implementation of the project would return the gas station building to a close approximation of its historic appearance. Loss of historic materials would be confined to portions of two window openings on the building's east and west

elevations, and the installation of ADA compliant doors on the street facade. Therefore, the project, which would preserve, repair, or recreate almost all of the building's character-defining materials and design features, meets Standard 5.

- F. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. (SOIS 6)*

The project proposes to implement the following measures related to the repair of the historic building:

- i. Remaining original windows will be repaired rather than replaced following the guidance in National Park Service Bulletin 9, *The Repair of Historic Wood Windows*. (SOIS 7)
- ii. Repair and repainting of the canopy structure will follow the guidance set forth in Preservation Brief #10, *Exterior Paint Problems on Historic Woodwork* and Preservation Brief #45, *Preserving Historic Wood Porches*.
- iii. Repair of historic stuccowork shall follow the guidance outlined in Preservation Brief #32, *The Preservation and Repair of Historic Stuccowork*.
- iv. Repainting exterior cladding, trim work, window and door frames and window units will follow the guidance, including employment of cleaning and stripping (if required) methods consistent with guidance in Bulletin #10.

Any features that cannot be repaired, will be designed to match the originals as much as possible in terms of colors, materials, shape etc. To ensure adherence with guidance documents identified above, DEIR mitigation measure CUL-1 (*Architectural Monitoring for Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station*) requires the project applicant to retain a Secretary of Interior's Professionally Qualified architectural historian and/or the City's Urban Historian (qualified historian) to ensure the project implements and complies with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the guidelines described above. The implementation of these requirements would ensure the historic property retains its contributing design features and materials consistent with the requirements of Standard 6.

- G. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used. (SOIS 7)*

The project applicant does not propose exterior chemical or physical cleaning treatments such as sandblasting or power washing. Should such treatments

be required, the guidance outlined in the Department of the Interior's Technical Preservation Briefs shall be implemented under the guidance of a City-approved architectural historian, as required by DEIR mitigation measure CUL-01. Provided these requirements are implemented, the project would be consistent with Standard 7.

- H. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken. (SOIS 8)*

The Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station is not an archaeological resource, therefore, Standard 8 does not apply to the project. Given the archaeological sensitivity of the Sandpiper Golf Course site overall, any ground disturbing activities in native soils will be required to have both an archeologist and a native American monitor present. Further, there are mitigation measures outlined in the Environmental Impact Report to address this topic.

- I. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment. (SOIS 9)*

The project would restore the exterior of the gas station building to a close approximation of its historic appearance and retain most of the surrounding hardscape features that characterized the setting of the building. Proposed new construction (i.e., the café building and associated trellis) is modest in scale, detached from the historic building, and compatible in materials and design with the historic property. Therefore, the project would meet Standard 9 provided the guidance detailed above under Standard 6 is implemented.

- J. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired. (SOIS 10)*

Loss of historic fabric is confined to portions of two windows, the front doors, and sections of concrete curbing. The other proposed alterations are reversible as the detached trellis and cafe building could be removed without affecting the physical or design integrity of the gas station building. Therefore, the proposed project meets Standard 10.

SECTION 8. Correction to Environmental Sensitive Habitat Area Maps. The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council makes the finding relative to General Plan Policy CE 1.5 as follows:

A site-specific biological study, prepared consistent with subpolicies CE 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5, contains substantial evidence to warrant changing General Plan Figure CE 4-1 and Figure OS 3-5) to accurately reflect up-to-date information on locations of rare, threatened, or endangered species or habitats, found on site.

Based on information included in the Final EIR prepared for the project, including Section 4.3 (Biological Resources); EIR Figure 4.3-2 (*Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area on the Project Site*); EIR Appendix D-1 (*Biological Resources Assessment Report for the Sandpiper Golf Club Project*); and EIR Appendix D-2 (*Memorandum Describing Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs) for the Sandpiper Golf Club Project*), substantial evidence has been provided supporting a determination that the requested changes to the Conservation Element Figure CE 4-1 (Special Status Species and Environmental Sensitive Habitat Area) and Open Space Element Figure OS 3.5 (Open Space) are warranted. While three areas on the 193-acre site would no longer be considered ESHA, seven additional would be, based on the site-specific study which has been prepared by a professional biologist and peer reviewed.

As a result of the extensive information and documentation contained within the above-mentioned documents, the requested General Plan Figure revisions would remove ESHA designations from the following areas: a) along Devereux Creek where the creek is contained within a culvert; b) the golf course pond, and c) California red-legged frog habitat associated with the pond. Further ESHA designations would be added in the following areas: d) purple needle grass to the southeast corner of the parcel; e) adding sage scrub adjacent to the Devereux creek; f) adding three special-status specific designations (raptor nests) adjacent to Devereux creek; g) adding wooly seablite and cliff malachtrix within sage scrub in various locations on the site; h) adding black walnut within Bell's Canyon; and i) adding coastal wetland in the middle of the site adjacent to the ocean.

SECTION 9. Actions

The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council take the following actions:

- a. Approve the Development Plan and Conditional Use Permit associated with Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path with height and setback adjustments for the golf course renovations and associated improvements provided as Exhibit A based on the findings of Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 above, the General Plan Consistency Analysis (Exhibit B), the Zoning Consistency Analysis (Exhibit C) and subject to conditions of approval provided (Exhibit D).
- b. Approve the amendments to Figures 3-5 and 4-1 of the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan to reflect the absence of ESHA associated with the existing

golf course pond based on the Finding outlined in Section 8 above and direct staff to amend said maps in accordance with General Plan Policy CE 1.5.

SECTION 10. Reliance on Record

Each and every one of the findings and determinations in this Resolution are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire record relating to the project. The findings and determinations constitute the independent findings and determinations of the Planning Commission in all respects and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.

SECTION 11. Limitations

The Planning Commission analysis and evaluation of the project, including this Resolution, are based on the entire record, including the best information currently available. This includes competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written. It is inevitable that in evaluating a project that absolute and perfect knowledge of all possible aspects of the project will not exist. One of the major limitations on analysis of the project is the Planning Commission's lack of knowledge of future events. In all instances, best efforts have been made to form accurate assumptions. Somewhat related to this are the limitations on the City's ability to solve what are in effect regional, state, and national problems and issues. The City must work within the political framework within which it exists and with the limitations inherent in that framework.

SECTION 12. Summaries of Information

All summaries of information in the findings, which precede this section, are based on the substantial evidence in the record. The absence of any particular fact from any such summary is not an indication that a particular finding is not based in part on that fact.

SECTION 13. Duration of the Resolution

This Resolution will remain effective until superseded by a subsequent Resolution

SECTION 14. Copies of the Resolution

The City Clerk is directed to mail a copy of this Resolution to Sandpiper Golf Trust, LLC, 280 Chestnut Avenue, Westmont Illinois 60559 and, to any other person requesting a copy.

SECTION 15. Effective date of the Resolution

This Resolution will become effective immediately after adoption.

SECTION 16. Certification of the Resolution

The City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this resolution and enter it into the book of original resolutions.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this ___ day of _____ 2026.

ANNE MILLER
CHAIR

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

DEBORAH S. LOPEZ
CITY CLERK

WINNIE CAI
ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA) ss.
CITY OF GOLETA)

I, DEBORAH S. LOPEZ, City Clerk of the City of Goleta, California, DO
HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution No. 26-__ was duly adopted by
the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta at a regular meeting held on the
__ day of _____ 2026, by the following roll call vote of the Planning
Commission:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

(SEAL)

DEBORAH S. LOPEZ
CITY CLERK

Exhibit A – Development Plan Plans
Exhibit B – GP/CLUP Consistency Analysis
Exhibit C – Zoning Consistency Analysis
Exhibit D – Conditions of Approval