

**TABLE B-2
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2B**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 2b – Options Associated with City-Initiated 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	Same as Alt 2a	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	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	Yes, certain biological resources potentially would receive less protection and therefore would be more at risk than under the existing sub-policy. The amendment could also potentially result in different impacts for Land Use and Recreation.	1) & 2). Yes, because the change has the potential to increase the impacts to special status species and habitats under the GP/CLUP.
CE 1.3	CE 1.3 Biological Assessment Guidelines, Site-Specific Studies and Unmapped ESHAs. [GP/CP] <u>The City shall prepare a Biological Assessment Guideline Manual that would specify the requirements for site-specific biological studies, assessments for ESHA determinations, and other biological resources. Any area not designated on the ESHA map in Figure 4-1 that meets the ESHA criteria for the resources specified in CE 1.1 shall be granted the same protections as if the area was shown on the map. Proposals for development on sites where ESHAs are shown on the map or where there is probable cause to believe that ESHAs may exist shall be required to provide the City with a site-specific biological study that includes the following information:</u> a. A base map that delineates topographic lines, parcel boundaries, and adjacent roads. b. A vegetation map that identifies species that may be	Yes	Yes. Because the details of the manual are not known, it is not possible to determine if unmapped ESHAs would be identified and protected in a way equal to that under the existing policy. Some areas potentially would receive less or no protection. This policy change could potentially lead to different impacts for Land Use and Recreation.	1) & 2). Yes, because the change has the potential to increase the impacts to special status species and habitats under the GP/CLUP. The change also potentially defers mitigation.

**TABLE B-2
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2B**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 2b – Options Associated with City-Initiated 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>indicators of ESHAs.</p> <p>e. A soils map that delineates hydric and nonhydric soils, if applicable.</p> <p>d. A census of animal species that indicates the potential existence of ESHAs.</p> <p>e. A detailed map that shows the conclusions regarding the boundary, precise location and extent, or current status of the ESHA based on substantial evidence provided in the biological studies.</p>			
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	<p>CE 1.6 Protection of ESHAs. [GP/CP] <u>The City shall prepare a Citywide Habitat Management Plan that includes the guidelines and criteria for compatible uses in ESHA, ESHA buffers, and other such protected biological resources.</u></p> <p>ESHAs shall be protected against significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses or development dependent on and compatible with maintaining such resources shall be allowed within ESHAs or their buffers. The following shall apply:</p> <p>a. No development, except as otherwise allowed by this element, shall be allowed within ESHAs.</p> <p>b. A setback or buffer separating all permitted development from an adjacent ESHA shall be required and shall have a minimum width as set forth in subsequent policies of this element. The purpose of such setbacks shall be to prevent any degradation of the ecological functions provided by the habitat area.</p> <p>c. Public accessways and trails are considered resource-dependent uses and may be located within or adjacent to ESHAs. These uses shall be sited to avoid or minimize impacts on the resource to the maximum extent feasible.</p>	Yes	<p>Yes. Because the details of the management plan are not known, it is not possible to determine if the restrictions on uses within ESHAs and ESHA buffers would be at least equal to those 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 it cannot be determined that the requirements in the management plan would at least equal those in the existing policy.</p> <p>2). Yes, because the approach potentially defers mitigation.</p>

**TABLE B-2
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2B**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 2b – Options Associated with City-Initiated 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>Measures—such as signage, placement of boardwalks, and limited fencing or other barriers—shall be implemented as necessary to protect ESHAs.</p> <p>d.—The following uses and development may be allowed in ESHAs or ESHA buffers only where there are no feasible, less environmentally damaging alternatives and will be subject to requirements for mitigation measures to avoid or lessen impacts to the maximum extent feasible: 1) public road crossings, 2) utility lines, 3) resource restoration and enhancement projects, 4) nature education, and 5) biological research.</p> <p>e.—If the provisions herein 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. This use shall not exceed a development footprint of 20 percent of the parcel area and shall be subject to approval of a conditional use permit. Alternatively, the City may establish a program to allow transfer of development rights for such parcels to receiving parcels that have areas suitable for and are designated on the Land Use Plan map for the appropriate type of use and development.</p> <p>f.—Any land use, construction, grading, or removal of vegetation that is not listed above is prohibited.</p>			
CE 1.9	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	No, erosion control measures are acceptable forms of impact avoidance/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.
CE 2.2	CE 2.2 Streamside Protection Areas. [GP/CP] A streamside protection area (SPA) is hereby established along both sides of	Yes	Yes. Because the details of the streamside protection plan are	1) & 2). Yes, because it cannot be determined

**TABLE B-2
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2B**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 2b – Options Associated with City-Initiated 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 creeks identified in Figure 4-1. The purpose of the designation shall be to preserve the streamside protection area in a natural state in order to protect the associated riparian habitats and ecosystems. The 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 streamside protection area shall be <u>determined in accordance with the City's adopted Streamside Protection Plan. The Streamside Protection Plan should reflect varying buffer widths based on differences in stream class/order and levels of adjacent development, as follows:</u></p> <p>a. In areas where land has already been fully subdivided and developed, the SPA 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. 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 50-100 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>c. 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>		<p>not known, it is not possible to determine if the provisions of the plan would provide protections at least equal to those under the existing sub-policy. Some areas potentially would receive less protection and hence be more at risk.</p> <p>Other environmental resource areas potentially affected by this policy change include Land Use and Recreation and Water Resources.</p>	<p>that the requirements in the plan would at least equal those in the existing policy; the change potentially would result in greater impacts to special status habitats and species. The approach also potentially defers mitigation.</p>

**TABLE B-2
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2B**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 2b – Options Associated with City-Initiated 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 2.3	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	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. Other environmental resource areas potentially affected by this policy change include Water Resources.	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	CE 3.1 Definition of Wetlands. [GP/CP] <u>Wetlands are defined as any area that meets the definition of a wetland as defined by the California Coastal Commission, California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The most protective of definitions shall be applied and used to determine the boundary of a wetland. those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface water or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Lands classified as wetlands generally have one or more of three indicators: (1) a substrate that is predominately undrained hydric soils; (2) at least periodically, the land supports a preponderance of plants adapted to moist areas, or hydrophytic plants; or (3) a surface or subsurface water source that is present for sufficient</u>	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.

**TABLE B-2
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2B**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 2b – Options Associated with City-Initiated 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>
	periods of time to promote formation of hydric soils or growth of hydrophytic plant species.			
CE 3.4	<p>CE 3.4 Protection of Wetlands in the Coastal Zone. [CP] The biological productivity and the quality of wetlands shall be protected and, where feasible, restored. <u>The City shall prepare a Riparian and Wetland Mitigation Ordinance that establishes buffers and includes the guidelines and criteria for determining the required mitigation for impacts to these resources. The filling, diking, or dredging of open coastal waters, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes is prohibited unless it can be demonstrated that:</u></p> <p>a. There is no feasible, environmentally less damaging alternative to wetland fill.</p> <p>b. The extent of the fill is the least amount necessary to allow development of the permitted use.</p> <p>c. Mitigation measures have been provided to minimize adverse environmental effects.</p> <p>d. The purposes of the fill are limited to: incidental public services, such as burying cables or pipes; restoration of wetlands; and nature study, education, or similar resource-dependent activities.</p> <p>A wetland buffer of a sufficient size to ensure the biological integrity and preservation of the wetland shall be required, but in no case shall wetland buffers be less than 100 feet. The buffer area shall serve as transitional habitat with native vegetation and shall provide physical barriers to human intrusion.</p>	Yes	<p>Yes. Because the details of the ordinance are not known, it is not possible to determine if the provisions would provide protections at least equal to those under the existing sub-policy. Some areas potentially would receive less protection and hence be more at risk.</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 result in greater impacts to special status species and a regulated Biological Resource (wetlands). The approach also potentially defers mitigation.
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. <u>The City shall prepare a Riparian and Wetland Mitigation Ordinance that establishes buffers and includes the guidelines and criteria for determining the required mitigation for impacts to these resources. The filling of wetlands outside the Coastal Zone is prohibited</u></p>	Yes	<p>Yes. Because the details of the ordinance are not known, it is not possible to determine if the provisions would provide protections at least equal to those under the existing sub-policy. Some areas potentially</p>	1) & 2). Yes, because the change has the potential to result in greater impacts to special status species and a regulated resource (wetlands). The approach also

**TABLE B-2
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2B**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 2b – Options Associated with City-Initiated 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>unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <p>a. The wetland area is small, isolated, not part of a larger hydrologic system, and generally lacks productive or functional habitat value.</p> <p>b. The extent of the fill is the least amount necessary to allow reasonable development of a use allowed by the Land Use Element.</p> <p>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> <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 100 feet, but in no case shall a wetland buffer be less than 50 feet. The buffer area shall serve as transitional habitat with native vegetation and shall provide physical barriers to human intrusion.</p>		<p>would receive less protection and hence be more at risk.</p> <p>Other environmental resource areas potentially affected by this policy change include Land Use and Recreation and Water Resources.</p>	<p>potentially defers mitigation.</p>
CE 4.5	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	<p>Yes. Because the details of the management plan are not known, it is not possible to determine if the provisions of the habitat management plan would provide protections at least equal to those under the existing sub-policy.</p> <p>The amendment would not be expected to impact any other environmental resource area.</p>	<p>1). Yes, because it cannot be determined that the requirements in the management plan would at least equal those in the existing policy.</p> <p>2). Yes, because the approach potentially defers mitigation.</p>
CE 4.6	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	<p>Yes. Because the details of the management plan are not known, it is not possible to determine if the provisions of the</p>	<p>1). Yes, because it cannot be determined that the requirements in the management plan</p>

**TABLE B-2
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2B**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 2b – Options Associated with City-Initiated 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>habitat management plan would provide protections at least equal to those under the existing sub-policy.</p> <p>The amendment would not be expected to impact any other environmental resource area.</p>	<p>would at least equal those in the existing policy.</p> <p>2). Yes, because the approach potentially defers mitigation.</p>
CE 5.1	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	<p>Yes, assuming that the change to CE 1.2 also is made. The habitats potentially would receive less protection and therefore would be more at risk than under the existing sub-policy. Native grassland and certain types of coastal sage scrub are protected under federal and state policies.</p> <p>The amendment could also potentially result in different impacts for Land Use and Recreation.</p>	<p>1) & 2). Yes, because the change has the potential to increase the impacts to special status species and habitats under the GP/CLUP.</p>
CE 5.3	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	<p>Yes. Because the details of the management plan are not known, it is not possible to determine if the restrictions on uses within ESHAs and ESHA buffers would be at least equal to those under the existing sub-policy.</p> <p>The amendment would not be expected to impact any other environmental resource area.</p>	<p>1). Yes, because it cannot be determined that the requirements in the management plan would at least equal those in the existing policy.</p> <p>2). Yes, because the approach potentially defers mitigation.</p>
CE 8.1	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	Yes. Certain habitats that could	1). Yes, because the

**TABLE B-2
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2B**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 2b – Options Associated with City-Initiated 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>
			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. The amendment would not be expected to impact any other environmental resource area.	change has the potential to reduce the total amount of available to listed and other special status species under the GP/CLUP. 2). No, the mitigation for Class II impact to species' habitat is the conservation of ESHAs where species' occur (not conservation of potential habitat).
CE 8.2	Same as Alt 2a	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	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. 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. <u>The City shall prepare a Citywide Habitat Management Plan that includes the guidelines and criteria for compatible uses in ESHA, ESHA buffers, and other such protected biological resources. The Citywide Habitat Management</u>	Yes	Yes, certain areas potentially would receive less protection than under the existing sub-policy. However, raptors and active nest sites are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code – both of which prohibit take. The proposed revision does change these protections. The amendment would not be expected to impact any other environmental resource area.	1). Yes, because the change potentially increases impacts to raptor nest sites. 2). Yes, because the approach potentially defers mitigation.

**TABLE B-2
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2B**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 2b – Options Associated with City-Initiated 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>Plan shall establish the criteria for and distance of buffer areas for raptor-related ESHAs.</u>			
CE 9.1	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	No, because CE 9.5 provides for mitigation for impacts to native trees where avoidance is not feasible. The change clarifies the sub-policy and makes it consistent with CE 9.5.	1) & 2). No, because revision does not substantively change the existing CE polices regarding Protected Trees.
CE 9.3	Same as Alt 2a	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 9.5 (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	Same as Alt 2a	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-2
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2B**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 2b – Options Associated with City-Initiated 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-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 Page 4-2	Same as Alt 2a	No	No, but the change is not appropriate because the text on CE page 4-2 refers to content 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.	NA
CE Table 4-2	Create a new table that provides a comprehensive, definitive list of ESHA types and locations with designated ESHAs in the City and cite the table in CE policies that currently include lists in ESHA types.	No	No, the revision does not change policies regarding protection of sensitive biological resources or GP/CLUP development patterns and related activities.	NA
CE Figure 4-1	Same as Alt 2a	No	No, the revision does not change policies regarding protection of sensitive biological resources or GP/CLUP development patterns.	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	1) & 2). No, because the revision does not alter the amount, type, and location of land uses planned for the City.

**TABLE B-2
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2B**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 2b – Options Associated with City-Initiated 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>
			of the City.	
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	Same as Alt 2a	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	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-2
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2B**

Policy ID #	<u>Alt 2b – Options Associated with City-Initiated 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>
			Coastal Commission permit requirements that remain in effect.	
OS 7.3	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	Yes, certain biological resources potentially would receive less protection and therefore would be more at risk than under the existing sub-policy.	1) & 2). Yes, because the change has the potential to increase the impacts to special status species and habitats under the GP/CLUP.
TE 13.4	Same as Alt 2a	Yes	No. TE 13.4 Subpart “d” would apply where application of subparts “a, b, and c” would not reduce the level of environmental impact to less than significant. The change corrects the term used in subsection d; in such circumstances impacts could be minimized but not fully mitigated.	1) & 2). No, because the change is a correction of the term used in the sub-policy and not a change to the policy itself.