

**TABLE B-3
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 3**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 3 – Track 3 SEIR Recommended Revisions</u>	<u>Is the sub-policy part of mitigation for Class II impacts identified in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>With the change, would GP/CLUP implementation result in greater or different impacts than those addressed in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>Does the change have the potential to result in 1) a significant impact not considered in the Final EIR or 2) inadequate mitigation for a Class II impact identified in the Final EIR?</u>
CE 1.1	<p>CE 1.1 Definition of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas. [GP/CP] ESHAs shall include, but are not limited to, any areas that through professional biological evaluation are determined to meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Any area in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem and that could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments. b. Any area that includes habitat for species and plant communities recognized as threatened or endangered by the state or federal governments; plant communities recognized by the State of California (in the Terrestrial Natural Communities Inventory) as restricted in distribution and very threatened; and those habitat types of limited distribution recognized to be of particular habitat value, including wetlands, riparian vegetation, eucalyptus groves associated with monarch butterfly roosts, oak woodlands, and savannas. c. Any area that has been previously designated as an ESHA by <u>the California Coastal Commission, the California Department of Fish and Game, City of Goleta, or other agency with jurisdiction over the designated area a competent authority.</u> 	Yes	No, none of the ESHAs identified in the Final EIR would be excluded by the proposed change to subsection c. The change clarifies the sub-policy by providing a definition of 'competent authority'.	1) & 2). No, because the revision does not change the protection of ESHAs or increase expected development under the GP/CLUP.
CE 1.2	<p>CE 1.2 Designation of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas. [GP/CP] ESHAs in Goleta are generally shown in Figure 4-1, and Table 4-2 provides <u>examples a summary</u> of the ESHAs and <u>some locations examples</u> of each. The provisions of this policy shall apply to all designated ESHAs. ESHAs <u>generally include but are not limited to</u> the following <u>resources</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Creek and riparian areas. b. Wetlands, such as vernal pools. c. Coastal dunes, lagoons or estuaries, and coastal bluffs/<u>coastal bluff scrub.</u> 	Yes	No, the change corrects and clarifies the existing sub-policy; it does alter any protection of ESHAs under CE policies.	1) & 2). No, because the change does not alter the protection provided to ESHAs or increase impacts under the GP/CLUP.

**TABLE B-3
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 3**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 3 – Track 3 SEIR Recommended Revisions</u>	<u>Is the sub-policy part of mitigation for Class II impacts identified in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>With the change, would GP/CLUP implementation result in greater or different impacts than those addressed in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>Does the change have the potential to result in 1) a significant impact not considered in the Final EIR or 2) inadequate mitigation for a Class II impact identified in the Final EIR?</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Beach and shoreline habitats. e. Marine habitats. f. Coastal sage scrub and chaparral. g. Native woodlands and savannahs, including oak woodlands. h. Native grassland. i. Monarch butterfly aggregation sites, including autumnal and winter roost sites, and related habitat areas. j. Beach and dune areas that are nesting and foraging locations for the western snowy plover. k. Nesting and roosting sites and related habitat areas for various species of raptors. l. Other habitat areas for species of wildlife or plants designated as rare, threatened, or endangered under state or federal law. m. Any other habitat areas that are rare or especially valuable from a local, regional, or statewide perspective. 			
CE 1.3	Same as Alt 1 - No Action	Yes	NA	NA
CE 1.5	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	No, the change is a text correction.	1) & 2). No, the change is a text correction.
CE 1.6	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	<p>Yes. More types of activities potentially could occur in and near designated ESHAs and the total amount of ESHA affected might be greater than under the existing sub-policy.</p> <p>Other environmental resource areas potentially affected by this policy change include Land Use and Recreation and Water Resources.</p>	1) & 2). Yes, because the change has the potential to increase the impacts to special status species and habitats under the GP/CLUP.

**TABLE B-3
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 3**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 3 – Track 3 SEIR Recommended Revisions</u>	<u>Is the sub-policy part of mitigation for Class II impacts identified in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>With the change, would GP/CLUP implementation result in greater or different impacts than those addressed in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>Does the change have the potential to result in 1) a significant impact not considered in the Final EIR or 2) inadequate mitigation for a Class II impact identified in the Final EIR?</u>
CE 1.9	<p>CE 1.9 Standards Applicable to Development Projects. [GP/CP] The following standards shall apply to consideration of developments within or adjacent to ESHAs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Site designs shall preserve wildlife corridors or habitat networks. Corridors shall be of sufficient width to protect habitat and dispersal zones for small mammals, amphibians, reptiles, and birds. b. Land divisions for parcels within or adjacent to an ESHA shall only be allowed if each new lot being created, except for open space lots, is capable of being developed without building in any ESHA or ESHA buffer and without any need for impacts to ESHAs related to fuel modification for fire safety purposes. c. Site plans and landscaping shall be designed to protect ESHAs. Landscaping, screening, or vegetated buffers shall retain, salvage, and/or reestablish vegetation that supports wildlife habitat whenever feasible. Development within or adjacent to wildlife habitat networks shall incorporate design techniques that protect, support, and enhance wildlife habitat values. Planting of nonnative, invasive species shall not be allowed in ESHAs and buffer areas adjacent to ESHAs. d. All new development shall be sited and designed so as to minimize grading, alteration of natural landforms and physical features, and vegetation clearance in order to reduce or avoid soil erosion, creek siltation, increased runoff, and reduced infiltration of stormwater and to prevent net increases in baseline flows for any receiving water body. e. Light and glare from new development shall be controlled and directed away from wildlife habitats. Exterior night lighting shall be minimized, restricted to low intensity fixtures, shielded, and directed away from ESHAs. f. <u>All new development should minimize potentially significant noise impacts on special-status species in adjacent ESHAs. In order to minimize adverse impacts related to fish and</u> 	Yes	No. The change to subsection f does not allow significant noise impacts from new development and is necessary because there is not a specific noise level standard that applies to all fish and wildlife. The change to subsection I adds erosion control measures that are acceptable forms of impact avoidance and reduction and are subject to advance City approval.	1) & 2). No, the impacts would be the same as considered in the Final EIR, and the erosion control measures are feasible mitigation.

**TABLE B-3
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 3**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 3 – Track 3 SEIR Recommended Revisions</u>	<u>Is the sub-policy part of mitigation for Class II impacts identified in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>With the change, would GP/CLUP implementation result in greater or different impacts than those addressed in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>Does the change have the potential to result in 1) a significant impact not considered in the Final EIR or 2) inadequate mitigation for a Class II impact identified in the Final EIR?</u>
	<p>wildlife habitat conservation areas and noise, noise levels from new development should not exceed an exterior noise level of 60 Ldn (day night noise level) at the habitat site. During construction, noise levels may exceed these levels when it can be demonstrated that significant adverse impacts on wildlife can be avoided or will be temporary.</p> <p>g. All new development shall be sited and designed to minimize the need for fuel modification, or weed abatement, for fire safety in order to preserve native and/or nonnative supporting habitats. Development shall use fire-resistant materials and incorporate alternative measures, such as firewalls and landscaping techniques, that will reduce or avoid fuel modification activities.</p> <p>h. The timing of grading and construction activities shall be controlled to minimize potential disruption of wildlife during critical time periods such as nesting or breeding seasons.</p> <p>i. Grading, earthmoving, and vegetation clearance adjacent to an ESHA shall be prohibited during the rainy season, generally from November 1 to March 31, except as follows: <u>1) where erosion control measures such as sediment basins, silt fencing, sandbagging, or installation of geofabrics have been incorporated into the project and approved in advance by the City; 2) where necessary to protect or enhance the ESHA itself; or 3).</u> An exception to this prohibition may be allowed if these actions are where necessary to remediate hazardous flooding or geologic conditions that endanger public health and safety.</p> <p>j. In areas that are not adjacent to ESHAs, where grading may be allowed during the rainy season, erosion control measures such as sediment basins, silt fencing, sandbagging, and installation of geofabrics shall be implemented prior to and concurrent with all grading operations.</p>			
CE 2.2	CE 2.2 Streamside Protection Areas. [GP/CP] A streamside	Yes	Yes. Creeks where the minimum	1) & 2). Yes, because

**TABLE B-3
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 3**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 3 – Track 3 SEIR Recommended Revisions</u>	<u>Is the sub-policy part of mitigation for Class II impacts identified in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>With the change, would GP/CLUP implementation result in greater or different impacts than those addressed in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>Does the change have the potential to result in 1) a significant impact not considered in the Final EIR or 2) inadequate mitigation for a Class II impact identified in the Final EIR?</u>
	<p>protection area (SPA) is hereby established along both sides of the creeks identified in Figure 4-1. The purpose of the designation shall be to preserve the SPA streamside protection area in a natural state in order to protect the associated riparian habitats and ecosystems. The SPA streamside protection area shall include the creek channel, wetlands and/or riparian vegetation related to the creek hydrology, and an adjacent upland buffer area. The width of the SPA upland buffer streamside protection area shall be as follows:</p> <p>a. In areas where land has already been fully subdivided and developed, the SPA upland buffer shall not be less than 50 feet outward on both sides of the creek, measured from the top of the bank or the outer limit of wetlands and/or riparian vegetation, whichever is greater. The City may consider increasing or decreasing the width of the SPA upland buffer on a case-by-case basis at the time of environmental review. The City may allow portions of a SPA upland buffer to be less than 50 feet wide based on a site specific assessment if (1) there is no feasible alternative siting for development that will avoid the SPA upland buffer; and (2) the project's impacts will not have significant adverse effects on streamside vegetation or the biotic quality of the stream. Exceptions may be allowed in instances where existing permitted development on a subject parcel encroaches within the 50-foot buffer if: (1) there is no feasible alternative siting for the development that will avoid the SPA; (2) the new development will not extend into the ESHA, and the resulting buffer will not be less than 25 feet; and (3) the new development will not encroach further into the SPA than the existing development on the parcel.</p> <p>b. In all other instances, the SPA shall not be less than 100 feet outward on both sides of the creek, measured from the top of the bank or the outer limit of associated wetlands and/or riparian vegetation, whichever is greater.</p>		<p>buffer would have been 100 feet potentially would be at greater risk of impacts from adjacent activities than under the existing sub-policy.</p> <p>Other environmental resource areas potentially affected by this policy change include Land Use and Recreation and Water Resources.</p>	<p>the change has the potential to increase the impacts to special status species and habitats under the GP/CLUP.</p>

**TABLE B-3
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 3**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 3 – Track 3 SEIR Recommended Revisions</u>	<u>Is the sub-policy part of mitigation for Class II impacts identified in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>With the change, would GP/CLUP implementation result in greater or different impacts than those addressed in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>Does the change have the potential to result in 1) a significant impact not considered in the Final EIR or 2) inadequate mitigation for a Class II impact identified in the Final EIR?</u>
	<p><u>b-e.</u> If the provisions above would result in any legal parcel created prior to the date of this plan being made unusable in its entirety for any purpose allowed by the land-use plan, exceptions to the foregoing may be made to allow a reasonable economic use of the parcel, subject to approval of a conditional use permit.</p>			
CE 2.3	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	<p>Yes. More types of activities potentially could occur in designated SPAs and potentially pose greater risk of impacts to creeks than under the existing sub-policy.</p> <p>Other environmental resource areas potentially affected by this policy change include Water Resources.</p>	1) & 2). Yes, because the change has the potential to increase the impacts to special status species and habitats under the GP/CLUP.
CE 2.5	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	No, because the change does not authorize any impacts not considered in the Final EIR. The change also is needed because it may not always be feasible to locate the features outside of creek beds and banks.	1) & 2) No, because the revision does not change the protection of creeks or increase expected infrastructure (i.e., bridges) under the GP/CLUP.
CE 3.1	Same as Alt 2b	Yes	No, the revised definition does not exclude any wetland identified in the GPCLUP or Final EIR.	1) & 2). No, the change does not increase potential impacts to wetland or eliminate or reduce mitigation for Class II impacts.
CE 3.4	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	Yes, because some wetlands potentially would have smaller	1). Yes, because the change has the potential

**TABLE B-3
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 3**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 3 – Track 3 SEIR Recommended Revisions</u>	<u>Is the sub-policy part of mitigation for Class II impacts identified in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>With the change, would GP/CLUP implementation result in greater or different impacts than those addressed in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>Does the change have the potential to result in 1) a significant impact not considered in the Final EIR or 2) inadequate mitigation for a Class II impact identified in the Final EIR?</u>
			<p>buffers and hence potentially at greater risk of impacts from adjacent uses than under the existing sub-policy.</p> <p>Other environmental resource areas potentially affected by this policy change include Land Use and Recreation and Water Resources.</p>	<p>to increase the impacts to special status species and a regulated Biological Resource (wetlands).</p> <p>2). No, because the change does not eliminate or reduce the requirement that the buffer protect wetland functions and values.</p>
CE 3.5	<p>CE 3.5 Protection of Wetlands Outside the Coastal Zone, [GP]– The biological productivity and the quality of inland wetlands shall be protected and, where feasible, restored. The filling of wetlands outside the Coastal Zone is prohibited unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The wetland area is small, isolated, not part of a larger hydrologic system, and generally lacks productive or functional habitat value. b. The extent of the fill is the least amount necessary to allow reasonable development of a use allowed by the Land Use Element. c. Mitigation measures will be provided to minimize adverse environmental effects, including restoration or enhancement of habitat values of wetlands at another location on the site or at another appropriate offsite location within the City. <p>A wetland buffer of a sufficient size to ensure the biological integrity and preservation of the wetland shall be required. Generally a wetland buffer shall be no 100 feet, but in no case shall a wetland buffer be less than 50 feet. . The buffer size should take into consideration the type and size of the</p>	Yes	<p>Yes. Some wetlands potentially would have less protection (based on buffer width) and therefore potentially would be at greater risk of impacts from adjacent uses than under the existing sub-policy.</p> <p>Other environmental resource areas potentially affected by this policy change include Land Use and Recreation and Water Resources.</p>	<p>1). Yes, because the change has the potential to increase the impacts to special status species and a regulated Biological Resource (wetlands).</p> <p>2). No, because the change does not eliminate or reduce the requirement that the buffer protect wetland functions and values.</p>

**TABLE B-3
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 3**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 3 – Track 3 SEIR Recommended Revisions</u>	<u>Is the sub-policy part of mitigation for Class II impacts identified in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>With the change, would GP/CLUP implementation result in greater or different impacts than those addressed in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>Does the change have the potential to result in 1) a significant impact not considered in the Final EIR or 2) inadequate mitigation for a Class II impact identified in the Final EIR?</u>
	<u>development, the sensitivity of the wetland resources to detrimental edge effects of the development to the resources, natural features such as topography, the functions and values of the wetland and the need for upland transitional habitat. The buffer area shall serve as transitional habitat with native vegetation and shall provide physical barriers to human intrusion.</u>			
CE 4.5	CE 4.5 Buffers Adjacent to Monarch Butterfly ESHAs. [GP/CP] A buffer of a sufficient size to ensure the biological integrity and preservation of the monarch butterfly habitat, including aggregation sites and the surrounding grove of trees, shall be required. Buffers shall not be less than 100 feet around existing and historic roost sites as measured from the outer extent of the tree canopy. The buffer area shall serve as transitional habitat with native vegetation and shall provide physical barriers to human intrusion. The buffer may be reduced to 50 feet in circumstances where the trees contribute to the habitat but are not considered likely to function as an aggregation site, such as along narrow windrows. Grading and other activities that could alter the surface hydrology that sustains the groves of trees are prohibited within or adjacent to the buffer area, <u>unless the activity is allowed under other CE subpolicies and mitigation is applied per CE 1.7.</u> <u>Protections afforded to historic and existing roost sites shall be evaluated on a case-by-case basis by a qualified biologist.</u>	Yes	No, because the change does not alter the requirement for a buffer; it makes CE 4.5 consistent with other sub-policies that allow certain activities within ESHA buffers.	1) & 2). No, because the revision does not eliminate or reduce the requirement for a buffer.
CE 4.6	CE 4.6 Standards Applicable to New Development Adjacent to Monarch ESHAs. [GP/CP] The following standards shall apply to consideration of proposals for new development adjacent to monarch ESHAs or ESHA buffers: a. A site-specific biological study, prepared by an expert approved by the City who is qualified by virtue of education and experience in the study of monarch butterflies, shall be required to be submitted by the project proponent. b. The study shall include preparation of a Monarch Butterfly Habitat Protection Plan, which at a minimum shall include: 1)	Yes	No, the change is a clarification of the sub-policy to ensure consistency with the Monarch Butterfly Habitat Protection Plan.	No, because the change does not increase potential impacts or reduce protections.

**TABLE B-3
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 3**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 3 – Track 3 SEIR Recommended Revisions</u>	<u>Is the sub-policy part of mitigation for Class II impacts identified in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>With the change, would GP/CLUP implementation result in greater or different impacts than those addressed in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>Does the change have the potential to result in 1) a significant impact not considered in the Final EIR or 2) inadequate mitigation for a Class II impact identified in the Final EIR?</u>
	<p>the mapped location of the cluster of trees where monarchs are known, or have been known, to roost in both autumnal and over-wintering aggregations; 2) an estimate of the size of the population within the colony; 3) the mapped extent of the entire habitat area; and 4) the boundaries of the buffer zone around the habitat area.</p> <p>c. A temporary fence shall be installed along the outer boundary of the buffer zone prior to and during any grading and construction activities on the site.</p> <p>d. If an active roost or aggregation is present on the project site, any construction grading, or other development within 200 feet of the active roost, shall be prohibited between October 1 and March 1, <u>unless it can be demonstrated that the Monarch Butterfly Habitat Protection Plan provides the necessary measures to protect the roost, subject to the approval of the City.</u></p>			
CE 5.1	<p>CE 5.1 Designation of <u>Other Terrestrial ESHAs</u>. [GP/CP] The following habitats, which are not specifically included in other policies, are hereby designated ESHAs:</p> <p>a. Native grasslands.</p> <p>b. <u>Coastal bluff scrub</u>, coastal sage-scrub and chaparral.</p>	Yes	No, the change corrects the text of the existing sub-policy.	1) & 2). No, because the change is a minor correction to the text of the existing sub-policy.
CE 5.3	<p>CE 5.3 Protection of <u>Coastal Bluff Scrub, Coastal Sage Scrub, and Chaparral</u>. [GP/CP] In addition to the provisions of Policy CE 1, the following standards shall apply:</p> <p>a. For purposes of this policy, <u>existing coastal bluff scrub is defined as scrub habitat occurring on exposed coastal bluffs. Example species in bluff scrub habitat include Brewer’s saltbush (<i>Atriplex lentiformis</i>), lemonade berry (<i>Rhus integrifolia</i>), seashore blight (<i>Suaeda californica</i>), seacliff buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum parvifolium</i>), California sagebrush (<i>Artemisia californica</i>), and coyote bush (<i>Baccharis pilularis</i>).</u> Coastal sage scrub is defined as a drought-tolerant,</p>	Yes	No, because the changes are clarifications and corrections of the existing sub-policy.	No, because the change would not increase potential impacts or reduce protections.

**TABLE B-3
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 3**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 3 – Track 3 SEIR Recommended Revisions</u>	<u>Is the sub-policy part of mitigation for Class II impacts identified in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>With the change, would GP/CLUP implementation result in greater or different impacts than those addressed in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>Does the change have the potential to result in 1) a significant impact not considered in the Final EIR or 2) inadequate mitigation for a Class II impact identified in the Final EIR?</u>
	<p>Mediterranean habitat characterized by soft-leaved, shallow-rooted subshrubs such as California sagebrush (<i>Artemisia californica</i>), coyote bush (<i>Baccharis pilularis</i>), and California encelia (<i>Encelia californica</i>). It is found at lower elevations in both coastal and interior areas where moist maritime air penetrates inland. <u>Chaparral is defined as composed mainly of fire- and drought-adapted woody, evergreen, shrubs and generally occurring on eucalyptus hills and lower mountain slopes. The area must have both the compositional and structural characteristics of coastal bluff scrub, coastal sage scrub, or chaparral habitat as described in <i>Preliminary Descriptions of Terrestrial Natural Communities of California</i> (Holland 1986) or other classification system recognized by the California Department of Fish and Game.</u></p> <p>b. To the maximum extent feasible, development shall avoid impacts to <u>coastal bluff scrub, coastal sage scrub, and or chaparral habitat that is part of a wildlife movement corridor and the impact would preclude animal movement or isolate ESHAs previously connected by the corridor. s that would destroy, isolate, interrupt, or cause a break in continuous habitat that would (1) disrupt associated bird and animal movement patterns and seed dispersal, and (2) increase erosion and sedimentation impacts to nearby creeks or drainages.</u></p> <p>c. Impacts to <u>coastal bluff scrub, coastal sage scrub, and chaparral ESHAs habitats</u> shall be minimized by providing at least a 25-foot buffer restored with native species around the perimeter of the <u>ESHA, delineated habitat area, unless the activity is allowed under other CE subpolicies and mitigation is applied per CE 1.7.</u></p> <p>d. Removal of nonnative and invasive exotic species shall be allowed; revegetation shall be with plants or seeds collected within the same watershed whenever feasible.</p>			

**TABLE B-3
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 3**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 3 – Track 3 SEIR Recommended Revisions</u>	<u>Is the sub-policy part of mitigation for Class II impacts identified in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>With the change, would GP/CLUP implementation result in greater or different impacts than those addressed in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>Does the change have the potential to result in 1) a significant impact not considered in the Final EIR or 2) inadequate mitigation for a Class II impact identified in the Final EIR?</u>
CE 8.1	<p>CE 8.1 ESHA Designation. [GP/CP] Requisite habitats for individual occurrences of special-status plants and animals, including candidate species for listing under the state and federal endangered species acts, California species of special concern, California Native Plant Society List 1B plants, and other species protected under provisions of the California Fish and Game Code shall be preserved and protected, and their occurrences, including habitat requirements, shall be designated as ESHAs.</p> <p>These habitats include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Habitats that support special-status plant species, such as oak woodland with populations of Santa Barbara honeysuckle (<i>Lonicera subspicata</i> var. <i>subspicata</i>) or wetlands with populations of southern tarplant (<i>Centromadia parryi</i> ssp. <i>australis</i>), and black-flowered figwort (<i>Scrophularia atrata</i>).</u> b. <u>Habitats that capable of supporting special-status invertebrate species, such as foredunes occupied by the globose dune beetle (<i>Coelus globosus</i>), and woodlands used as roosting sites habitat for by the migratory monarch butterfly.</u> c. <u>Aquatic habitats that capable of supporting special-status fish species, such as creeks where the steelhead trout (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>) occur and estuaries where tidewater goby (<i>Eucyclogobius newberryi</i>) occur.</u> d. <u>Aquatic and terrestrial Hhabitats that -capable of supporting special-status amphibians and reptiles, such as riparian areas where the red-legged frogs (<i>Rana aurora draytonii</i>) occur and streams and ponds used by the western pond turtle (<i>Clemmys marmorata pallida</i>).</u> e. <u>Nesting and roosting areas for special-status bird species, various species of raptors such as Cooper’s hawks (<i>Accipiter cooperii</i>), red-tailed hawks (<i>Buteo jamaicensis</i>), white-tailed kites (<i>Elanus leucurus</i>), and turkey vultures (<i>Cathartes aura</i>).</u> 	Yes	<p>Yes. Certain habitats that could but currently do not support special status species would receive less protection and therefore potentially would be more at risk than under the existing sub-policy. There potentially would be fewer benefits to special status species than under the existing GP/CLUP policies.</p> <p>The amendment would not be expected to impact any other environmental resource area.</p>	<p>1). Yes, because the change has the potential to reduce the total amount of available to listed and other special status species under the GP/CLUP.</p> <p>2). No, the mitigation for Cass II impact to species’ habitat is the conservation of ESHAs where species’ occur (not conservation of potential habitat).</p>

**TABLE B-3
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 3**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 3 – Track 3 SEIR Recommended Revisions</u>	<u>Is the sub-policy part of mitigation for Class II impacts identified in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>With the change, would GP/CLUP implementation result in greater or different impacts than those addressed in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>Does the change have the potential to result in 1) a significant impact not considered in the Final EIR or 2) inadequate mitigation for a Class II impact identified in the Final EIR?</u>
	<p>f. Nesting habitat for other special status bird species such as western snowy plover, southwestern willow flycatcher (<i>Empidonax traillii extimus</i>), loggerhead shrike (<i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>), yellow warbler (<i>Dendroica petechia</i>), or and tri-colored blackbird (<i>Agelaius tricolor</i>); and communal roost sites for turkey vultures.</p> <p>f. g. Nesting and foraging hHabitat that supports for special-status mammals, including communal nest and roost sites for the such as pallid bat (<i>Antrozous pallidus</i>), western red bat (<i>Lasiurus blossevillii</i>), and Yuma myotis (<i>Myotis yumanensis</i>); and den sites for the American badger (<i>Taxidea taxus</i>).</p>			
CE 8.2	<p>CE 8.2 Protection of Habitat Areas. [GP/CP] All development shall be located, designed, constructed, and managed to avoid disturbance of adverse impacts to special-status species and their habitats, including spawning, nesting, rearing, roosting, foraging, and other elements of the required habitats <u>to the maximum extent feasible. See also CE 1.7 for mitigation of impacts to ESHA and CE 1.9 for standards applicable to development projects.</u></p>	Yes	No, because the first sentence of the policy mandates impact avoidance and minimization. The change does not eliminate or modify that requirement.	1) & 2). No, because the revision does not eliminate or reduce the impact avoidance and minimization requirement of the sub-policy..
CE 8.4	<p>CE 8.4 Buffer Areas for Raptor Species. [GP/CP] Development shall be designed to provide a 100-foot buffer around active and historical nest sites for protected species of raptors when feasible. <u>Protection afforded to historic nest sites shall be evaluated on a case-by-case basis by a qualified biologist.</u> In existing developed areas, the width of the buffer may be reduced to correspond to the actual width of the buffer for adjacent development. If the biological study described in CE 8.3 determines that an active raptor nest site exists on the subject property, whenever feasible no vegetation clearing, grading, construction, or other development activity shall be allowed within a 300-foot radius of the nest site during the nesting and fledging season</p>	Yes	No, the change modifies the protection of historic sites to project-level determination but does not eliminate that provision.	1). No. The revision does not change the requirement to protect raptors where they actually occur. 2). No, the mitigation for Class II impact to raptors includes the protection of active nests (not the protection of unoccupied nests).
CE 9.1	Same as 2a	Yes	No, because CE 9.5 provides for mitigation for impacts to native	1) & 2). No, because revision does not

**TABLE B-3
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 3**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 3 – Track 3 SEIR Recommended Revisions</u>	<u>Is the sub-policy part of mitigation for Class II impacts identified in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>With the change, would GP/CLUP implementation result in greater or different impacts than those addressed in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>Does the change have the potential to result in 1) a significant impact not considered in the Final EIR or 2) inadequate mitigation for a Class II impact identified in the Final EIR?</u>
			trees where avoidance is not feasible. The change clarifies the sub-policy and makes it consistent with CE 9.5.	substantively change the existing CE polices regarding Protected Trees.
CE 9.3	CE 9.3 Native Oak Woodlands or Savannas. [GP/CP] Native oak woodlands and savannas are designated as ESHAs and shall be preserved and protected. A minimum buffer area shall be established via the implementation of CE-IA-4 Preparation of a Tree Protection Ordinance. 25 feet wide shall be provided around the woodland, measured from the outer extent of the canopy of the trees or the critical root zone, whichever is greater.	Yes	No, because the revision does not change the requirement for buffers around this type of ESHA.	1) & 2). No, because the revision does not eliminate or reduce the requirement for a buffer.
CE 9.4	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	No, the revision replaces the term “critical root zone” with “protection zone” and makes 9.4 consistent with CE 95 (which allows mitigation when impacts avoidance is not feasible).	1) & 2). No, because revision does not substantively change the existing CE polices regarding Protected Trees.
CE 9.5	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	No, the change is a clarification of when offsite mitigation is an option; it does not alter the requirements to avoid impacts where feasible.	1) & 2). No, because revision is not a substantial change to the existing CE polices regarding Protected Trees.
CE 10.3	CE 10.3 Incorporation of Best Management Practices for Stormwater Management [GP/CP]: New development shall be designed to minimize impacts to water quality from increased runoff volumes and discharges of pollutants from non-point sources to the maximum extent feasible, <u>consistent with the City's Storm Water Management Plan or a subsequent Storm Water Management Plan approved by the City and the consistent with the requirements and standards of the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.</u> Post construction structural BMPs	Yes.	No, because Best Management Practices for stormwater management are still required. The change does not authorize any impacts to water quality or watershed functions and values.	1) & 2). No, because the revision is not a substantive change to change to the existing sub-policy.

**TABLE B-3
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 3**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 3 – Track 3 SEIR Recommended Revisions</u>	<u>Is the sub-policy part of mitigation for Class II impacts identified in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>With the change, would GP/CLUP implementation result in greater or different impacts than those addressed in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>Does the change have the potential to result in 1) a significant impact not considered in the Final EIR or 2) inadequate mitigation for a Class II impact identified in the Final EIR?</u>
	<p>shall be designed to treat, infiltrate, or filter stormwater runoff in accordance with applicable standards as required by law. the City's Stormwater Management Program. Examples of BMPs include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Retention and detention basins; b. Vegetated swales; c. Infiltration galleries or injection wells; d. Use of permeable paving materials; e. Mechanical devices such as oil-water separators and filters; f. Revegetation of graded or disturbed areas; g. Other measures as identified in the <u>City's adopted Storm Water Management Plan</u>, that are promoted by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board and those described in the BMP report of the Bay Area Association of Stormwater Management Agencies. 			
CE-IA-4	Same as Alt 2a	No	No, the change is a clarification and does not alter any policy.	1) & 2). No, the change is a clarification and does not alter any policy.
CE-IA-5	<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Add a Policy that Requires Development of a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan</p> <p>Within 24 months of the adoption of the General Plan Amendments, the City of Goleta will develop a GHG Reduction Plan with implementation to commence 12 months thereafter. The Plan is intended to address City activities, as well as activities and projects subject to ministerial and/or discretionary approval by the City.</p> <p>At a minimum, the Plan will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Establish an inventory of current GHG emissions in the City of Goleta including, but not limited to, residential, commercial, industrial, and agricultural emissions. b. Forecast GHG emissions for 2020 for City operations. 	No	No, the change adds mitigation to reduce impacts.	1) & 2). No, the change adds mitigation to reduce impacts.

**TABLE B-3
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 3**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 3 – Track 3 SEIR Recommended Revisions</u>	<u>Is the sub-policy part of mitigation for Class II impacts identified in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>With the change, would GP/CLUP implementation result in greater or different impacts than those addressed in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>Does the change have the potential to result in 1) a significant impact not considered in the Final EIR or 2) inadequate mitigation for a Class II impact identified in the Final EIR?</u>
	<p>c. Forecast GHG emissions for areas within the jurisdictional control of the City for business-as-usual conditions.</p> <p>d. Identify methods to reduce GHG emissions.</p> <p>e. Quantify the reductions in GHG emissions from the identified methods.</p> <p>f. Establish requirements for monitoring and reporting of GHG emissions.</p> <p>g. Establish a schedule of actions for implementation.</p> <p>h. Identify funding sources for implementation.</p> <p>i. Identify a reduction goal for the 2030 Planning Horizon.</p> <p>j. Consider a biological resource component.</p> <p>During preparation of the GHG Reduction Plan, the City will also continue to implement City policies regarding land use and circulation as necessary to further achieve the 2020 and 2030 reduction goals and measures to promote urban forestry and public awareness concerning climate change.</p> <p>In addition to the above, the GHG Reduction Plan will include a plan for City Operations that will address, but is not limited to, the following measures: an energy tracking and management system; energy-efficient lighting; lights-out-at-night policy; occupancy sensors; heating, cooling, and ventilation system retrofits; ENERGY STAR appliances; green or reflective roofing; improved water pumping energy efficiency; central irrigation control system; energy-efficient vending machines; preference for recycled materials in purchasing; use of low or zero-emission vehicles and equipment and recycling of construction materials in new city construction; conversion of fleets (as feasible) to electric and hybrid vehicles; and solar roofs.</p>			
CE Page 4-2	Same as Alt 1 - No Action	No	No, but the change is not appropriate because the text on CE page 4-2 refers to content	NA

**TABLE B-3
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 3**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 3 – Track 3 SEIR Recommended Revisions</u>	<u>Is the sub-policy part of mitigation for Class II impacts identified in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>With the change, would GP/CLUP implementation result in greater or different impacts than those addressed in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>Does the change have the potential to result in 1) a significant impact not considered in the Final EIR or 2) inadequate mitigation for a Class II impact identified in the Final EIR?</u>
			from a 2005 planning document that preceded the City's 2006 GP/CLUP. Since the text is from a historical document, it cannot be revised retroactively.	
CE Table 4-2	Revise Table 4-2 consistent with Alternative 2a and to reflect Alternative 3 CE 1.2 amendments. This additional change identifies ESHA locations in Table 4-2 as examples only.	No	No, the revision does not change policies regarding protection of sensitive biological resources or GP/CLUP development patterns and related activities.	No, the revision is not a substantive change to an existing policy.
CE Figure 4-1	Change Figure 4-1 to reflect the correct raptor/butterfly ESHA along Comstock Homes northern and western boundary consistent with the Comstock Homes FEIR; <u>identify Old San Jose Creek with a creek pattern; and correct ESHA designation from "Riparian/Marsh/Vernal Pool" to "Native Upland Woodlands/Savannah" for parcels 069-090-050, 069-380-001, 069-380-003, 069-380-004, 069-391-001, 069-391-002, 069-391-006, 069-391-007, 069-391-008, 069-401-001, 069-401-002, 069-401-003, 069-401-013, 069-401-016, 069-401-017.</u>	No	No, the revision does not change policies regarding protection of sensitive biological resources or GP/CLUP development patterns. It corrects the map to reflect actual conditions.	NA
LU 11.2 and LU 11.3, plus entirety of LU 11	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	No. Figure 2-3 of the GP/CLUP specifies the amount, type, and location of land uses within the City through buildout and was determined to be an appropriate growth management tool. Removal of Policy LU 11 (and the GGMO) removes redundant growth management policies and may affect the pacing of growth within the City, but will not alter the overall planned development of the City.	1) & 2). No, because the revision does not alter the amount, type, and location of land uses planned for the City.

**TABLE B-3
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 3**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 3 – Track 3 SEIR Recommended Revisions</u>	<u>Is the sub-policy part of mitigation for Class II impacts identified in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>With the change, would GP/CLUP implementation result in greater or different impacts than those addressed in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>Does the change have the potential to result in 1) a significant impact not considered in the Final EIR or 2) inadequate mitigation for a Class II impact identified in the Final EIR?</u>
LU 3.2	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	No. The change would allow consideration of new commercial development at the time of a specific development application. The amendment does not include any additions of the C-R (Regional Commercial) land use designation to Figure 2-1, Land Use Plan Map, at this time.	1) & 2). No, because the revision does not change the amount or type of C-R identified in the GP/CLUP. Project-level review and mitigation are still required as under the existing GP/CLUP.
LU IA-2	<p>LU-IA-2 Update of Goleta Growth Management Ordinance. The existing growth management ordinance shall be updated and may need to be amended to conform to the provisions of this plan. The ordinance may be codified as part of the new zoning code. Time period: 2008 to 2009 Responsible parties: Planning and Environmental Services Department, Planning Commission, and City Council.</p>	No.	No. Figure 2-3 of the GP/CLUP specifies the amount, type, and location of land uses within the City through buildout and was determined to be an appropriate growth management tool. Removal of Policy LU 11 (and the GGMO) removes redundant growth management policies and may affect the pacing of growth within the City, but will not alter the overall planned development of the City.	1) & 2). No, because the revision does not alter the amount, type, and location of land uses planned for the City.
OS 1.10	Same as Alt 2a	No.	No. The California Coastal Commission currently requires a Coastal Development Permit for temporary events that occupy all or a part of a sandy beach area, subject to several caveats and exclusions. Removal of the reference to the Coastal Permit from the GP/CLUP would have no effect on the applicability of Coastal Commission permit	1). No, because the revision does not authorize any impacts 2). No, because the policy is not part of mitigation in the Final EIR for a Class II impact.

**TABLE B-3
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 3**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 3 – Track 3 SEIR Recommended Revisions</u>	<u>Is the sub-policy part of mitigation for Class II impacts identified in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>With the change, would GP/CLUP implementation result in greater or different impacts than those addressed in the Final EIR?</u>	<u>Does the change have the potential to result in 1) a significant impact not considered in the Final EIR or 2) inadequate mitigation for a Class II impact identified in the Final EIR?</u>
			requirements that remain in effect.	
OS 7.3	Same as Alt 1 - No Action	NA (no change)	NA (no change)	NA (no change)
TE 13.4	Same as Alt 1 - No Action	NA (no change)	NA (no change)	NA (no change)