

1.0 SUMMARY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

On November 17, 2008, Kenwood Village, LLC (the applicant) submitted an application to the City of Goleta (City) for a residential development on a site approximately ten acres in size located on the 7300 Block of Calle Real. The 9.39-acre main portion of the project site would be used for the development of new residential units and has two land use designations under the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP): the southern portion of the site has an Agriculture land use designation, and the northern portion has a Single-Family Residential designation. A 0.53-acre "arm" parcel portion of the project site that would be used to construct a trail has a Planned Residential land use designation; and a 0.17 "arm" parcel that would also be used to construct a trail has a Single Family Residential land use designation.

The Kenwood Village Project application includes requests for the following discretionary approvals:

1. A zone change, vesting tentative map, and development plan for a residential project;
2. A General Plan Amendment to revise the Land Use Plan Map (Land Use Element Figure 2-1) to change the land use designation of the entire project site to Planned Residential 6.2 units per acre; and
3. A General Plan Amendment to remove the project site from the Open Space Plan (Open Space Element Figure 2-5).

This Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) will only analyze the second and third General Plan Amendment (GPA) requests of the application under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code §§ 21000, *et seq.*) and CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, §§ 15000, *et seq.*). The environmental impacts of the first request will be reviewed in a separate Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

1.2 APPLICABILITY OF MEASURE G

In 2012, voters in the City passed an initiative known as Measure G (the "Initiative"), which provides that before December 31, 2032, any change to the land use designation of heritage farmlands or to the existing and proposed General Plan language adopted by the Initiative would be effective only if approved by the voters of the City. The Initiative defines "heritage farmlands," as "lands within the City having a land use designation of 'Agriculture' and which are 10 or more acres in size." In addition, the Initiative exempts from the voter approval requirement any development project or ongoing activity that has obtained, as of the effective date of the initiative, a vested right pursuant to California law.

The Subdivision Map Act (Government Code §§ 66410, *et seq.*) confers a vested right to applications for a tentative map. It states, in relevant part,

“[I]n determining whether to approve or disapprove an application for a tentative map, the local agency shall apply only those ordinances, policies, and standards in effect at the date the local agency has determined the application is complete pursuant to section 65943 of the Government Code.” (Govt. Code § 66474.2.)

Government Code § 65943 requires public agencies to determine in writing whether an application for a development project is complete within 30 calendar days after receipt of the application.

The Initiative became effective November 6, 2012. The Kenwood Village application was deemed complete by the City on August 23, 2010, well before the effective date of the Initiative. Therefore, the Application is exempt from the Initiative.

1.3 PURPOSE OF THE GPA SEIR

The CEQA Lead Agency for this SEIR is the City. A SEIR was prepared for this project following conditions and definitions in CEQA Guidelines §§ 15162 and 15163.

This SEIR provides analysis of only the impacts related to implementation of the GPA, which would change the existing land use designations of the project site to Planned Residential 6.2 units per acre. Adopting the GPA by the City would be required before any discretionary action is taken by the City regarding the related zone change, vesting tentative map, and development plan. Decision-makers must consider the SEIR before taking action on the proposed GPA.

A separate project-specific EIR (City EIR No. 12-EIR-004) evaluates the environmental impacts of the first request of the Project application (i.e., the proposed zone change, vesting tentative map, and development plan for the Kenwood Village Project). The project-specific EIR has been prepared at the same time as, and in coordination with, this SEIR. Decision-makers must first render a decision regarding the GPA. Thereafter, if the decision-makers approved the GPA, they may consider the Project as proposed and evaluated in the Project EIR.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) and scoping document for this SEIR were circulated for review and comment by the public, agencies, and organizations. The scoping document is provided in Appendix A, and the NOP and the comments received are provided in Appendix B. The NOP was sent to the State Clearinghouse at the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research to officially solicit statewide agency input on the project. A public notice for the NOP was published in the *Santa Barbara News Press* on July 26, 2012 to solicit comments. The 30-day public review period for the NOP for the GPA SEIR and the Kenwood Village Project EIR began on July 23, 2012 and ended on August 23, 2012.

This SEIR has taken into consideration all of the comments received in response to the NOP, including comments received during a public scoping meeting on August 8, 2012. The project to be analyzed for the SEIR originally included an amendment to the language of GP/CLUP Policy CE 11.2, as well as changes to the Land Use Plan Map and Open Space Map for the Kenwood Village property. Since the publication of the NOP, the scope of the project

being analyzed in this SEIR has been narrowed to encompass only the changes to the Land Use Plan Map and Open Space Map for the Kenwood Village property.

Pursuant to CEQA and CEQA Guidelines, this Draft SEIR is being circulated for public review for a period of at least 45 days. The Draft SEIR is available for public review at the Goleta Public Library and at the City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Review office, and will also be posted online at the City of Goleta's website, www.cityofgoleta.org/. CDs and printed copies of the Draft SEIR are also available for purchase at the City's Planning and Environmental Review Department. Interested agencies and members of the public are invited to provide written comments on this Draft SEIR during the 45-day comment period to the City at the following address:

Ms. Kathy Allen, Supervising Senior Planner
City of Goleta
Planning and Environmental Review Department
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117
kallen@cityofgoleta.org

Upon completion of the 45-day review period, the City will review and prepare written responses to each comment as required by CEQA and CEQA Guidelines. A Final SEIR will then be prepared, incorporating all of the comments received, responses to the comments, and revisions to the SEIR text, as applicable. All responses to comments will be provided to public agencies at least 10 days before final action on the GPA. In addition, all persons who commented on the Draft SEIR will be notified of the availability of the Final SEIR and of the dates of all applicable public hearings concerning the Final SEIR. The Final SEIR will then be presented to the City for certification.

Public input is encouraged at all public hearings concerning the proposed GPA.

1.4 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1.4.1 Objectives

As summarized in the GP/CLUP Final EIR, the fundamental objectives of the GP/CLUP are to:

1. Ensure a high quality environment by protecting and conserving the community's cultural, historical, natural, and environmental assets, values, and resources.
2. Provide a sustainable economy that is not solely dependent on growth, but provides for economic prosperity and well-being for the current and future residents.
3. Maintain adequate service standards, including levels of service (LOS) on area highways.
4. Enable income group opportunities to meet current and future housing needs.

These objectives are retained as part of this SEIR. In addition, the Kenwood Village Project objective for the GPA is to:

1. Revise the project site's existing land use designation to allow multiple types of residential units to be developed on the site.

1.4.2 Proposed GPA

The proposed GPA would make the following changes to the GP/CLUP:

1. A land use designation change in the Land Use Plan Map (Land Use Element Figure 2-1) to change the land use designation of the entire project site to Planned Residential 6.2 units per acre; and
2. Removal of the project site from the Open Space Plan (Open Space Element Figure 2-5).

1.5 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The significance of the environmental impacts that would result from the implementation of the proposed GPA would not exceed the significance of most of the impacts identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR. Impacts that would result from the GPA that would exceed the significance of impacts identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR pertain to:

- Potential impacts to special status habitats (riparian habitat adjacent to the project site) that could result from a reduction of the El Encanto Creek Streamside Protection Area buffer.
- Potential policy consistency impacts that could result from a reduction of the El Encanto Creek Streamside Protection Area buffer
- A cumulative city-wide increase in the number of residents that could be exposed to hazardous materials in the unlikely event of a major transportation accident along U.S. 101 or the Union Pacific Railroad tracks.

As supported by the analysis in Section 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis, the proposed GPA would result in no new significant environmental effects beyond those identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR.

Table 1.5-1 summarizes the environmental impacts identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR, and indicates if those impacts would be increased with the implementation of the GPA. For a more detailed evaluation of impacts related to the proposed GPA, please refer to Section 4.0 of this GPA SEIR.

1.6 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The following alternatives to the proposed GPA were evaluated in this SEIR:

- Alternative 1: No Project Alternative
- Alternative 2: Reduced Site Conversion Alternative

No Project Alternative. Under the No Project Alternative, the GPA would not be approved, the Land Use Map change for the Kenwood Village property would not occur, and the project site would continue to be designated Agriculture and Single-family Residential in the GP/CLUP Land Use Element. Also, the Open Space Plan Map would not be changed and the site would continue to be identified as Open Space in the GP/CLUP Open Space Element. Agricultural uses could be established on the southern portion of the project site, and the number of residential units that could be developed on the project site would be consistent with the site's existing land use designations. Therefore, this alternative would avoid the increases in environmental impacts identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR that would occur if the proposed project were to be implemented.

Reduced Site Conversion Alternative. The Reduced Site Conversion Alternative would modify the GPA by minimizing the area of the Kenwood Village project site that would have its land use designation changed. Under this alternative, only the land use designation on the northern 6.3 acres of the project site (the main project parcel and the two "arm" parcels) would be changed to Planned Residential; and the remaining 3.8-acre southern portion of the site would continue to be designated as Agriculture. It was assumed that this alternative would result in the development of approximately 60 residential units on the project site, similar to the proposed project.

The incremental increases to many of GP/CLUP impacts identified for the proposed project would also occur under the Reduced Site Conversion Alternative because the existing GP/CLUP land use designation on the northern portion of the project site would facilitate the development of 31 residential units and this alternative would result in the development of approximately 60 units. This alternative would, however, have increased consistency with GP/CLUP policies that pertain to issue areas such as agriculture and open space preservation because the land use designation of the southern portion of the project site would not be changed and that area would not be converted to a residential land use.

Environmentally Superior Alternative. The No Project Alternative would not result in changes to the General Plan land use designations of the project site, nor would it result in the conversion of lands designated as Agriculture in the GP/CLUP to non-agricultural uses. The GPA's incremental increases to the impacts identified in the GP/CLUP Final EIR would not occur. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative, but would not implement the proposed Project's objective of amending the land use designation of the project site.

The Reduced Site Conversion Alternative would reduce the Project-related increases to GP/CLUP Final EIR impacts related to agriculture and open space preservation. Therefore, the Reduced Site Conversion Alternative would result in reduced impacts when compared to the impacts of the proposed Project and would be the environmentally superior alternative.

1.7 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

The primary areas/issues of controversy, based on comments received on the NOP, are associated with the change in land use and population growth:

- Reduction in land designated as Agriculture and available for agricultural uses within the City.
- Reduction in undeveloped open space within the City.
- Change in visual character of the site from undeveloped and recent history of cultivation to residential neighborhood as viewed from public (nearby roadways) and private viewing areas (adjacent residences).
- Increased traffic on neighborhood streets and other City of Goleta roadways and intersections.
- Increased demand for parking, which may overflow onto neighborhood streets,
- Different types and increased noise levels for adjacent residents.

An issue to be resolved is future water service. For the GWD to provide water service for future development on the project site facilitated by the proposed GPA, the water service connection restrictions of the SAFE Ordinance and the Stage II and III Water Shortage Emergency Resolutions will need to be lifted. The timing of when those requirements will be lifted is unknown at this time and is predicated on the area receiving sufficient rainfall to meet the criteria outlined by the GWD *Drought Preparedness and Water Shortage Contingency Plan*.

**Table 1.5-1
Kenwood Village Project GPA
Impact Summary Table**

GP/CLUP Final EIR Impact	Impact Class	GP/CLUP Impact Significance	Would the GPA Increase the GP/CLUP Impact?	Impact Significance with GPA
SEIR Section 4.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources				
Impact 3.1-1. Impacts of GP/CLUP on Visual Resources within the City Including Views from Hollister Avenue and City Gateways	I	Significant	No	Significant
Impact 3.1-2. Impacts of GP/CLUP on Citywide Visual Character	I	Significant	Yes	Significant
Impact 3.1-3. Impacts of GP/CLUP on Visual Resources within the City Including Scenic Corridors and Key Public Viewpoints	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.1-4. Impacts from Light and Glare	III	Less Than Significant	No	Less Than Significant
Impact 3.1-5. Improvements to Visual Quality of City Gateways	IV	Beneficial	No	Beneficial
Impact 3.1-6. Creating Well Defined Public Spaces	IV	Beneficial	No	Beneficial
SEIR Section 4.2 Agriculture and Farmland				
Impact 3.2-1. Conversion of Agricultural Land and Loss or Impairment of Agricultural Productivity	I	Significant	No	Significant
Impact 3.2-2. Incompatible Land Uses and Structures	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	No	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.2-3. Preservation of Agricultural Land	IV	Beneficial	No	Beneficial
Impact 3.2-4. Cumulative Loss of Agricultural Lands	I	Significant	No	Significant
SEIR Section 4.3 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions				
Impact 3.3-1. Construction Emissions	II	Less Than Significant with	Yes	Less Than Significant with

GP/CLUP Final EIR Impact	Impact Class	GP/CLUP Impact Significance	Would the GPA Increase the GP/CLUP Impact?	Impact Significance with GPA
		Mitigation		Mitigation
Impact 3.3-2. GP/CLUP Growth Projections Are Consistent with the Clean Air Plan	III	Less Than Significant	Yes	Less Than Significant
Impact 3.3-3. The GP/CLUP Rate of Increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled is Greater Than the Rate of Population Growth for the Same Area	III	Less Than Significant	Yes	Less Than Significant
Impact 3.3-4. Long-term Operational Contributions to Air Pollutant Emissions as a Result of GP/CLUP Buildout	III	Less Than Significant	Yes	Less Than Significant
Impact 3.3-5. Cumulative ROG and NOX Emissions	I	Cumulatively Significant	Yes	Cumulatively Significant
Impact 3.3-6. Cumulative PM10 Emissions	III	Cumulatively Less Than Significant	Yes	Cumulatively Less Than Significant
Impact 3.3-7. Long-term Cumulative Operational Contributions to Greenhouse Gas Emissions	II	Cumulatively Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Cumulatively Less Than Significant with Mitigation
SEIR Section 4.4 Biological Resources				
Impact 3.4-1. Temporary Impacts to Special Status Habitats and Special Status Species	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.4-2. Loss of Special Status Habitats	III/I	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation. Could be increased to Class I if a reduced SPA buffer results in significant impacts
Impact 3.4-3. Long-term Degradation of Special Status Habitats	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.4-4. Fragmentation of Special Status Habitats	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.4-5. Harm to Listed Species	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation

GP/CLUP Final EIR Impact	Impact Class	GP/CLUP Impact Significance	Would the GPA Increase the GP/CLUP Impact?	Impact Significance with GPA
Impact 3.4-6. Loss, Reduction, or Isolation of Local Populations of Native Species	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.4-7. Reduction in Amount or Quality of Habitat for Special Status Species	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.4-8. Break or Impairment of Function of Existing Wildlife Linkages	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.4-9. Loss or Degradation of Conserved Habitat	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.4-10. Inconsistency with Approved Conservation Program or Local Conservation Policy	II/I	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation. Could be increased to Class I if a reduced SPA buffer results in significant impacts
Impact 3.4-11. Impacts to Non-Special-Status Habitats and Species	III	Less Than Significant	Yes	Less Than Significant
Impact 3.4-12. Resources Not Affected by Maintenance/Management	IV	Beneficial	No	Beneficial
Impact 3.4-13. Protection of ESHAs and Maintenance/Management of Regional and Neighborhood Open Space Area	IV	Beneficial	No	Beneficial
Impact 3.4-14. Cumulative Impacts to Biological Resources – Except for Raptor Foraging	III	Cumulatively Less Than Significant	Yes	Cumulatively Less Than Significant
Impact 3.4-14. Cumulative Impacts to Biological Resources - Loss of Raptor Foraging Habitat	III	Cumulatively Less Than Significant	Yes	Cumulatively Less Than Significant
SEIR Section 4.5 Cultural Resources				
Impact 3.5-1. Damage to Sites of Cultural, Historical, or Paleontological Significance	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	No	Less Than Significant with Mitigation

GP/CLUP Final EIR Impact	Impact Class	GP/CLUP Impact Significance	Would the GPA Increase the GP/CLUP Impact?	Impact Significance with GPA
Impact 3.5-2. Loss or Destruction of an Important Historical Building, Archaeological Site, or Paleontological Site	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.5-3. Loss or Destruction of Significant Cultural Resource	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
SEIR Section 4.6 Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources				
Impact 3.6-1. Substantial Accelerated Soil Erosion and/or Loss of a Substantial Amount of Topsoil	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.6-2. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Effects Resulting from the Rupture of a Known Earthquake Fault, Seismic Ground Shaking, Seismically Induced Landslide, or Liquefaction	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.6-3. Exposure of People or Structures to Substantial Adverse Landslide Effects Resulting from Development on Unstable Geologic Units or Soils or Steep Slopes	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.6-4. Location of Development on Expansive Soil That Could Lead to Risks to People or Structures	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.6-5. Exposure of People to Elevated Levels of Indoor Radon	III	Less Than Significant	No	Less Than Significant
SEIR Section 4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
Impact 3.7-1. Risk of Upset at Venoco Facilities	I	Significant	No	Significant
Impact 3.7-2. Transport	I	Significant	Yes	Significant
Impact 3.7-3. Risk of Upset at S.L. 421 Wells	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	No	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.7-4. Risk of Upset at Ellwood Marine Terminal	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	No	Less Than Significant with Mitigation

GP/CLUP Final EIR Impact	Impact Class	GP/CLUP Impact Significance	Would the GPA Increase the GP/CLUP Impact?	Impact Significance with GPA
Impact 3.7-5. Airport	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	No	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.7-6. Wildland Fires	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	No	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.7-8. Exposure of Population to Listed/Contaminated Sites	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	No	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.7-9. Contaminated Soil	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.7-10. Exposure of Populated Areas to Oil and Gas Pipelines	III	Less Than Significant	Yes	Less Than Significant
Impact 3.7-11. Ellwood Facility	III	Less Than Significant	No	Less Than Significant
Impact 3.7-12. EMFs	III	Less Than Significant	No	Less Than Significant
Impact 3.7-13. Upset and Accident Conditions	III	Less Than Significant	Yes	Less Than Significant
Impact 3.7-14. Contaminated Groundwater	III	Less Than Significant	No	Less Than Significant
SEIR Section 4.8 Land Use and Recreation				
Impact 3.10-1. Conflict with Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout (Construction) of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.10-2. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due To Construction of Planned Recreational Facilities	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	No	Less Than Significant with Mitigation

GP/CLUP Final EIR Impact	Impact Class	GP/CLUP Impact Significance	Would the GPA Increase the GP/CLUP Impact?	Impact Significance with GPA
Impact 3.10-3. Conflict with Other Applicable Land Use Policies and/or Regulations Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses, Transportation Improvements, and Public Facilities	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.10-4. Conflict with Any Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.10-5. Loss of Privacy and/or Neighborhood Incompatibility Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.10-6. Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment Due To Buildout of Planned Recreational Facilities	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	No	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.10-7. Substantial Physical Deterioration or Accelerated Deterioration of Existing Recreational Facilities Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.10-8. Physical Division of an Established Community Due To Buildout of GP/CLUP Land Uses	III	Less Than Significant	No	Less Than Significant
SEIR Section 4.9 Noise				
Impact 3.11-1. Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Noise from Single-Event and Nuisance Noise Sources	I	Significant	Yes	Significant
Impact 3.11-2. Exposure of Existing or Planned Noise Sensitive Receptors Uses to Increased Noise	I	Significant	Yes	Significant
Impact 3.11-3. Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Traffic Noise	I	Significant	Yes	Significant
Impact 3.11-4. Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Railway Noise	I	Significant	Yes	Significant
Impact 3.11.5. Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Industrial and Other Point Sources	I	Significant	No	Significant

GP/CLUP Final EIR Impact	Impact Class	GP/CLUP Impact Significance	Would the GPA Increase the GP/CLUP Impact?	Impact Significance with GPA
Impact 3.11-6. Exposure of Proposed Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Airport Noise	III	Less Than Significant	No	Less Than Significant
Impact 3.11-7. Cumulative Traffic Noise	I	Cumulatively Significant	Yes	Cumulatively Significant
SEIR Section 4.10 Population and Housing				
Impact 3.8-1. The Result of the Increased Population Would Be the Need for Additional Housing and Jobs, Which Would Result in the Physical Alteration of Vacant and Previously Developed Land within the City	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.8-2. Population Growth Associated with Implementation of the Proposed GP/CLUP Is Anticipated to Result in an Increase in the Population by 24 Percent at Full or Ultimate Buildout	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.8-3. Ultimate Buildout of the City in Accordance with the GP/CLUP Could Result in the Addition of 3,730 Residential Units to the City's Housing Stock	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.8-4. Ultimate Buildout of the City in Accordance with the GP/CLUP Would Result in the Addition of Approximately 3,400 to 3,900 Jobs	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	No	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.8-5. The GP/CLUP Would Not Result in the Displacement of a Substantial Number of People or Existing Homes	III	Less Than Significant	No	Less Than Significant
SEIR Section 4.11 Public Services and Utilities				
Impact 3.12-1. Increased Demand for Police Protection	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.12-2. Increased Demand for Fire Protection	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.12-3. Increased Demand for Wastewater Collection, Treatment, and Disposal	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation

GP/CLUP Final EIR Impact	Impact Class	GP/CLUP Impact Significance	Would the GPA Increase the GP/CLUP Impact?	Impact Significance with GPA
Impact 3.12-4. Increased Demand for Utility Services	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.12-5. Increased Demand on Local School Districts	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.12-6. Increased Demand on Library Facilities	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.12-7. Exceedance of Capacity of Landfills to Accommodate Additional Solid Waste Stream	III	Less Than Significant	Yes	Less Than Significant
SEIR Section 4.12 Transportation and Circulation				
Impact 3.13-1. Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways	I	Significant	No	Significant
Impact 3.13-2. Exceed, Either Individually or Cumulatively, a LOS Standard Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways Intersections	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.13-3. Increased Traffic Volumes, Either Individually or Cumulatively, without Violation of LOS Standards Established by Local Jurisdictions for Designated Roadways or Highways	III	Less Than Significant	Yes	Less Than Significant
Impact 3.13-4. LOS under 2030 is expected to improve or remain unchanged at Hollister Avenue/Market Place Drive and Cathedral Oaks/Calle Real	IV	Beneficial	Yes	Beneficial
Impact 3.13-5. No Impacts To Air Traffic Patterns	IV	Beneficial	No	Beneficial
Impact 3.13-6. Increased Transit Ridership and Encourage Alternative Modes of Transportation.	IV	Beneficial	Yes	Beneficial

GP/CLUP Final EIR Impact	Impact Class	GP/CLUP Impact Significance	Would the GPA Increase the GP/CLUP Impact?	Impact Significance with GPA
SEIR Section 4.13 Water Resources				
Impact 3.9-1. Degradation of Water Quality from Construction-Related Contaminants	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.9-2. Adequacy of Water Supplies to Serve New Development	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.9-3. Changes in Groundwater Supply from New Development	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.9-4. Alterations in Existing Drainage Patterns and Downstream Flooding and Erosion	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.9-5. Construction of Structures or Housing in a 100-Year Flood Hazard Area	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	No	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.9-6. Risk to New Development from Inundation by a Tsunami, Mudslide, or Seiche	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.9-7. Increases in Point Source and Nonpoint Source Pollution from New Development	II	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
Impact 3.9-8. Risk to New Development from Dam Failure and Resultant Flooding	III	Less Than Significant	No	Less Than Significant
Impact 3.9-9. Water Quality Impacts from Discharge to Surface Water Bodies Where Water Bodies Are 303(d) Listed	I	Cumulatively Significant	No	Cumulatively Significant
Impact 3.9-10. Cumulative Effects on Water Supply	II	Cumulatively Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Yes	Cumulatively Less Than Significant with Mitigation

