
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

E.1 INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared by the County of Santa Barbara to evaluate potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed Las Varas Ranch Lot Split and Lot Line Adjustments projects (hereafter “project”).

This EIR was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970¹, ~~and~~ the State CEQA Guidelines², and the County’s adopted *Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA*, published June 2010. The County of Santa Barbara is the lead agency for this EIR as per Section 15367 of the CEQA Guidelines. The County will use this EIR in its consideration of the requested approvals that would allow implementation of the proposed project.

This Executive Summary summarizes the project description and conclusions of the impact analyses provided in the EIR. Section 2.0, Project Description, provides a detailed description of the proposed project evaluated in the EIR. Section 3.0, Related Projects, identifies other planned, pending, and recently approved projects along the Gaviota Coast considered in the cumulative impact analyses. Section 4.0 addresses each of the issues that were identified in the EIR Scoping Document as requiring further analysis in the EIR, including an existing setting, impact analysis, and identification of mitigation measures where applicable. Section 5.0 provides a preliminary policy consistency analysis. Section 6.0 describes and evaluates alternatives to the project and the extent to which each alternative would reduce or avoid the environmental effects associated with the project. Section 7.0 includes a discussion of effects not found to be significant and significant irreversible environmental changes.

E.2 PROJECT OVERVIEW

The proposed project includes the validation of an illegally created lot; reconfiguration of existing parcels within 1,784 acres of the 1,802-acre Las Varas and Edwards Ranches under three separate applications; identification of residential development envelopes within each proposed lot; and construction of infrastructure including access roads and a shared water system to serve future development. Specifically, nine existing parcels would be reconfigured through a combination of lot mergers, lot line adjustments, and subdivisions into seven new legal parcels ranging in size from 55 acres to 1,115 acres. Each newly configured parcel would include a designated area for future residential development.

E.3 PROJECT LOCATION

The project site, encompassing the historic Las Varas and Edwards ranches, is located approximately four miles northwest of the western extent of the City of Goleta, on either side of

¹ State of California, Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.

² Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Sections 15000 et seq.

U.S. Highway 101 (**Figure 2-1**). A total of 10 existing lots³ (9 APNs) comprise the two historic ranches, which encompass approximately 1,802 acres. See **Figure 2-2**. The project site trends north-south and stretches from the Los Padres National Forest boundary to the north to the Pacific Ocean to the south. The project site is bordered by the Dos Pueblos Ranch to the east and the El Capitan properties to the west. Project APNs on Las Varas Ranch include 079-080-002, -009, and -012; project APNs on Edwards Ranch include 079-080-001, -013, -014, -022, and 081-240-003 and -014. For simplicity purposes, the project site is referred to as Las Varas Ranch (or ranch) hereafter.

E.4 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The proposed project includes the following primary objectives:

- Reduce the total number of existing lots from nine to seven and designate a residential development envelope or potential development area for each lot;
- Reconfigure the boundaries of the lots to achieve a suitable balance between residential, agricultural, open space and natural resource values;
- Allow for coastal recreational opportunities;
- Maintain long-term continued agricultural use of the ranch property;
- Incorporate a site design that reflects and is compatible with the scenic and rural character of the historic Las Varas Ranch and the Gaviota Coast;
- Minimize potential visibility of residential development areas from public transportation corridors;
- Minimize environmental impacts and preserve and/or restore wildlife habitats, wildlands, and other coastal resources; and
- Allow upper canyon wildland areas to remain intact and largely undisturbed.

E.5 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LOT RECONFIGURATION

The proposed project is composed of three distinct applications, broken down by geographic area: 1) in between the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and Pacific Ocean; 2) in between U.S. Highway 101 and UPRR; and 3) north of U.S. Highway 101. **Figures 2-3** and **2-4** depicts the existing and proposed lot lines along with the proposed development envelopes and infrastructure as described below.

In between the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and Pacific Ocean, the project includes a lot line adjustment between Lots A and B after receipt of a Certificate of Compliance for Lot B, followed by a voluntary merger by the applicant between Lots B and C. This has the effect of

³ Two of the lots are currently unrecognized. The applicant is proposing to merge one of the lots and validate the other concurrently with preparation of the EIR.

~~reconfiguring of two lots following a voluntary merger by the applicant combining three~~ existing lots of 11.08 acres (Lot A), 94.25 acres (Lot B), and 8.35 acres (Lot C) into two lots of 55 acres (Parcel 1) and 58.68 acres (Parcel 2), respectively.

In between the UPRR and U.S. Highway 101, the project includes a lot merger combining two existing lots of 239.53 acres (Lot D) and 165.21 acres (Lot E) and a simultaneous subdivision (Vesting Tentative Parcel Map) resulting in three proposed parcels of 100.00 acres (Parcel 3), 147.53 acres (Parcel 4), and 157.21 acres (Parcel 5), respectively.

North of U.S. Highway 101, the project includes a lot line adjustment of two lots following a voluntary lot merger by the applicant combining four existing lots of 740.09 acres (Lot F), 281.35 acres (Lot G), 242.30 acres (Lot H), and 1.27 acres (Lot I) into two lots. The lot line adjustment and lot merger would result in two parcels of 1,115 acres (Parcel 6) and 150.01 acres (Parcel 7), respectively.

FUTURE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Each proposed parcel would include a designated development envelope ranging in size from 2.5 to 5 acres, except for Parcel 6 which only identifies potential development areas rather than a single development envelope given its size. Future residential development within each lot would be restricted to two contiguous acres within each designated development envelope or building area; the two contiguous acres may be fenced. No non-agricultural structures, improvements, development, grading or ground disturbance is to occur outside of the two-acre envelope selected for residential development within each of the proposed parcels except for proposed access roads, utility lines, any wastewater disposal areas and connection laterals to serve future residences as needed, and underground water storage tanks for fire protection and other purposes.

Access roads would range from 16 feet to 20 feet in width and would be improved with all-weather surfaces. All resulting parcels would be served by private septic systems and a private water system as discussed below. Additional grading would be expected as part of future building pad preparation on each residential building site, though the majority of the development envelopes are located on relatively flat terrain, thereby minimizing the amount of cut and/or fill that would be necessary. Drainage from proposed development areas and roadways would be collected and conducted to relevant adjacent natural drainages. Undeveloped areas of the Ranch would continue to sheet flow consistent with historical drainage patterns.

PUBLIC TRAIL EASEMENTS

The project includes the dedication of an easement to the County of Santa Barbara for a public parking lot and public riding and hiking trail leading to the beach along the eastern boundary of proposed Parcel 5. Construction of the parking lot would occur concurrent with the first new residence south of the highway. The easement includes an 84-foot x 170-foot area in the northeast corner of proposed Parcel 5 for the parking lot and an approximately 4,000-foot long, ~~815-foot wide~~ 815-foot wide corridor for the trail. ~~It passes~~ The trail would pass through an existing 8-foot wide, 12 to 15-foot high culvert under the Union Pacific Railroad tracks and out to the beach

upon obtaining a public access easement through the culvert from the Union Pacific Railroad company. See Figure 2-4.

The project also includes the dedication of a lateral 25-foot wide easement to the County of Santa Barbara for a public riding and hiking trail along the southern property line of proposed Parcel 6 and continuing along Calle Real immediately south of Parcel 7 adjacent to U.S. Highway 101. Per the applicant, construction of the trail would be contingent upon the placement of a pedestrian bridge over the existing underpass used by cattle to cross under U.S. Highway 101 at Gato Creek.

The project also includes granting of a lateral easement across the coastal properties (Parcels 1 and 2) to allow for public access along the shoreline, to include the sandy beach area located seaward of the base of the coastal bluffs.

WATER AND SEWER SERVICE

The project includes a Minor Conditional Use Permit for a State Small Water System for existing and future residences on the seven proposed parcels that would result from the proposed project. The water system would be designed to support up to two residential water connections (assuming an agricultural employee residence or guest house on each parcel in addition to the primary residence) for each parcel for a total of 14 water connections. It would be designed to meet domestic and landscape irrigation water demands.

Water would be supplied by surface water from existing water diversion and storage facilities within the Ranch and groundwater from a recently drilled well. The water system would include a water well, two booster pumps, treatment facility, and two above-ground water tanks to serve two different pressure zones. The treatment facility would be located on Parcel 6 adjacent to an existing ranch road near Gato Creek and would include a building of approximately 960 square feet (24 feet x 40 feet) for treatment equipment and supplies. It would require electrical power and an all-weather access road. The water tanks would have storage capacities of 30,000 and 60,000 gallons. The water lines would range between 2 and 4 inches in diameter.

Domestic water service for the existing residential development on the project site is provided by the Goleta Water District. However, this water is non-potable, so potable water is provided by bottled water deliveries from the District. This service would remain in place for existing development within the project site.

Sewer service would be provided by individual septic systems and associated leach fields within each proposed parcel. Existing septic systems are in place to serve existing development within proposed Parcels 4, ~~and 5,~~ and 6. New systems would be installed for the remaining proposed parcels. With the exception of Parcel 2, septic systems would be installed within the designated residential development envelopes. The system for Parcel 2 would be installed on the coastal terrace just west of the residential development envelope.

AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS

Existing grazing lands on the ranch are proposed to continue as common grazing lands to be collectively managed through a cooperative grazing agreement and the development of CC&Rs to ensure such collective management. At a minimum, the CC&Rs would limit residential perimeter fencing to surround or be installed within the two-acre area selected for residential development within each lot and would provide a cooperative management structure through identification of an HOA or other cooperative entity. Fences for agricultural purposes would be coordinated with Ranch Management so as not to impact existing and future agricultural operations. Each parcel resulting from the project will be subject to CC&Rs that will include a requirement that all land outside the designated owners' development envelopes will be devoted to agricultural usage. The CC&Rs would not be able to be terminated or substantially altered for a minimum of 50 years.

Existing orchards on the ranch are proposed to remain but would be individually managed by individual lot owners. However, minimum standards for production of commercial agriculture and best management practices in the orchard areas would be governed by the ranch CC&Rs.

REZONES

The applicant has requested ~~to a consistency~~ rezone of the Inland parcels that are currently zoned Unlimited Agriculture ("U") under Ordinance Number 661 (now defunct/obsolete) to Agriculture II with a 100-acre minimum lot area (AG-II-100) under the County Land Use and Development Code. These include ~~two~~ three entire parcels (Existing Lots F, G, and I) and portions of three other parcels (Existing Lots H, E, and D). The subject parcels are designated Agriculture II, 100-acre minimum lot area (A-II-100) under the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed rezone would update the zoning of the subject parcels consistent with current governing ordinances and the designation in the Comprehensive Plan. Parcels, and portions thereof, within the Coastal Zone are currently zoned AG-II-100 and therefore do not require rezoning.

PARCEL VALIDATION

The applicant has identified ~~two~~ three additional parcels within the 1,802-acre ranch that, at the time of release of the Draft EIR, have not been validated with Certificates of Compliance or by other means. One parcel of 1.27 acres (Lot I) is proposed to be merged with its surrounding lot and become part of proposed Parcel 6. ~~The other~~ A second parcel, an 18.26-acre parcel located adjacent to the highway on the west side of the property, is proposed to be removed from the project such that the total project area comprises only 1,784 acres of the 1,802-acre ranch. The applicant is in the process recently received a Certificate of Compliance for the 18.26-acre parcel from the County Surveyor Office (recorded on July 13, 2011), thus ~~of validating this parcel as a legal lot. ~~these~~ parcels through the County Surveyor Office, which is occurring concurrently with preparation of the EIR. The EIR assumes that the 18.26-acre parcel will receive a Certificate of Compliance or be recognized as a valid legal parcel by another means.~~ In the case of the 1.27-acre parcel, since it is proposed to be merged and become part of Parcel 6 under the proposed project, its legal status is irrelevant. ~~If it is determined that the 18.26-acre parcel is not a valid or legal parcel, then the project would be modified to incorporate the 18.26-acre parcel into proposed Parcel 7. In either~~

~~scenario, the physical improvements associated with the project would be unchanged. The third parcel is the 94-acre middle parcel (Parcel B) located in between the railroad and Pacific Ocean. An application for a Conditional Certificate of Compliance is being processed concurrently with the rest of the project in order to validate this parcel.~~

E.6 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table E-1 summarizes the proposed project's environmental impacts and the measures identified to mitigate these impacts. The table also notes the significance of impacts after mitigation measures are implemented. Residual impacts are classified as follows:

- **Class I:** Significant adverse impacts that cannot be feasibly mitigated or avoided. If the project is approved, decision makers are required to adopt a statement of overriding considerations pursuant to CEQA Section 15093, explaining why project benefits outweigh the damage caused by these significant and unavoidable environmental impacts.
- **Class II:** Significant adverse impacts that can be feasibly mitigated or avoided to a less than significant level. If the project is approved, decision makers are required to make findings pursuant to CEQA Section 15091 that significant impacts have been avoided or substantially lessened by implementation of mitigation measures.
- **Class III:** Adverse impacts that are less than significant and therefore no mitigation are required. These impacts do not require findings to be made.
- **Class IV:** Beneficial impacts.

E.7 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Five alternatives, in addition to the No Project Alternative, were selected for evaluation in the EIR. The alternatives were selected based on their ability to substantially lessen or avoid the project's significant environmental impacts while still meeting at least most of the basic project objectives. The EIR includes the following alternatives:

- **No Project Alternative:** Assumes future development of parcels in their current configuration. Where existing parcels already include residential development, no further development was assumed. Trail easements were eliminated under this alternative.
- **Reduced Project, Option A:** Reduces the size of development envelopes on Parcels 1 through 5 to 2.5 acres or smaller in order to avoid sensitive resources and reduce impacts associated with future development. Restricts the height of future residential development to 15 feet in the coastal zone and 16 feet in the inland area of the site.
- **Reduced Project, Option B:** Similar to Option A except for the location of the development envelopes on Parcels 1 and 2.

- **Project Redesign, Option A:** Relocates the development envelopes on Parcels 2 and 4 in order to reduce impacts associated with future residential development in these areas.
- **Project Redesign, Option B:** Similar to Option A, except the Parcel 4 envelope is relocated to another area of the parcel and the development envelope on Parcel 3 is relocated as well in order to reduce impacts to archaeological resources.
- **Project Redesign, Option C:** Relocates or reduces the development envelopes on Parcels 2, 3, 4, and 5; ~~Similar to Option A, except the Parcel 4 development envelope is relocated to another area of the parcel and the Parcel 5 development envelope is reduced and oriented away from the adjacent riparian corridor.~~

Among these alternatives, ~~the No Project Alternative was considered to be the environmentally superior alternative.~~ Besides the No Project Alternative, the Project Redesign Option C Alternative was considered to be the environmentally superior alternative because, on balance, it would be the most effective in reducing significant impacts of the proposed project.

E.8 AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY

Based on comments received at the EIR Scoping Meeting and responses to the EIR Scoping Document and Notice of Preparation, the following issues are known to be of concern and may be controversial, and are discussed and evaluated in the EIR:

- Visual incompatibility of future residential development as seen from public viewing places and potential to obstruct or impair scenic views;
- Disruption of the existing agricultural operation on the ranch from the lot reconfigurations and future residential development, and conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses;
- Effects of future development on existing unauthorized recreational access to the beach, primarily by surfers at Edwards Point;
- Disturbance to cultural resources, including archaeological sites and the rural historic landscape;
- Disturbance to sensitive biological resources; ~~and~~
- Cumulative impacts from additional estate-style development on land use and visual character of the rural Gaviota Coast;
- Impacts to the agricultural operation from existing and future public access through the Ranch, including the existing unauthorized access to Edward's Point; and
- Location of the lateral trail easement north of U.S. Highway 101, separated from the vertical beach access and shoreline.

Table E-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--|--|
| CLASS I IMPACTS | | |
| Biological Resources | | |
| <p>Impact BIO-13: The Parcel 2 Development Envelope would potentially interfere with wildlife movements and adversely affect aquatic amphibians and reptiles such as California red-legged frog, Southwestern pond turtle, Coast Range Newt, and Two-Striped Garter Snake.</p> <p>The Parcel 2 development envelope is situated on a stream terrace immediately west of Gato Creek and almost completely covers the ground between UPRR tracks and the coastal bluff. The envelope introduces a barrier to upland migration for CRLF and other aquatic amphibians, especially in an east-west direction and could interfere with dispersal and aestivation of amphibian species and increase the potential for “take” of listed species.</p> | <p>Mitigation Measures BIO 5, 6-1, 12-1, and 12-2, and 13, <u>limit the size of the Parcel 2 development envelope and</u> which contain provisions for CCR’s and future development and ensuring adequate setbacks from sensitive habitats, would partially mitigate impacts.</p> | <p>Impact BIO-13 would remain significant and unavoidable absent relocation and reconfiguration of the Parcel 2 development envelope – Class I.</p> |
| CLASS II IMPACTS | | |
| Aesthetics/Visual Resources | | |
| <p>Impact AES-1: Impacts on Views and Impairment of Viewsheds, Views from U.S. Highway 101.</p> | <p>AES 1 In the event future residential development is sited within building area #1 (6a) on Parcel 6, it shall be restricted in height to 16 feet above existing grade (consistent with the Ridgeline/Hillside guidelines) and shall be sited and designed so as to avoid intrusion into the skyline as viewed from U.S. Highway 101. <u>Excessive grading, interpreted for this project to mean a cut or fill slope of five feet or greater, shall not be permitted as a means to avoid skyline intrusion.</u> Development of this site shall be subject to review and approval by the Central Board of Architectural Review (CBAR). Landscape plans</p> | <p>Less than significant with mitigation.</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>shall be prepared with the objective of integrating the structures with the surrounding landscape and softening views.</p> <p>AES 2 Future residential structures shall not exceed a maximum height of 15 feet above existing grade (excluding architectural projections) within the View Corridor Overlay District and the area designated as a Rural Historic Landscape.</p> <p>AES 3 All elements of the project (e.g., design, scale, character, colors, materials and landscaping) shall be compatible with the rural character of the area and vicinity development, including existing development within the site, and shall be subject to review and approval by the CBAR.</p> <p>AES 4 Natural building materials and colors compatible with surrounding terrain (earthtones and non-reflective paints) shall be used on exterior surfaces of all structures, including water tanks and non-agricultural fences. <u>White-board fencing shall not be permitted.</u></p> <p>Mitigation Measure CULT 5 would also apply.</p> | |
| Impact AES-2: Impacts on Views and Impairment of Viewsheds, Views from Union Pacific Railroad. | Same mitigation measures as for Impact AES-1. | Less than significant with mitigation. |
| Impact AES-3: Impacts on Views and Impairment of Viewsheds, Views from the Beach and Pacific Ocean. | Same mitigation measures as for Impact AES-1. Mitigation Measure REC 2 would also apply. | Less than significant with mitigation. |
| Impact AES-4: Impacts on Visual Character. | Same mitigation measures as for Impact AES-3 would apply. | Less than significant with mitigation. |
| Impact AES-5: Light and Glare Impacts | AES 56: To minimize nighttime lighting effects, future residential development on the site shall incorporate a lighting plan with the following elements: | Less than significant with mitigation. |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserve energy and follow night sky lighting practices, generally conforming to the standards and recommendations of the International Dark-Sky Association (IDA) and the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IESNA) for rural settings; • Any exterior night lighting installed on the project site <u>within the residential development envelopes</u> shall be of low intensity, low glare design, minimum height, and shall be fully hooded and shielded to direct light downward, such that lamp usage is not directly visible beyond the area of illumination; • Exterior lighting shall only be permitted within the development envelopes, <u>unless associated with the agricultural operation;</u> • Motion, light, and time sensors shall be used that minimize duration of use and 24-hour security lighting shall be avoided; • Uplighting of landscaping or structures shall be prohibited; • Locations of exterior lighting shall be minimized to that necessary for safety along driveways and parking areas. The driveway lighting shall be low intensity and indirect with on-demand switching to minimize night light visibility from public viewing places. | |
| Agricultural Resources | | |
| Impact AG-2: Indirect Impairment of Agricultural Operations and Productivity. | <p><i>Recommended Mitigation</i></p> <p>AG 2-1: Controlled Access. To protect the liability of the ranch’s agricultural operations, public access within the trails shall be restricted on days when aerial a pesticide application (<u>aerial or ground based</u>) is being conducted <u>until the treated area is safe to re-enter, when orchards or trees are being pruned adjacent to the trails, or when other activities that may endanger the public or pose a potential conflict are being conducted adjacent to or in close</u></p> | Less than significant with mitigation. |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| | <p><u>proximity to the trails.</u> The applicant/landowner shall notify the County Parks Department and post a notice at the trails' public control points within the ranch at least 48 hours in advance of closures. In addition, permanent signs shall be placed at the trails' public control points within the ranch identifying the agricultural practices and the issues associated with being present adjacent to an active agricultural area, as well as educating trail users on proper trail etiquette and directing them to the right locations.</p> <p>Required Mitigation</p> <p>AG 2-2: Buyer Notification Program. The following buyer notification shall be recorded on a separate information sheet with the final map and lot line adjustment or deed accompanying the sale of each lot:</p> <p>Important: Buyer Notification</p> <p><i>This property is zoned agriculture and is located in an area that is in active agriculture. The County of Santa Barbara has determined that it is in the public interest to preserve agricultural land and operations within the County and to specifically protect these lands for continued agricultural use. Through enactment of an ordinance adding Section 3-23, Article V to Chapter 3 of the County Code, any inconvenience or discomfort from properly conducted agricultural operations, including but not limited to noise, odors, dust, and chemicals, will not be deemed a nuisance. Landowners within or adjacent to agricultural operations shall be prepared to accept such problems as the natural result of living in or near agricultural areas.</i></p> <p>AG 2-3: CC&Rs. The applicant shall prepare and record CC&Rs for each lot, which address continued agricultural use of the ranch. The CC&Rs shall, at a minimum, address the following agricultural issues:</p> | |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of residential development envelopes, with the requirement that all residential buildings and non-agricultural structures be located within the development envelopes (except provisions for water storage tanks for fire protection purposes <u>and other permitted infrastructure improvements</u>); • No conversion of existing orchards to a non-agricultural use and conversion of existing orchards to grazing land shall be minimized, though crop types may be changed; any necessary buffers between orchards and residential and non-agricultural development must be contained within the residential development envelopes; • No impingement of existing cattle grazing operation by non-agricultural uses; restrict the installation of perimeter fencing outside of <u>the 2-acre areas selected by each owner for residential development within each development envelopes shall not interfere with the ongoing agricultural operation and shall to</u> ensure continued use of common grazing lands; • Provide cooperative management structure through identification of an HOA; • Establishment of standards for production of commercial agriculture and best management practices in the orchard areas. | |
| Biological Resources | | |
| Impact BIO-2: Impacts to nesting and foraging habitat for raptors | <p>BIO 2: Schedule Ground disturbance to Avoid Nesting Season or Conduct Pre-construction surveys and Establish Buffers for Avian and Special-Status Bat species. All construction-related activities, including, but not limited to, vegetation removal and initial ground disturbance, shall be scheduled to avoid the breeding bird season, which is generally February 1 to August 15. If construction must begin within this period, a qualified</p> | Less than significant with mitigation |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>biologist shall be retained to conduct a pre-construction survey for active nests in areas within 500 ft. of development. The biologist shall also survey nearby structures and habitats <u>within 500 feet</u> for bat roosts and <u>nests and</u> bat foraging activity.</p> | |
| <p>Impact BIO-3: Impacts to nesting and foraging habitat for bats</p> | <p>See Mitigation Measures BIO 2 and BIO 8.</p> | <p>Less than significant with mitigation</p> |
| <p>Impact BIO-4: Increased sedimentation during construction and polluted runoff from development</p> | <p>BIO 4-1: Additional Provisions for SWPPP and Erosion Control Plans. MM WAT 2-1 and 2-4 require the preparation of Stormwater and Erosion Control Plans. These plans shall also show the locations of coastal scrub, oak woodland, riparian woodland, delineated seasonal wetlands and undefined water bodies, and seeps within 100 feet of any work areas in the project area. Habitats occurring within 100 feet of proposed work areas shall be delineated in the field for avoidance during construction.</p> <p>BIO 4-2: Erosion Control BMPs and Seasonal Restrictions on Construction. The applicant shall incorporate all applicable Best Management Practices (BMPs), including seasonal restrictions on construction, as appropriate, into the grading/drainage plan and implemented in the field to contain, control, and prevent soil erosion and sedimentation occurring outside of the development envelopes or areas of disturbance. Seasonal restrictions on construction shall be subject to: a) raptor and other bird nesting season (March-July), and b) monarch autumnal and/or overwintering sites (November-February). In all cases, seasonal restrictions on construction for species protection shall be determined on a site-specific basis by a qualified local biologist, depending on field conditions revealed during field surveys.</p> | <p>Less than significant with mitigation</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>See also Mitigations WAT 2-1 through 2-4, which require a Storm Water Pollution Prevention and Control Program and an Erosion Control Plan for construction, and Mitigations WAT 3-1 and 3-2 which provide long-term erosion control protection through the minimization of surface runoff from development.</p> | |
| <p>Impact BIO-5: Building within Development Envelopes could result in potential degradation and loss of native grasslands, oak woodlands, and potential wetlands.</p> | <p>BIO 5: Buffer from Sensitive Habitat. Future residences and habitable structures within each development envelope, <u>as well as the water treatment facility and storage tanks</u>, shall be sited a minimum of 100 feet from the edge of sensitive habitat as depicted on Figure 4.4-6 of the EIR (30 ft. for native grasslands) and as determined in the field by a County-qualified biologist at the time of future development. Based on the field survey, building envelopes shall not encroach into the sensitive habitat areas.</p> | <p>Less than significant with mitigation</p> |
| <p>Impact BIO-6: Removal and degradation of environmentally sensitive vegetation for fuel management purposes</p> | <p>BIO 6-1: Buffer from Sensitive Habitat. All future residences, guest houses and other habitable structures <u>(including the water treatment facility)</u> must be positioned so that the 100-ft. fuel modification zones (30 feet for native grasslands) will not encroach within sensitive native habitat as depicted on Figure 4.4-6 of the EIR and as determined in the field by a County-qualified biologist at the time of future development, including oak forest and woodland, Eucalyptus (for Monarch habitat and drainage features) California sycamore riparian woodlands, native grasslands (foothill and purple needlegrass, and meadow barley), specific types of coastal sage scrub (i.e., goldenbush scrub and lemonadeberry scrub) and wetlands. Based on the field survey, fuel management shall not encroach into the sensitive habitat areas.</p> <p>BIO 6-2 Fuel Management Plan Required. The applicant shall prepare a Fuel Management Plan to ensure that</p> | <p>Less than significant with mitigation</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>avoidance is accomplished and to ensure that fuel management is balanced with sensitive resource protection. Plan Requirements: The Fuel Management Plan shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The goal of the plan would be to meet the dual goals of public safety and protection of significant vegetation. • The plan shall depict fuel management zones (i.e., Zone 1, 2, and 3) wherever required and shall include specific habitat and rare species protection and fuel management measures to be used in each management zone and for each habitat type. Onsite vegetation management shall be limited to the zones and clearance requirements/percentages conceptually described. • Impacts to native grasslands and special status plant and animal species shall be minimized. Zone 2 clearance of shrub cover shall not exceed 50% of shrub cover and shall be created in a mosaic pattern. Mowing of native bunchgrass shall occur in such a manner that at least 4 inches of height of each plant remains after mowing. | |
| <p>Impact BIO-7: Potential Introduction or Increase of Invasive Non-native Plants</p> | <p>BIO 7-1: Biologist review of Landscape Plans. Landscape Plans for future development shall be reviewed and approved by the P&D Staff Biologist. The applicant shall use native, locally collected plant species (coastal Santa Barbara and Ventura County species or other non-invasive plant material) for landscaping purposes.</p> <p>BIO 7-2: Revegetation of Disturbed Soils and Weed Eradication. All soil surfaces exposed during any construction activity and which are not proposed to be developed or landscaped shall be revegetated with native plants typical of the adjacent habitat immediately after</p> | <p>Less than significant with mitigation</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>construction. All disturbed areas shall be monitored for the presence of invasive species. If weedy invasive species are found to be present, a weed-eradication program for the affected area shall be developed and implemented.</p> <p>See also Mitigation Measures BIO 6-1 and 6-2.</p> | |
| <p>Impact BIO 8: Wildlife mortality and disturbance from Introduction of non native animals and interactions with humans</p> | <p>BIO 8: Prepare Resident Education Program. The applicant shall retain a qualified local biologist to prepare a Resident Education Program. Plan Requirements: At a minimum, the Program shall contain literature discussing proactive measures that landowners can implement regarding the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimizing the attractiveness of the project area, specifically livestock areas, to non native wildlife and avoiding or minimizing native wildlife mortality; ▪ Reducing or avoiding negative human/wildlife interactions; ▪ Keeping cats and dogs in at night in order to reduce predation by them on native wildlife and to prevent them from being preyed upon by coyotes and mountain lions; ▪ Restricting dogs on hiking trails; ▪ Developing measures to prevent domestic cats and dogs from roaming habitats outside the development envelopes; ▪ Preventing domestic cats and dogs from reproducing and becoming feral; ▪ Eliminating food sources and other attractive nuisances to wildlife in and around development envelopes; ▪ Limiting impacts of non native aquatic and terrestrial plants and animals on native wildlife and habitats (See BIO 6 above); ▪ Prohibiting release of non native animals into open | <p>Less than significant with mitigation</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>spaces and collecting of native wildlife, such as turtles, frogs, and snakes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Educating residents concerning snakes and the benefits of these predators for rodent control, identification of harmless species, and the alternative of capturing and moving snakes to open space areas rather than killing them; ▪ The value of swallows, black phoebes, and other cave-nesting birds for insect control; ▪ Simple, proactive, non-invasive measures that can be implemented by landowners to prevent nesting by these species on residences and other structures; and ▪ Other relevant topics. <p>See also Mitigation Measure BIO-12 1a, which limits agricultural activity on lots 1 and 2.</p> | |
| <p>Impact BIO-9: Gato Crossing: Temporary Construction Impacts of removal and construction of Gato Creek span crossing on Aquatic (mostly amphibian) wildlife</p> | <p>BIO 9: The applicant shall prepare a Gato Creek Bridge Crossing Protection and Restoration Plan for avoiding impact to sensitive species and <u>native</u> vegetation in Gato Creek during construction of the bridge. The Plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-Construction Surveys. Pre-construction surveys for California red-legged frogs, South Coast newts, and other special-status amphibian species shall be conducted prior to construction activities no more than one week before construction begins. If any individuals of CARLF are found, the agencies shall be contacted. • Biological Monitoring. Removal of the existing crossing and installation of the proposed span crossing shall be monitored by a qualified wildlife biologist with a handling permit for potentially-affected wildlife. The A County same qualified wildlife biologist shall monitor all aspects of removing the existing crossing | <p>Less than significant with mitigation</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|-----------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | <p>and installation of the new span crossing and installation of grade control structures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of boulder weirs. Prior to construction, plans for installing one or more boulder weirs (grade control structures) shall be prepared in consultation with a <u>County</u>-qualified wildlife biologist. The grade control structures shall consist of large boulders placed across the streambed upstream and downstream of the existing crossing in order to reduce the magnitude of streambed gradient re-adjustment following removal of the existing crossing. The boulder weir plans shall be included on all grading plans. • Dry season construction. All work shall be conducted in the dry season after CRLF and newt larvae have metamorphosed (August 1 - October 15). Removing and replacing the existing crossing shall be done in as short a period of time as possible. • Staging outside Gato Creek corridor. All staging and laydown areas shall be located outside of the Gato Creek riparian corridor on previously-disturbed ground. • Restoration of Vegetation. Any <u>native</u> riparian vegetation removed or damaged shall be restored at a 3:1 (restored acres: disturbed acres) ratio. A separate plan shall be prepared by a <u>County</u>-qualified botanist that would be reviewed and approved by P&D. The goal of the restoration would be to restore any riparian habitat or functions disturbed by construction with a similar assemblage of species that occur in the area such that the restoration area is suitably integrated into the larger ecological matrix. Specific measures for restoration and monitoring success shall be included in the plan, including: an explicit species list, installation methods and activities, performance standards, monitoring methods, and schedules and budgets. | |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fencing during construction. Any additional protection procedures proposed to be used, including marking the extent of ground disturbance and fencing areas for avoidance. | |
| Impact BIO-11: Temporary loss of riparian vegetation in Gato Creek | See Mitigation Measure BIO 9 above. | Less than significant with mitigation. |
| Impact BIO-12: The project would result in fragmentation and loss of grassland habitats, including effects on ground-dwelling special status reptile, bird and mammal species due to development | <p><u>Recommended Mitigation</u></p> <p>BIO 12-1: CC&R Provisions for Protection of Grassland Habitat and Wildlife. In order to protect remaining grassland habitat within the project site and use of the habitat by wildlife, the following measures shall be incorporated into CC&R's for the project:</p> <p>a. Open Space provisions and Regulation of Agricultural Use. Areas outside of development envelopes on Parcel 1 and 2 that contain native vegetation shall remain as open space and shall not be converted to row-crop agriculture, including, but not limited, to: alfalfa production, vineyards, orchards, or dry-farmed fields. Grazing shall be allowed.</p> <p>b. Fencing. <u>New</u> fences outside of development envelopes, along access roads and elsewhere in open space areas, shall be <u>constructed to allow for wildlife passage while still providing the necessary functions for the cattle operation</u> no more than 48 inches high and shall be constructed either of three strand barbed wire or two rail wooden rails; the bottom strand or rail shall be no lower than 24 inches above the ground surface. The use of deer fencing or other tall mesh-type fencing shall be restricted to agricultural areas and within development envelopes. Construction of stone, stucco, or other solid walls outside of</p> | Less than significant with mitigation |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|-----------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | <p>development envelopes shall be prohibited.</p> <p>c. Rodenticides prohibited. Rodenticides, pesticides, and other chemical and/or mechanical control of insects and rodents shall be prohibited outside of development envelopes and actively farmed <u>and grazed</u> areas as required in order to avoid impacts to prey populations on which raptors and carnivores depend for food. Rodent traps within the development envelopes shall be restricted to snap-traps and not rodenticides, which may kill rodents over a broad area outside the development envelopes.</p> <p>BIO 12-2: <u>Habitat Avoidance, Protection, and Restoration Plan</u>Future plans to show provisions for Protection of Grassland Habitat and Wildlife. <u>To minimize impacts to sensitive resources from future development on Parcels 1 and 2, an onsite Habitat Avoidance, Protection, and Restoration Plan shall be prepared by a qualified biologist prior to development occurring on proposed Parcels 1 and 2. The Plan shall be prepared based on siting surveys conducted according to Mitigation Measure BIO-5. The Plan shall meet the following minimum parameters: In order to protect remaining grassland habitat within the project site and use of the habitat by wildlife, the following measures shall be printed on all plans for future development:</u></p> <p><u>a. Development envelopes shall be reduced in size from 5 acres to 2 acres (Parcel 1) and from 2.5 acres to 1 acre (Parcel 2);</u></p> <p><u>b. Development envelopes shall avoid impacting native grasslands;</u></p> <p><u>c. Any native habitats temporarily or permanently disturbed shall be restored at a 2:1 ratio based on</u></p> | |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|---|
| | <p><u>acreage.</u></p> <p>a.d. Roadways. Roadways shall not contain curbs, ditches, or other barriers to small, ground-dwelling wildlife. The width of access roads shall be the minimum necessary for vehicular and emergency vehicle safety in order to avoid or minimize habitat fragmentation and barriers to wildlife movement. Maximum speed limits on all access roads shall not exceed 20 mph in order to avoid or minimize wildlife mortality.</p> <p>e. Lighting. All outdoor lighting (including around residences, barns, corrals, and other facilities), access roads, and trails shall be of the minimum number and wattage necessary for safety and shall be shielded and directed downward to minimize light “pollution” to adjacent open spaces. Lighting within development envelopes shall not be directed outside of the envelopes.</p> <p>b.f. Landscaping shall avoid disturbance of native habitats.</p> | |
| <p>Impact BIO 14: Project use of beaches could result in impacts to special status beach dwelling invertebrates, specifically the globose dune beetle (Class II)</p> | <p>BIO 14-1: — Globose Dune Beetle Protection Plan. The landowner shall prepare a Globose Dune Beetle Protection Plan. Plan Requirements: The Plan shall include management measures to protect the dune beetle and beach areas including (1) restricting motor vehicles, horses and bikes from the beach and intertidal areas; and (2) restricting grooming of beaches.</p> | <p>Less than significant with mitigation</p> |
| <p>Impact BIO-15: Potential Loss or Degradation of Monarch butterfly autumnal and overwintering habitat (Class II)</p> | <p>BIO 15-1: Trees in the monarch groves shall not be trimmed or removed during construction or occupation unless approved and monitored by County P&D and a</p> | <p>Less than significant with mitigation</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>qualified monarch butterfly biologist.</p> <p>BIO 15-2: Monarch Protection Plan. The landowner and future applicants for Lots 1, 2, 4 and 5 shall prepare and implement a Monarch Butterfly Protection Plan. The Plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing restrictions on grading and construction of access roads and future residential development that require use of heavy equipment, including backhoes, to avoid noise, dust, and increased human activity impacts to overwintering monarch butterflies (i.e., construction activities should occur between March and October); • If grading or other heavy equipment work must occur between October and March, a qualified biologist shall survey all eucalyptus trees within 50 feet of the development area prior to the start of work to determine use by monarchs. If butterfly aggregations are found within 50 feet of the work area, work activities shall be delayed until monarchs have left the site. <p>See also Mitigation Measure BIO 5.</p> | |
| <p>Impact BIO-16: Potential effects on wetland resources on Parcels 4 and 5</p> | <p>BIO 16: Wetlands. All site improvements and project development shall maintain a minimum 100-ft. buffer from all coastal wetlands. The potential wetlands in the vicinity of Parcels 4 and 5 shall be properly delineated (i.e., using U.S. Army Corps of Engineers methods and coastal zone definitions) and identified on all grading or building plans for future residential development. No new structures, including irrigation and non-native landscaping, shall be placed, and no disturbance shall occur, within the wetlands or the 100 ft. buffers.</p> | <p>Less than significant with mitigation</p> |
| <p>Impact BIO-18: Potential effects on coast live oak forest, riparian resources, Santa Barbara honeysuckle, and</p> | <p>BIO 18: Water line Location. The water line locations shall utilize existing roads and disturbed areas to</p> | <p>Less than significant with mitigation</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| Plummer’s Baccharis on Parcel 6 from construction of water lines | the maximum extent feasible. Trenching shall be avoided under oak tree canopies and near sensitive plants. Prior to construction, the applicant shall survey and flag the alignment of the water lines along Gato Creek. A County-qualified biologist shall be retained to participate in the survey and realign the water line where necessary to avoid impacts to sensitive plant species or riparian vegetation. Any field revisions shall be plotted on a revised site plan submitted to P&D for review and approval. | |
| Cultural Resources | | |
| Impact CULT-1: Indirect Impacts on Cultural Resources | <p>CULT 1-1 All earth disturbances associated with infrastructure improvements and future residential development shall be monitored by a P&D-qualified archaeologist <u>unless subsurface testing within the area of disturbance determines that no resources are present.</u></p> <p>CULT 1-2 In the event archaeological remains are encountered during grading, work shall be stopped immediately or redirected until a P&D qualified archaeologist and Native American representative are retained by the applicant to evaluate the significance of the find pursuant to Phase 2 investigations of the County Archaeological Guidelines. If remains are found to be significant, they shall be subject to a Phase 3 mitigation program consistent with County Archaeological Guidelines and funded by the applicant.</p> | Less than significant with mitigation |
| Impact CULT-2: Impacts to CA-SBA-80 on Proposed Parcel 3 | <p>CULT 2-1 The development envelope on Parcel 3 shall be reduced in size in order to avoid the high-density area of CA-SBA-80 that contributes to the site’s significance, <u>as recommended in the Phase 2 Archaeological Investigation of Parcel 3 conducted by Applied Earthworks in 2010 (to be determined by a County-qualified archaeologist).</u></p> | Less than significant with mitigation |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| | <p>CULT 2-2 No ground disturbance of any kind, including landscaping and vegetation removal involving disturbance of root balls, shall be permitted outside of the reconfigured development Parcel 3 envelope. Utility infrastructure shall be sited so as to avoid the significant portions of CA-SBA-80, <u>as recommended in the Phase 2 Archaeological Investigation of Parcel 3 conducted by Applied Earthworks in 2010.</u> No additional orchard planting shall be permitted within the boundaries of CA-SBA-80. Grazing shall be exempt from this requirement.</p> <p>CULT 2-3 The high-density area of CA-SBA-80 (as determined by a County-qualified archaeologist) shall be temporarily fenced with chain link flagged with color or other material authorized by P&D where ground disturbance is proposed within 100 feet.</p> <p>CULT 2-4 All earth disturbances within the development envelope for proposed Parcel 3 shall be monitored by a P&D-qualified archaeologist and a Native American Observer in accordance with the County Cultural Resource Guidelines.</p> <p>CULT 2-5 In the event significant archaeological remains such as features or diagnostic artifacts are encountered during grading in the low-density portion of CA-SBA-80, work shall be stopped immediately or redirected until a P&D qualified archaeologist and Native American representative are retained by the applicant to evaluate the significance of the find pursuant to Phase 2 investigations of the County Archaeological Guidelines. If remains are found to be significant, they shall be subject to a Phase 3 mitigation program consistent with County Archaeological Guidelines and funded by the applicant.</p> | |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Impact CULT-3: Impacts to CA-SBA-2409 on Proposed Parcel 7 | <p>CULT 3 Archaeological site CA-SBA-2409 and a buffer area (to be determined by a County-qualified archaeologist) shall be temporarily fenced with chain link flagged with color or other material authorized by P&D where ground disturbance is proposed within 100 feet of the site.</p> | Less than significant with mitigation |
| Impact CULT-5: Impacts to Rural Historic Landscape | <p>CULT 5: Proposed residential and accessory buildings in Envelope Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 shall be compatible in size, bulk, scale, height, and style with the Las Varas Ranch’s existing historic buildings. Plans for proposed future residential development within these envelopes shall be reviewed by a County-approved <u>qualified</u> architectural historian contracted by the owner/applicant to ensure that future development does not compromise the integrity of the rural setting and adheres to the Secretary of the Interior’s <i>Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i>.</p> <p>See also Mitigation Measure CULT 6-1, which would require preservation of the existing historic structures.</p> | Less than significant with mitigation |
| Impact CULT-6: Impacts to Historic Structures | <p>CULT 6-1: The significant historic buildings in Area 1 and Area 2 shall be retained <i>in situ</i>. Any rehabilitation of these buildings shall be undertaken using the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.</p> <p>CULT 6-2: Prior to the project’s implementation the applicant shall provide for photographic documentation of the significant buildings in Areas 1 and 2 within their setting by a County-approved historian. Such photographic documentation includes large-format black and white archival photographs of the elevations of each building and their relationship to each other within their setting. A color Xerox copy of these photographs, with a copy of this report, shall be provided to Planning and Development in</p> | Less than significant with mitigation |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| | <p>hard copy and digital format and the original photographs and negatives shall be compiled in a binder, with a site map with arrows indicating the direction of each photograph, and provided to the Goleta Valley Historical Society.</p> <p>See also Mitigation CULT 5, which would ensure that new development is compatible with the size, height, and style of the existing historic structures.</p> | |
| Fire Hazards | | |
| Impact FIRE-2: Fire Response Times and Service Levels. | FIRE-1: Impact Fees. All applicable Development Impact Mitigation Fees in effect at the time of permit issuance for future residential development of the site shall be paid. | Less than significant with mitigation |
| Geologic Processes | | |
| Impact GEO-1: Erosion and Sedimentation | Short-term erosion impacts would be mitigated by implementation of Mitigation Measure WAT 2-4, which requires preparation and implementation of an erosion and sediment control plan during grading and construction activities. Long-term erosion impacts resulting from development of the site would be mitigated by implementation of Mitigation Measures WAT 3-1 and 3-2, which require the implementation of various Best Management Practices (BMPs) and drainage features in order to minimize runoff and associated long-term erosion and sedimentation. | Less than significant with mitigation |
| Impact GEO-2: Bluff Retreat | GEO 1: Bluff Retreat. All structures and improvements adjacent to the coastal bluffs shall be setback from the bluff tops consistent with the approved development envelopes. All structures and improvements within Parcels 1 and 2 shall be designed such that surface and subsurface drainage from development is conducted | Less than significant with mitigation |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| | away from coastal bluffs and does not contribute to bluff erosion. | |
| Impact GEO-3: Landslides and Slope Stability | GEO 2: Geologic Hazards. Site-specific engineering geology/geotechnical report(s) and soils engineering studies addressing structure sites, shared water system, and access roads shall be performed. These reports shall provide recommendations for proper grading, foundation design, and other structural components of future development. | Less than significant with mitigation |
| Impact GEO-4: Expansive Soils and Liquefaction | See Mitigation Measure GEO 2 above. | Less than significant with mitigation |
| Impact GEO-6: Radon Gas | GEO 3: Prior to issuance of building permits, radon testing shall be conducted in all areas of proposed structural development. If radon gas is present, habitable structures shall be designed and constructed in accordance with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) guidelines for minimizing impacts associated with radon gas exposure. | Less than significant with mitigation |
| Hazardous Materials | | |
| Impact HAZ-1: Impacts from Past Oil and Gas Activities | <p>HAZ 1-1: Hazardous Materials Discovery - Field Observation. A registered environmental assessor shall <u>conduct a pre-grading/construction training with appropriate construction crews regarding the identification of contaminated soil and shall be on-site during grading and site excavation activities in areas that are within 300 yards500 feet of mapped abandoned oil wells.</u> In the event that visual contamination or chemical odors are detected while implementing the approved work on the project site, all work shall cease immediately. The property owner or appointed agent shall contact the County Fire Department’s Hazardous Materials Unit (HMU); the resumption of work requires the approval of the HMU.</p> <p>HAZ 1-2: Encountering Oil Production Infrastructure. In the event that any unexpected wells or piping are encountered during normal grading operations, all grading</p> | Less than significant with mitigation |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>operations shall cease until the Division of Oil and Gas has been notified and appropriate actions have been taken. Previously abandoned wells showing evidence of continued leaking shall require re-abandonment to current standards under the direction of DOGGR and the County Fire Department in compliance with California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 4 and the Public Resources Code, Section 3106.</p> | |
| <p>Impact HAZ-2: Impacts from Agricultural Operations.</p> | <p>HAZ 2: Hazardous Materials Permits. The landowner/applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and authorizations from the County Fire Department for the storage and handling of hazardous materials, including agricultural chemicals, fuels, and spent lubricants. The landowner/applicant shall prepare and submit to the County Fire Department a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) plan for their review and approval.</p> | <p>Less than significant with mitigation</p> |
| <p>Land Use</p> | | |
| <p>Impact LU-1: Land Use Compatibility.</p> | <p>Land use impacts associated with compatibility of development would be mitigated by implementation of the following mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigation Measure CULT 5, which requires that future residential development be compatible with the size, bulk, scale, height, and style of existing historic structures within the project site; and • Mitigation Measures AES 1 through AES 5, which reduce aesthetic impacts of the project. • Mitigation Measure AG 2-3, which codifies the applicant’s commitment to remain in agriculture through the recordation of CC&Rs. | <p>Less than significant with mitigation</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--|--|
| Impact LU-2: Conflicts with County Policies | Mitigation Measure CULT 2-1, which reduces the extent of the development envelope on Parcel 3, would ensure consistency with Coastal Land Use Plan Policy 10-2. Mitigation Measure BIO 16 would ensure consistency with Coastal Land Use Plan Policy 9-9. | Less than significant with mitigation |
| Recreation | | |
| Impact REC-2: Effects on the Quality or Quantity of Existing Recreational Opportunities. | REC 2: The design for any future residences on proposed Parcels 1 and 2, including massing, building materials, colors, and landscaping, shall be compatible with the rural character of the area. Residences shall be set back far enough from the beach and sized appropriately so as to not intrude into the skyline or break the view plane of the Santa Ynez Mountains as viewed by the public. <u>Excessive grading, interpreted for this project to mean a cut or fill slope of five feet or greater, shall not be permitted as a means to avoid skyline intrusion. The peak height of residential structures shall be 15 feet, consistent with View Corridor Overlay requirements, unless otherwise approved by the CBAR following a site visit and the erection of story poles.</u> —The minimum distance for residential structures from the bluff top or beach edge shall be 200 feet. | Less than significant with mitigation |
| Impact REC 3: Effects of the Proposed Recreational Facilities. | REC 3: The applicant shall work with the County Parks Department to develop an alternative to the pedestrian bridge that will facilitate public use of the trail while maintaining necessary security and protection of the existing agricultural operation. This may include a combination of fencing, gates, cattle guards, and/or temporary trail closures. | Less than significant with mitigation |
| Transportation/Circulation | | |
| Impact TRANS-2: Traffic-Related Hazards. | TRANS 1: To improve the corner and stopping sight distance, the small cut slope approximately 600 feet north of the Las Varas Ranch Road access on the beach side shall | Less than significant with mitigation |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>be modified to increase the sight distance.</p> <p>TRANS 2: The existing northbound left turn lane shall be extended approximately 240 feet within the center median to meet the minimum Caltrans distance of 530 feet.</p> <p>TRANS-3: Full deceleration and acceleration lanes at Las Varas Ranch Road along the southbound shoulder of U.S. Highway 101 shall be constructed to meet minimum Caltrans requirements.</p> | |
| Water Resources/Flooding | | |
| <p>Impact WAT-2: Construction-related Water Quality Impacts.</p> | <p>WAT 2-1 SWPPP. The applicant shall submit proof of exemption or a copy of the Notice of Intent to obtain coverage under the Construction General Permit of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.</p> <p>WAT 2-2 Sediment and Contamination Containment. The Owner/Applicant shall prevent water contamination during construction by implementing the following construction site measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All entrances/exits to the construction site shall be stabilized using methods designed to reduce transport of sediment off site. Stabilizing measures may include but are not limited to use of gravel pads, steel rumble plates, temporary paving, etc. Any sediment or other materials tracked off site shall be removed the same day as they are tracked using dry cleaning methods. Entrances/exits shall be maintained until graded areas have been stabilized by structures, long-term erosion control measures or landscaping. 2. Apply concrete, asphalt, and seal coat only during dry weather. 3. Cover storm drains and manholes within the | <p>Less than significant with mitigation</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| | <p>construction area when paving or applying seal coat, slurry, fog seal, etc.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Store, handle and dispose of construction materials and waste such as paint, mortar, concrete slurry, fuels, etc. in a manner which minimizes the potential for storm water contamination. 5. Re-vegetate graded areas upon within 30 days of completion of grading activities with deep rooted, native, drought-tolerant species to minimize slope failure and erosion potential. Use hydroseed, straw blankets, other geotextile binding fabrics or other P&D approved methods as necessary to hold slope soils until vegetation is established. P&D may require the reseeded of surfaces graded for the placement of structures if construction does not commence within 30 days of grading. <p>WAT 2-3 Equipment Washout-Construction. The Owner/Applicant shall designate a washout area(s) for the washing of concrete trucks, paint, equipment, or similar activities to prevent wash water from discharging to the storm drains, street, drainage ditches, creeks, or wetlands. Note that polluted water and materials shall be contained in this area and removed from the site on a daily basis <u>necessary to avoid spillage</u>. The area shall be located at least 100 feet from any storm drain, waterbody or sensitive biological resources.</p> <p>WAT 2-4 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan. Grading and erosion and sediment control plans shall be designed to minimize erosion during construction and shall be implemented for the duration of the grading period and until regraded areas have been stabilized by structures, long-term erosion control measures or permanent landscaping. The Owner/Applicant shall</p> | |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>submit an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) using Best Management Practices (BMP) designed to stabilize the site, protect natural watercourses/creeks, prevent erosion, convey storm water runoff to existing drainage systems keeping contaminants and sediments onsite. The Erosion and Sediment control plan shall be a part of the Grading Plan submittal and will be reviewed for its technical merits by P&D. Information on Erosion Control requirements can be found on the County web site re: Grading Ordinance Chapter 14 (www.countysb.org/government/county_ordinance_code_Chapter_14_14-9 and 14-29 - refer to Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Requirements.)</p> <p><u>WAT 2-5 Grading Limits.</u> All future plans for development within individual development envelopes shall designate a "limit of disturbance" line within the envelope.</p> | |
| <p>Impact WAT-3: Long-term Water Quality Impacts and Hydrological Changes.</p> | <p>WAT 3-1 Storm Water Retention-Biofiltration Systems. To reduce storm water runoff, allow for infiltration, reduce pollutants and minimize degradation of storm water quality from development, parking lots and other paved surfaces, the Owner/Applicant shall construct a permanent biofiltration system to treat storm water runoff from the site. Biofiltration includes vegetated swales, channels, buffer strips, retention, and rain gardens, and shall be designed in accordance with the California Stormwater BMP Handbook for New Development and Redevelopment (California Storm Water Quality Association) or other approved method. The biofiltration systems shall be designed by a registered civil engineer specializing in water quality or other qualified professional to ensure that the filtration properties and the plants selected are adequate to reduce concentrations of the target pollutants including nutrients, heavy metals, pathogens, and oil and grease. Where feasible, local plants sources (i.e.,</p> | <p>Less than significant with mitigation</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>collected from the watershed or propagated from cuttings or seed collected from the watershed) shall be used in the biofiltration system. Invasive plants shall not be used. Biofilters shall not replace existing riparian vegetation or native vegetation unless otherwise approved by P&D.</p> <p>WAT 3-2 To reduce runoff from impervious areas and allow for infiltration, the applicant shall incorporate pervious materials or surfaces (e.g., porous pavement or unit pavers on sand) into the project design where feasible, including parking areas, courtyards, etc.</p> <p>WAT 3-3 All outdoor trash container areas must meet the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Trash container areas must divert drainage from adjoining paved areas. 2) Trash container areas must be protected and regularly maintained to prevent off-site transport of trash. | |
| CLASS III IMPACTS | | |
| Aesthetics/Visual Resources | | |
| Impact AES-6: Impacts on Private Views. | None required. | Less than significant before mitigation. |
| Agricultural Resources | | |
| Impact AG-1: Direct Effects on Agricultural Operations and Productivity. | None Required | Less than significant before mitigation. |
| Impact AG-3: Effects on Long-term Viability | None Required | Less than significant before mitigation. |
| Air Quality | | |
| Impact AQ-1: Construction PM ₁₀ Emissions. | <p>AQ 1: Construction-Generated Airborne Dust (PM₁₀). The applicant shall prepare a Construction Management Plan to control PM₁₀ emissions. At a minimum the Plan shall include the following dust control measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement | Less than significant before mitigation. |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| | <p>damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this should include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency shall be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 mph. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible. However, reclaimed water should not be used in or around crops grown for human consumption.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimize the amount of disturbed area and reduce onsite vehicle speeds to 15 mph per hour or less. • Gravel pads must be installed at all access points to prevent tracking of mud on to public roads and internal private roads where applicable. • If importation, exportation, and stockpiling of fill material are involved, soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be covered with a tarp from the point of origin. • After clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation is completed, the disturbed area shall be treated by watering, revegetating, or spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur. • The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust off site. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SBCAPCD prior to approval of permits for map recordation and for finish grading for any structures. | |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Impact AQ-2: Construction-related NO_x and ROG Emissions.</p> | <p>AQ 2: Construction-Related Emissions. The applicant shall prepare a Construction Management Plan to control diesel emissions during construction. At a minimum the Plan shall incorporate the following mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All portable diesel-fired construction engines rated at 50 brake-horsepower or greater must have either statewide Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) certificates or APCD permits prior to operation. Construction engines with PERP certificates are exempt from APCD permit, provided they will be on-site for less than 12 months. • Diesel construction equipment meeting the California Air Resources Board’s Tier 1 emission standards for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines shall be used. Equipment meeting Tier 2 or higher emissions standards should be used to the maximum extent feasible. • Diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts, and diesel particulate filters, as certified and/or verified by EPA or California, shall be installed on equipment operating on-site, if available. • Diesel-powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible. • Idling of heavy-duty diesel trucks during loading and unloading should be limited to five minutes; auxiliary power units should be used whenever possible. • Construction worker’s trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch on site. • The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size. • The amount of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient construction management practices to ensure that the | <p>Less than significant before mitigation.</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>smallest practical number is operating at any one time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction equipment shall be maintained per the manufacturer’s specifications. • Construction equipment operating on site shall be equipped with two or four degree engine timing retard or pre-combustion chamber engines. • Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible. | |
| Impact AQ-3: Long-term Emissions | <p>AQ 3: Energy Conservation Measures. The applicant shall incorporate the following energy conservation measures into future building plans unless the applicant or future landowner proves to the satisfaction of P&D that incorporation of a specific measure is infeasible:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Exceed the California Title 24 Energy Code requirements by 20% or greater for all relevant applications, including energy efficient appliances and lighting. 2. Apply water-based paint on all structures. 3. Low NOx residential and commercial water heaters and space heaters per specifications in the 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan; 4. Solar panels for residential water heating systems and other facilities or use of on-demand water heater(s); Include design elements that maximize the use of natural lighting and passive solar cooling/heating. 5. Construct parking areas with concrete or other non-polluting materials instead of asphalt. 6. Develop landscape plans that use landscaping to shade buildings and parking areas where feasible. | Less than significant before mitigation. |
| Impact AQ-4: Carbon Monoxide Hot Spots | None required. | Less than significant before mitigation. |
| Biological Resources | | |
| <u>Impact BIO-8: Wildlife mortality and disturbance from Introduction of non-native animals and interactions with</u> | <u>BIO 8: Prepare Resident Education Program.</u> The applicant shall retain a qualified local biologist to prepare a Resident Education Program. <u>Plan Requirements:</u> At a | <u>Less than significant with mitigation</u> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| <p><u>humans</u></p> | <p><u>minimum, the Program shall contain literature discussing proactive measures that landowners shall implement regarding the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Minimizing the attractiveness of the project area, specifically livestock areas, to non-native wildlife and avoiding or minimizing native wildlife mortality;</u> ▪ <u>Reducing or avoiding negative human/wildlife interactions;</u> ▪ <u>Keeping cats and dogs in at night in order to reduce predation by them on native wildlife and to prevent them from being preyed upon by coyotes and mountain lions;</u> ▪ <u>Requiring leashing of dogs on hiking trails;</u> ▪ <u>Developing measures to prevent domestic cats and dogs from roaming habitats outside the development envelopes, such as barrier fencing around the development envelopes;</u> ▪ <u>Preventing domestic cats and dogs from reproducing and becoming feral;</u> ▪ <u>Eliminating food sources and other attractive nuisances to wildlife in and around development envelopes;</u> ▪ <u>Limiting impacts of non-native aquatic and terrestrial plants and animals on native wildlife and habitats (See BIO-6 and BIO 7-1 above);</u> ▪ <u>Prohibiting release of non-native animals into open spaces and collecting of native wildlife, such as turtles, frogs, and snakes;</u> ▪ <u>Educating residents concerning snakes and the benefits of these predators for rodent control, identification of harmless species, and the alternative of capturing and moving snakes to open space areas rather than killing them;</u> ▪ <u>The value of swallows, black phoebes, and other eave-nesting birds for insect control,</u> | |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Simple, proactive, non-invasive measures that can be implemented by landowners to prevent nesting by these species on residences and other structures; and</u> ▪ <u>Other relevant topics.</u> <p><u>See also Mitigation Measure BIO 12-1a, which limits agricultural activity on lots 1 and 2.</u></p> | |
| Impact BIO-10: Gato Crossing: Short-term, Temporary Water Quality Impacts During Construction (removal of crossing) | None required | Less than significant before mitigation. |
| <u>Impact BIO-14: Project use of beaches could result in impacts to special-status beach-dwelling invertebrates, specifically the globose dune beetle (Class III)</u> | <u>None required</u> | <u>Less than significant before mitigation.</u> |
| Impact BIO-17: Potential effects on riparian and wildlife resources on Parcel 5 from trail construction and use. | None required | Less than significant before mitigation. |
| Cultural Resources | | |
| Impact CULT-4: Ethnic Impacts | None required | Less than significant before mitigation |
| Fire Hazards | | |
| Impact Fire-1: Defensibility and Potential for Wildland Fires | None required | Less than significant before mitigation |
| Geologic Processes | | |
| Impact GEO-5: Seismic Shaking | None required | Less than significant before mitigation |
| Land Use | | |
| Impact LU-3: Growth Inducing Impacts. | None required | Less than significant before mitigation |
| Recreation | | |
| Impact REC-1: Conflicts with Established Recreational Uses. | None required | Less than significant before mitigation |
| Transportation/Circulation | | |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--|---|
| Impact TRANS-1: Long-term Traffic Impacts. | None required | Less than significant before mitigation |
| Water Resources/Flooding | | |
| Impact WAT-1: Drainage and Flood Hazards. | None required | Less than significant before mitigation |
| Impact WAT-4: Groundwater Resources | <p>No mitigation is required. However, in order to minimize water use given the uncertain state of long-term water supplies in the region as a whole, the following mitigation measures are recommended.</p> <p>WAT 4-1 Outdoor water use shall be limited through the measures listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Landscaping shall be <u>primarily</u> with native and/or drought tolerant species. b. Drip irrigation or other water-conserving irrigation shall be installed. c. Plant material shall be grouped by water needs. d. Turf shall constitute less than 20% of the total landscaped area. e. No turf shall be allowed on slopes of over 4%. f. Extensive mulching (2" minimum) shall be used in all landscaped areas to improve the water holding capacity of the soil by reducing evaporation and soil compaction. f. Soil moisture sensing devices shall be installed to prevent unnecessary irrigation. g. <u>If a successor ordinance is adopted regulating outdoor water use, it shall be complied with and shall supersede the above requirements.</u> h. Permeable surfaces such as turf block or intermittent permeable surfaces such as French drains shall be | Less than significant before mitigation |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>used for all parking areas and driveways.</p> <p>WAT 4-2 Indoor water use shall be limited through the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. All hot water lines shall be insulated. b. Recirculating, point-of-use, or on-demand water heaters shall be installed. c. Self regenerating water softening shall be prohibited in all structures. d. Pool(s) shall have pool cover(s). | |
| CLASS IV IMPACTS | | |
| Impact BIO-1: Replacement of Arizona crossing at Gato Creek with a span bridge would remove a barrier to special status fish species dispersal. | None required. | Beneficial impact |
| Impact REC-3: Effects of the Proposed Recreational Facilities. | None required | Beneficial Impact |
| CUMULATIVE IMPACTS | | |
| <p>Cumulative Aesthetic Impacts</p> <p>Given that many of the recently approved, planned, and pending projects identified in Section 3.0 are located in the coastal zone and visible from a roadway (U.S. Highway 101) recognized as highly scenic by the County and eligible for scenic highway designation by the State, and located in areas highly visible to the public in one of the last remaining rural, undeveloped coastlines in southern California, cumulative impacts to the visual character and important visual resources and viewsheds of the Gaviota Coast are considered significant. However, the proposed project would contribute a total of seven new residences to the area.</p> | See Mitigation Measures AES 1 through AES 5. | Less than significant (not cumulatively considerable) - Class II |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Five of these would be on the coastal terrace south of U.S. Highway 101 on property totaling approximately 520 acres and the other two would be sited north of the highway on property totaling approximately 1,264 acres. Therefore, the density of development associated with the proposed project would remain compatible with the rural character of the area. In addition, much of the new development would be screened from public view by vegetation or existing topography and therefore their presence would not contribute to the change in the visual character of the area as experienced by the public. Lastly, new development within the ranch would have to be designed to be compatible with the character of the existing ranch development in order to protect the integrity of the Rural Historic Landscape, as discussed in Section 4.5. Given these factors, the project's contribution to the significant cumulative impacts is <i>not cumulatively considerable</i>.</p> | | |
| <p>Cumulative Agricultural Impacts</p> <p>While estate-style residential development will occur within the area, as identified by the related projects in Section 3.0, it is expected that agricultural uses will continue and sufficient land will continue to be available for agriculture. Overall, cumulative impacts to agriculture along the Gaviota Coast are considered less than significant. Given the nature and extent of the proposed project, the project's contribution to cumulative agricultural impacts is <i>not cumulatively considerable</i>.</p> | <p>See Mitigation Measures AG 2-1 through 2-3.</p> | <p>Less than significant (not cumulatively considerable) - Class II</p> |
| <p>Impact AQ-5: Cumulative Air Quality</p> <p>On a cumulative basis, other planned, pending and future projects as identified in Section 3.0 would incrementally add to the generation of air pollutants from construction activities and long-term traffic generation. Vehicles trips generated by traffic associated with these projects would</p> | <p>None required.</p> | <p>Less than significant (not cumulatively considerable) - Class III</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| <p>contribute incrementally to the County air emissions; however the burden contributed by any single project-generated vehicular use is added to that from thousands of other vehicles. The impact of a single project or collection of projects is very small on a regional scale. Cumulative impacts are therefore often addressed in terms of project compatibility with the County air quality plans. With projects that have been properly accounted for or anticipated in the County-wide growth projections used as a basis for regional air quality planning, there would be no significant cumulative impact as a result of unanticipated growth. The 2007 Clean Air Plan indicates that the County is projected to reach attainment status even with continued growth as currently forecasted; based upon a menu of air pollution reduction strategies to be implemented on small and large scales, including the application of standard emission controls applied to development projects, increased vehicle emission standards, and alternative transportation programs. The proposed project is consistent with plan elements and land use designations included as part of the County Comprehensive Plan and Coastal Land Use Plan. Since the project’s air quality impacts are less than significant and the project is consistent with the Clean Air Plan, its contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is <i>not cumulatively considerable</i>.</p> | | |
| <p>Impact AQ-6: Greenhouse Gas Emissions</p> <p>Given the global nature of climate change resulting from GHG emissions, GHG emission impacts are inherently cumulative in nature. The determination of whether a project’s GHG emissions impacts are significant depends on whether emissions would represent a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact. In 2004, California emitted 484 million metric tons of GHGs (CARB 2007). The proposed project would</p> | <p>See Mitigation Measure AQ 3.</p> | <p>Less than significant (not cumulatively considerable) - Class III</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--|---|
| <p>contribute incrementally to cumulative greenhouse gas emissions through the release of carbon dioxide from vehicle use and indirectly through energy consumption for the residences and other uses. According to the URBEMIS 2007 computer model, the proposed project would generate maximum daily carbon dioxide emissions of approximately 1,934 pounds per day (321 metric tons/year), driven primarily by vehicle emissions from future residents and public visitors to the proposed beach access trail. This is far less than the 1,100 metric ton significance criteria referenced in Section 4.3.3, though it does not include indirect emissions associated with residential electricity use.</p> <p>According to the BAAQMD, the 1,100 metric ton significance criteria is equivalent to approximately 60 single-family residences given average annual household GHG emissions of approximately 18.3 metric tons/household/year.⁴ The proposed project would result in the development of up to seven new single family dwellings. Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts as a result of GHG emissions would <i>not be cumulatively considerable</i>.</p> | | |
| <p>Cumulative Biological Impact</p> <p>In conjunction with other planned, pending, and potential future projects in the vicinity of the project site (e.g., Santa Barbara Ranch, Paradiso del Mare Ocean and Inland Estates, Eagle Canyon Ranch), the project has the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts on biological resources. Future residential development along the coastal terrace in the vicinity of the project site has the potential to result in the incremental loss or degradation of significant raptor</p> | <p>See project-specific mitigation measures to reduce impacts to biological resources.</p> | <p>Cumulatively considerable - Class I</p> |

⁴ BAAQMD Thresholds of Significance (May 2010), at 60.

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--|--|
| <p>roosting, foraging, and nesting habitat. The resulting incremental loss and fragmentation of habitat will further restrict the movement of wildlife across and between habitats. Loss of foraging habitat for white-tailed kites on nearby properties, when combined with on-site impacts to foraging habitat, could decrease the viability of nesting and breeding in the project vicinity. Residential development in the project vicinity associated with the related projects also has the potential to result in cumulative impacts to riparian vegetation and aquatic species such as California red-legged frog. This would result from 1) direct impacts from disturbance or degradation of riparian habitat; 2) indirect impacts resulting from water quality degradation associated with an increase in impervious surfaces and pollutant runoff near water bodies; 3) increased human and domestic animal presence in close proximity to riparian habitats; and 4) fragmentation of upland habitat used for wildlife movement, <u>particularly associated with the development envelope on proposed Parcel 2.</u> The low density of residential development associated with the project and the large areas of open/undeveloped land and orchard areas within the project site that would remain would help to ensure that the project's contribution to significant impacts on raptor foraging would not be cumulatively considerable. Project impacts to California red-legged frog and other sensitive aquatic species remains significant and unavoidable absent relocation of the development envelope on Parcel 2. For this reason, the project's contribution to significant cumulative biological impacts is considered <i>cumulatively considerable</i>.</p> | | |
| <p>Cumulative Cultural Resources Impacts <i>Archaeological Resources</i> As discussed in Section 4.5.2, numerous recorded sites occur</p> | <p>See project-specific mitigation measures to reduce impacts to cultural resources.</p> | <p>Less than significant (not cumulatively considerable) - Class II</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <p>within the project site. However, the proposed project has been designed to avoid significant impacts to known archaeological sites. Mitigation measures applied to the project would result in further avoidance of archaeological sites and ensure that impacts to archaeological resources (both recorded and unknown) would be reduced to less than significant levels. As a result, development of the proposed project would not significantly contribute to a significant cumulative impact on cultural resources. Therefore the project's contribution to cumulative archaeological impacts <i>would be cumulatively considerable but feasibly mitigated.</i></p> <p><i>Historic Resources</i></p> <p>The proposed Santa Barbara Ranch development, located immediately east of the project site, would potentially develop up to 72 home sites (under Alternative 1) encompassing both sides of U.S. Highway 101. It is located on portions of the historic Dos Pueblos Ranch and the old Naples Townsite and contributes to the rural setting of the area. This and other nearby projects have the potential to impact views of the historic rural setting as experienced from U.S. Highway 101, thereby compromising the historic integrity of the rural setting. In total, other planned, pending, and recently constructed projects would introduce approximately 143 <u>117</u> new residences along both sides of U.S. Highway 101 in this section of the Gaviota Coast. Potential impacts on the historic rural setting of the area from these projects are cumulatively significant. The proposed project has the potential to impact views of the historic rural setting from U.S. Highway 101, railroad, and ocean, and materially impair the historic setting and character defining features of the site by the introduction of incompatible development. This would potentially</p> | | |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|------------------------------|---|
| <p>contribute to the cumulative historic impacts to the Gaviota Coast. However, the project only includes the potential for seven new residences scattered throughout the ranch and many of the future residences would not be visible from U.S. Highway 101 or are located outside of the boundaries of the Rural Historic Landscape. In addition, implementation of the mitigation measures identified above would ensure that future residential development is compatible with, and would not compromise the historic integrity of, the existing historic structures and Rural Historic Landscape found within the project site, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative historic impacts would be <i>cumulatively considerable but feasibly mitigated</i>.</p> | | |
| <p>Cumulative Fire Hazard Impacts</p> <p>The proposed project, in conjunction with other planned and pending projects identified in Section 3.0, would result in an incremental increase in the temporary and permanent residential population in a high fire hazard area, thereby exposing additional residents and members of the public to potential fire hazards and increasing the potential for a fire to be ignited by human activities. These projects would be underserved by the County Fire Department due to their distance from the closest fire stations until such time as the new station is constructed and operational in western Goleta. This would result in a potentially significant cumulative impact. The proposed project would increase the total on-site residential population by approximately 19 people with residential buildout of the project site. In addition, provision of a public parking lot to serve the proposed beach access trail would result in an increase in the temporary population in this area by up to approximately 63 people (based on 2.1 people per vehicle) at</p> | <p>None required.</p> | <p>Less than significant (not cumulatively considerable) - Class III</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--|--|
| <p>any given time. This level of growth associated with the project would not exacerbate evacuation of area residents given the excess capacity of U.S. Highway 101 and the relatively short and straightforward ingress/egress routes. Fuel management and water storage capacities within the ranch would ensure the site is defensible from wildfire events and would not significantly exacerbate existing fire hazards. Therefore, the project's contribution to area fire hazards would <i>not be cumulatively considerable</i>.</p> | | |
| <p>Cumulative Geologic Impacts</p> <p>Geologic impacts are generally localized and project-specific in nature, as they involve the land upon which the project is proposed to be located. Geologic hazards present on an individual site would likely be limited to that site and would not contribute to any cumulative impacts to the rest of the community. The proposed project, as well as other planned or pending projects in the vicinity, would be required to comply with the California Building Code and County Grading Ordinance which would help to ensure that any geologic impacts are reduced to the maximum extent feasible and do not result in any off-site impacts to the surrounding community. Overall, cumulative geologic impacts are considered less than significant and the project's contribution is <i>not cumulatively considerable</i>.</p> | None required. | Less than significant (not cumulatively considerable) - Class III |
| <p>Cumulative Hazardous Materials Impacts</p> <p>The proposed project, in conjunction with other planned and pending projects would potentially increase the residential population in a predominantly agricultural area. This could have the effect of increasing the number of people potentially exposed to agricultural chemicals. However, the application and storage of pesticides and other agricultural chemicals is strictly regulated by the County Agricultural Commissioner's Office and County</p> | See Mitigation Measures HAZ 1-1, 1-2, and 2. | Less than significant (not cumulatively considerable) - Class III |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Fire Department in order to protect public health and prevent unintended release of hazardous materials. In addition, exposure to hazardous materials such as improperly abandoned oil or gas wells is rather localized and would not have far-reaching effects. The proposed project would involve the future development of up to seven residences, which would not result in a significant increase in the population potentially exposed to public health hazards. In addition, it is not expected that the new public trails created as part of the project would expose the public to health or safety hazards from continued pesticide application in compliance with local and state regulations. Thus, the cumulative effect of unsafe public exposure to these hazards is considered less than significant and the project's contribution would <i>not be cumulatively considerable</i>.</p> | | |
| <p>Cumulative Land Use Impacts</p> <p>New residential development associated with the cumulative projects (including the proposed project and the identification of building envelopes for future development) totals 143 117 residential units (assuming implementation of the Santa Barbara Ranch Alternative 1 project totaling 72 units; the MOU project consisting of 18 fewer units). This number of residential units distributed along the entire Gaviota Coast would not necessarily be incompatible with the existing rural agricultural land uses characteristic of the area; however, the majority of these residences would be concentrated in a roughly three-mile segment within or east of the Naples Townsite and many of these would be clearly visible from the main travel corridor of U.S. Highway 101. House sizes within this development could range from approximately 4,000 square feet to 13,000 square feet and would include guest houses, garages, and other residential accessory structures that would potentially be out of</p> | <p>See Mitigation Measures AES 1 through 5, CULT 5, and AG 2-3.</p> | <p>Less than significant (not cumulatively considerable) - Class II</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| <p>character with existing rural land uses in the surrounding area. Land use in this immediate area would become characterized more by rural residential development, with most of the lots less than 20 acres in size, than by agriculture and ranching. The Paradiso del Mare project just east of Santa Barbara Ranch is also proposing two residences of over 6,000 feet with accessory structures on the coastal terrace south of U.S. Highway 101. These two projects are located at the gateway to the Gaviota Coast as one leaves the urban communities of Goleta and Santa Barbara, and thus have a notable influence on helping to define the rural agricultural character of land uses and development along the Gaviota Coast.</p> <p>Other planned, pending, and future projects may follow this trend of large estate-style residences that, together, could change the character of existing and surrounding land uses and development along the Gaviota Coast. For these reasons, cumulative impacts with regards to land use compatibility and the rural character of the surrounding area are considered significant. The proposed project would only contribute up to seven new residences and accessory structures across 1,784 acres to this cumulative development and many of these would not be visible from U.S. Highway 101 so as not to significantly contribute to the change in character of the area as experienced by the general public. In addition, the ranch would be maintained in agriculture consistent with its current orchard and ranching operations. This would help to ensure that the site retains its existing rural agricultural character and residential uses remain subordinate to the rural setting. Therefore, the project's contribution to the significant cumulative impact is <i>not cumulatively considerable</i>.</p> | | |
| Cumulative Recreation Impacts | See Mitigation Measures AES 1 through AES 5, REC 1 | Less than significant |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| <p>The cumulative projects would result in up to approximately 143-117 residential units being constructed along the Gaviota Coast in between the City of Goleta and Gaviota State Park (assuming implementation of the Santa Barbara Ranch Alternative 1 project totaling 72 units; the MOU project consists of 18 fewer units). Much of this development would be concentrated east of the project site within and adjacent to the Naples Townsite. Especially in this area, this level of development has the potential to significantly impact the visual character of the area and thereby degrade the recreational experiences currently enjoyed by the public. While many of the planned and pending projects are low density and smaller in scale than the projects contemplated in and around the Naples Townsite, they would nonetheless incrementally add to the change in the rural character of the region that contributes to the area’s recreational value.</p> <p>The proposed project would result in up to seven new single family residences and associated infrastructure and accessory structures over the entire project site, representing a small fraction of the cumulative development proposed along this section of the Gaviota Coast. At the same time, it would add two-three new recreational opportunities for the public in the form of vertical <u>and lateral</u> beach access and a segment of the California Coastal Trail. While future residential development within the project site would potentially degrade the quality of the recreational experience of the public by degrading scenic views and viewsheds as experienced by the public, the project would not directly impact any existing designated recreational facilities. Many of the future residences would not be visible from public viewpoints or would be subordinate to the surrounding landscape due to their distance from public recreational areas and surrounding vegetation and</p> | <p>through REC 3, and CULT 5.</p> | <p>(not cumulatively considerable) - Class II</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|--|------------------------------|---|
| <p>intervening topography. Development would be low density and the existing agricultural and ranching operations would remain to help maintain the ranch's rural character. Given this and project mitigations, the project's contribution to significant cumulative recreational impacts would <i>not be cumulatively considerable</i>.</p> | | |
| <p>Cumulative Transportation/Circulation Impacts</p> <p>Average daily trips (ADTs) and peak hour trips (PHTs) on U.S. Highway 101 in the vicinity of the project site have been decreasing over the last seven years, from a peak of 4,050 PHTs and 40,500 ADTs in 2002 to 3,100 PHTs and 31,000 ADTs in 2008 (no data is available for 2009). Because the historic traffic growth rate shows a negative trend, a conservative analysis for the future traffic volumes for U.S. Highway 101 in the vicinity of the project site would include no change (increase or decrease) for the next 20 years. As such, the existing plus project impact analysis is representative of a cumulative analysis for traffic conditions in the vicinity of the project site. The list of planned, pending, and recently approved projects included in Section 3.0 would result in an increase in ADTs along various segments of U.S. Highway 101, primarily east of the project site in between the project site and the City of Goleta. Assuming the development of up to 143<u>117</u> new single family dwellings within the segment of U.S. Highway 101 in between the City of Goleta and Gaviota Beach State Park, less than 2,000 ADTs would be generated and these would be distributed along several miles of the highway. Traffic volume on the highway would remain well below capacity and levels of service would remain within acceptable levels of LOS C or better.</p> <p>The other cumulative projects would not contribute significant numbers of peak hour trips to the project</p> | <p>None required.</p> | <p>Less than significant (not cumulatively considerable) - Class III</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|--|
| <p>intersection at Las Varas Ranch Road, thus impacts to levels of service associated with intersection capacity would not be significantly affected by other projects and impacts to delays would be minimal. Level of Service would remain within acceptable levels of LOS C or better. Therefore, cumulative traffic impacts would not be significant and the project's contribution to cumulative traffic impacts would <i>not be cumulatively considerable</i>.</p> | | |
| <p>Cumulative Water Resources/Flooding Impacts</p> <p><i>Water Quality</i></p> <p>In conjunction with other planned, pending, and future projects in the vicinity of the project site, the project has the potential to contribute to cumulative water quality impacts. Because of the pattern of drainages within the vicinity of the project site (a series of separate north to south flowing watersheds isolated from one another), there is no interaction or transport of pollutants in between watersheds. Most other projects within the cumulative projects list, including the residential development at Santa Barbara Ranch, would also be subject to storm water treatment requirements and the incorporation of Best Management Practices to minimize erosion and treat surface runoff before it enters area watercourses. Due to the scale of the project, the limited amount of new impervious surfaces associated with future development of the site relative to the ranch as a whole, and the ample opportunities within the site for storm water treatment before reaching nearby watercourses, the project's contribution to cumulative water quality impacts is <i>not considered cumulatively considerable</i>.</p> <p><i>Flooding</i></p> <p>In terms of cumulative flooding impacts, other planned,</p> | <p>See project-specific mitigation measures to address water quality and flooding.</p> | <p>Less than significant (not cumulatively considerable) - Class II</p> |

| Description of Impact | Proposed Mitigation Measures | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <p>pending and future projects identified on the cumulative projects list would incrementally increase the amount of impervious surfaces within the local watersheds, increasing surface runoff and potentially resulting in localized flooding impacts if not properly managed. Flooding is typically localized within individual watersheds. There are no other planned or pending projects within the watershed occupied by the project site that would contribute to flooding impacts. Regardless, all new development projects are required to incorporate necessary drainage features to ensure peak flows are not increased and excessive surface runoff is detained on-site. These features, combined with the relatively low-intensity character of future development in this area, would ensure that cumulative flooding impacts are less than significant and the proposed project's contribution to these impacts would <i>not be cumulatively considerable</i>.</p> <p><i>Groundwater</i></p> <p>Impacts to groundwater resources in the vicinity of the project site are also localized, as watershed boundaries delineate the boundaries for establishing safe yields for bedrock aquifers. The proposed project would not contribute to the overdraft of other groundwater resources (e.g. other bedrock aquifers in nearby watersheds or different geologic formations) in the project vicinity, since there are no other planned or pending projects within the Gato Creek watershed or Vaqueros sandstone aquifer. Cumulative impacts on the safe yield of the Vaqueros aquifer which would supply some of the project's water demands are therefore considered less than significant and the proposed project's contribution to this impact is <i>not cumulatively considerable</i>.</p> | | |

This page intentionally left blank