

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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	<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 the California Coastal Commission, the California Department of Fish and Game, City of Goleta, County of Santa Barbara, or other agency with jurisdiction over the designated area a competent authority. 	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] Naturally occurring habitats which may be considered to be ESHAs in Goleta are generally shown in Figure 4-1, and Table 4-2 provides a summary of habitats which may be considered the ESHAs designated after a formal determination has been made by the City based upon site specific environmental studies, and examples of each. The provisions of this policy shall apply to all designated ESHAs. ESHAs may include the following resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Creek and riparian areas. b. Wetlands, such as vernal pools. 	Yes	<p>Yes, certain biological resources potentially would receive less protection and therefore would be more at risk than under the existing sub-policy.</p> <p>The amendment could also potentially result in different impacts for Land Use and Recreation.</p>	1) & 2). Yes, because the change has the potential to increase the impacts to special status species and habitats (Biological Resources) under the GP/CLUP.

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Coastal dunes, lagoons or estuaries, and coastal bluffs. 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	<p>CE 1.3 Site-Specific Studies and Unmapped ESHAs. [GP/CP] 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 <u>may</u> 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 <u>areas meeting the criteria in CE 1.1</u> may exist shall be required to provide the City with a site-specific biological study that includes the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A base map that delineates topographic lines, parcel boundaries, and adjacent roads. b. A vegetation map that identifies all vegetation communities and sensitive plant species that may be indicators of ESHAs. c. A soils map that delineates hydric and nonhydric soils, if applicable. d. A census of animal species that utilize the area indicates the 	Yes	<p>Yes. Certain biological resources potentially would receive less protection and therefore would be more at risk than under the existing sub-policy.</p> <p>This policy change could potentially lead to different impacts for Land Use and Recreation.</p>	1) & 2). Yes, because the change has the potential to increase the impacts to special status species and habitats (Biological Resources) under the GP/CLUP.

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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>potential existence of ESHAs.</p> <p>e. A detailed map that shows the conclusions regarding the proposed boundary, precise location and extent of the area proposed as ESHA, or current status of the ESHA based on substantial evidence provided in the biological studies.</p>			
CE 1.5	<p>CE 1.5 Corrections to Map of ESHAs. [GP/CP] If a site-specific biological study contains substantial evidence that an area previously shown as an ESHA on Figure 4-1 does not contain habitat that meets the definition of an ESHA for reasons other than that set forth in CE 1.4, the City biologist and the Planning Commission shall review all available information and determine if the area in question should no longer be considered an ESHA and therefore not be subject to the ESHA protection policies of this plan. If the final decision-making body determines that the area is not an ESHA, a map modification shall be included in the next <u>General Plan/ Coastal Land Use Plan</u> amendment; however, Local Coastal Program policies and standards for protection of ESHAs shall not apply, and approval of development consistent with all other requirements of this plan may be considered prior to the map revision.</p>	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] 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 <u>and/or ESHA buffers</u>.</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</p>	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 (Biological Resources) under the GP/CLUP.

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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 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. 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, <u>and 6) Public Works projects only where there are no feasible, less environmentally damaging alternatives.</u></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	CE 1.9 Standards Applicable to Development Projects. [GP/CP] The following standards shall apply to consideration of	Yes	No, erosion control measures are acceptable forms of impact	1) & 2). No, the impacts would be the same as

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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>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. In order to minimize adverse impacts related to fish and 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. 		avoidance/reduction and are subject to advance City approval.	considered in the Final EIR, and the erosion control measures are feasible mitigation.

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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>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, <u>unless erosion control measures such as sediment basins, silt fencing, sandbagging, or installation of geofabrics have been incorporated into the project and such measures receive prior City approval, or except</u> where necessary to protect or enhance the ESHA itself. An exception to this prohibition, <u>subject to City approval,</u> may be allowed if these actions are 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	<p>Alternative 1—No Changes (No Project) as Existing Prior to May 2009</p> <p>CE 2.2 Streamside Protection Areas. [GP/CP] A streamside protection area (SPA) is hereby established along both sides of</p>	Yes	<p>Alternative 1—No Changes (No Project) as Existing Prior to May 2009</p> <p>Yes. Creeks where the minimum</p>	1) & 2). Yes, because the change has the potential to increase the impacts to special status species

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. 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>Alternative 1—No Changes (No Project) as Amended by City May 2009</p> <p>CE 2.2 Streamside Protection Areas. [GP/CP] A streamside protection area (SPA) is hereby established along both sides of</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>Alternative 1—No Changes (No Project) as Amended by City May 2009</p> <p>Compared with the alternatives considered in the SEIR, this newly adopted policy can be viewed as a combination of Alternative 1 and 3. Technically the new policy is the existing GP/CLUP policy. For purposes of the Final SEIR, the new policy is identified as Alternative 1a and the prior policy is identified as Alternative 1b in Table 2-1. The SEIR analysis of potential impacts associated with alternatives does not require revision because the potential effects of Alternative 1a are encompassed by the analysis of Alternatives 1b and 3. Although no longer the existing policy, Alternative 1b has been retained in the Final SEIR as a potential choice for the City. That action is covered both by the Final SEIR</p>	<p>and habitats (Biological Resources) under the GP/CLUP.</p>

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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 SPA in a natural state in order to protect the associated riparian habitats and ecosystems. The SPA 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 shall be as follows:</p> <p>a. In areas where land has already been fully subdivided and developed, the SPA <u>upland</u> 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 associated 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, only if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) there is no feasible alternative siting for the development that will avoid the SPA; (2) the new development will not extend into an 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>b. In all other instances, the SPA <u>upland</u> buffer 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. <u>If there is no feasible alternative siting for the development that will avoid the SPA, the City may consider changing the width of the SPA upland buffer on a case-by-case basis at the time of environmental review. Based on a site-specific assessment, the City may designate portions of an SPA upland buffer to be less than or greater than 100 feet wide, but not less than 50 feet, only if:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) <u>substantial beneficial environmental improvements to the creek, its SPA, and/or related ESHAs are to be made as</u> 		<p>and the 2006 Final EIR for the GP/CLUP. Unless otherwise noted, all references to CE 2.2 under Alternative 1 are to the policy as worded prior to May 19, 2009.</p>	

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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><u>part of the project:</u></p> <p>(2) <u>the new development will not extend into an ESHA, and the resulting buffer will not be less than 50 feet; and</u></p> <p>(3) <u>the project's impacts will not have significant adverse effects on streamside vegetation or the biotic quality of the stream.</u></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. <i>(Amended by Reso. 09-30, 5/19/09)</i></p>			
CE 2.3	<p>CE 2.3 Allowable Uses and Activities in Streamside Protection Areas. [GP/CP] The following compatible land uses and activities may be allowed in SPAs, subject to all other policies of this plan, including those requiring avoidance or mitigation of impacts:</p> <p>a. Agricultural operations, provided they are compatible with preservation of riparian resources.</p> <p>b. <u>Fencing and other access barriers</u> along property boundaries and along SPA boundaries.</p> <p>c. Maintenance of existing roads, driveways, utilities, structures, and drainage improvements.</p> <p>d. Construction of public road crossings and utilities, provided that there is no feasible, less environmentally damaging alternative.</p> <p>e. Construction and maintenance of foot trails, bicycle paths, and similar low-impact facilities for public access.</p> <p>f. Resource restoration or enhancement projects.</p> <p>g. Nature education and research activities.</p> <p>h. Low-impact interpretive and public access signage.</p>	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 (Biological Resources) under the GP/CLUP.

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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>i. <u>Other such Public Works projects only where there are no feasible, less environmentally damaging alternative.</u> Any land use, construction, grading, or removal of vegetation that is not listed above is prohibited.</p>			
CE 2.5	<p>CE 2.5 Maintenance of Creeks as Natural Drainage Systems. [GP/CP] Creek banks, creek channels, and associated riparian areas shall be maintained or restored to their natural condition wherever such conditions or opportunities exist. Creeks carry a significant amount of Goleta's stormwater flows. The following standards shall apply:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The capacity of natural drainage courses shall not be diminished by development or other activities. Drainage controls and improvements shall be accomplished with the minimum vegetation removal and disruption of the creek and riparian ecosystem that is necessary to accomplish the drainage objective. Measures to stabilize creek banks, improve flow capacity, and reduce flooding are allowed but shall not include installation of new concrete channels, culverts, or pipes except at street crossings, unless it is demonstrated that there is no feasible alternative for improving capacity. Drainage controls in new development shall be required to minimize erosion, sedimentation, and flood impacts to creeks. Onsite treatment of stormwater through retention basins, infiltration, vegetated swales, and other best management practices (BMPs) shall be required in order to protect water quality and the biological functions of creek ecosystems. Alteration of creeks for the purpose of road or driveway crossings shall be prohibited except where the alteration is not substantial and there is no other feasible alternative to provide access to new development on an existing legal parcel. Creek crossings shall be accomplished by bridging 	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.

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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>
	and shall be designed to allow the passage of fish and wildlife. Bridge abutments or piers should be <u>shall be</u> located outside creek beds and banks, where feasible.			
CE 3.1	CE 3.1 Definition of Wetlands. [GP/CP] <u>Wetlands are defined as land where the water table is at near, or above the land surface long enough to promote the formation of hydric soils or to support the growth of hydrophytes, and shall also include types of wetlands where vegetation is lacking and soil is poorly developed or absent as a result of frequent drastic fluctuations of surface water levels, wave action, water flow, turbidity or high concentration of salts or other substances in the substrate. Such wetlands can be recognized by the presence of surface water or saturated substrate at some point during each year and their location within, or adjacent to vegetated wetland or deepwater habitats. 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 periods of time to promote formation of hydric soils or growth of hydrophytic plant species.</u>	Yes	No, the revised definition does not exclude any wetland identified in the GP/CLUP 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	CE 3.4 Protection of Wetlands in the Coastal Zone. [CP] <u>The biological productivity and the quality of wetlands shall be protected and, where feasible, restored, in accordance with the federal and state regulations and policies that apply to wetlands within the Coastal Zone. Only uses permitted by the regulating agencies shall be allowed within wetlands. The filling, diking, or</u>	Yes	Yes, because some wetlands potentially would have smaller buffers and hence potentially at greater risk of impacts from adjacent uses than under the existing sub-policy.	1). Yes, because the change has the potential to increase the impacts to special status species and a regulated Biological Resource

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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>dredging of open coastal waters, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes is prohibited unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> There is no feasible, environmentally less damaging alternative to wetland fill. The extent of the fill is the least amount necessary to allow development of the permitted use. Mitigation measures have been provided to minimize adverse environmental effects. 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>A wetland buffer of a sufficient size to ensure the biological integrity and preservation of the wetland shall be required. <u>Generally the required buffer shall be 100 feet, but in no case shall wetland buffers be less than 50-100 feet. The buffer size should take into consideration the type and size of the 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. A 100-foot minimum buffer area shall not be reduced when it serves the functions and values of slowing and absorbing flood waters for flood and erosion control, sediment filtration, water purification, and ground water recharge.</u> The buffer area shall serve as transitional habitat with native vegetation and shall provide physical barriers to human intrusion.</p>		Other environmental resource areas potentially affected by this policy change include Land Use and Recreation and Water Resources.	(wetlands). 2). No, because the change does not eliminate or reduce the requirement that the buffer protect wetland functions and values.
CE 3.5	CE 3.5 Protection of Wetlands Outside the Coastal Zone [GP]. The biological productivity and the quality of inland wetlands shall <u>should</u> be protected and, where feasible, restored. The filling of wetlands outside the Coastal Zone is prohibited unless it can be demonstrated that:	Yes	Yes, some wetlands potentially would have smaller buffers and hence potentially at greater risk of impacts from adjacent uses than under the existing sub-policy.	1). Yes, because the change has the potential to increase the impacts to special status species and a regulated Biological Resource

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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>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 <u>may</u> 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 <u>should</u> be required. Generally a wetland buffer shall <u>should</u> be 100 feet, but in no case shall <u>should</u> a wetland buffer be less than 50 feet. The buffer area s shall <u>should</u> serve as transitional habitat with native vegetation and shall <u>should</u> provide physical barriers to human intrusion.</p>		Other environmental resource areas potentially affected by this policy change include Land Use and Recreation and Water Resources.	(wetlands). 2). No, because the change does not eliminate or reduce the requirement that the buffer protect wetland functions and values.
CE 4.5	<p>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. <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 Plan shall include the details regarding buffers adjacent to monarch butterfly ESHAs. 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</u></p>	Yes	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. The amendment would not be expected to impact any other environmental resource area.	1). Yes, because it cannot be determined that the requirements in the management plan would at least equal those in the existing policy. 2). Yes, because the approach potentially defers mitigation.

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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>
	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.			
CE 4.6	<p>CE 4.6 Standards Applicable to New Development Adjacent to Monarch 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. The Citywide Habitat Management Plan shall include the standards applicable to new development adjacent to monarch ESHAs. The following standards shall apply to consideration of proposals for new development adjacent to monarch ESHAs or ESHA buffers:</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p>b. The study shall include preparation of a Monarch Butterfly Habitat Protection Plan, which at a minimum shall include: 1) 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.</p>	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>

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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 5.1	<p>CE 5.1 Designation of ESHAs. [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. Coastal sage scrub and chaparral.</p>	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>	1) & 2). Yes, because the change has the potential to increase the impacts to special status species and habitats under the GP/CLUP.
CE 5.3	<p>CE 5.3 Protection of Coastal Sage Scrub and Chaparral. [GP/CP] In addition to the provisions of Policy CE 1, <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 Plan shall include the standards applicable to the protection of coastal sage scrub and chaparral ESHAs, the following standards shall apply:</u></p> <p>a. For purposes of this policy, existing coastal sage scrub is defined as a drought tolerant, 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. Chaparral is composed mainly of fire and drought adapted woody, evergreen, shrubs and generally occupies hills and lower mountain slopes.</p> <p>b. To the maximum extent feasible, development shall avoid impacts to coastal sage scrub and chaparral habitats that</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>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>

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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>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.</p> <p>e. Impacts to coastal sage scrub and chaparral habitats shall be minimized by providing at least a 25-foot buffer restored with native species around the perimeter of the delineated habitat area.</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>			
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, habitats which support the <u>species listed in Table 4-1 Potentially Occurring Special Status Species and habitats listed in Table 4-1 Summary of Environmentally Sensitive Habitats, and habitats listed in Table 4-2, Summary of Environmentally Sensitive Habitats, following:</u></p> <p>a. <u>Special status plant species such as Santa Barbara honeysuckle (<i>Lonicera subspicata</i> var. <i>subspicata</i>), southern tarplant (<i>Centromadia parryi</i> ssp. <i>australis</i>) and black-flowered figwort (<i>Scrophularia atrata</i>).</u></p> <p>b. <u>Habitat capable of supporting special status invertebrate species, such as the globose dune beetle (<i>Coelus globosus</i>), and roosting habitat for the monarch butterfly.</u></p>	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 Class II impact to species' habitat is the conservation of ESHAs where species' occur (not conservation of potential habitat).</p>

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

Policy ID #	Alt 2a - City-Initiated Revisions	Is the sub-policy part of mitigation for Class II impacts identified in the Final EIR?	With the change, would GP/CLUP implementation result in greater or different impacts than those addressed in the Final EIR?	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?
	<p>e. <i>Aquatic habitat capable of supporting special-status fish species such as the steelhead trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss) and tidewater goby (Eucyclogobius newberryi).</i></p> <p>d. <i>Habitat capable of supporting special-status amphibians and reptiles such as the red-legged frog (Rana aurora draytonii) and western pond turtle (Clemmys marmorata pallida).</i></p> <p>e. <i>Nesting and roosting areas for various species of raptors such as Cooper's hawks (Accipiter cooperii), red-tailed hawks (Buteo jamaicensis), white-tailed kites (Elanus leucurus), and turkey vultures (Cathartes aura).</i></p> <p>f. <i>Nesting habitat for other special-status bird species such as western snowy plover, southwestern willow flycatcher (Empidonax traillii extimus), loggerhead shrike (Lanius ludovicianus), yellow warbler (Dendroica petechia), or tri-colored blackbird (Agelaius tricolor).</i></p> <p>g. <i>Nesting and foraging habitat for special-status mammals such as pallid bat (Antrozous pallidus), western red bat (Lasiurus blossevillii), Yuma myotis (Myotis yumanensis), and American badger (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>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 Plan shall include the standards applicable to new development near ESHAs.</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</p>	Yes	Yes. Potential but currently not occupied sites would not received added protection. No increased	1) No. The revision does not change the requirement to protect

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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>
	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		impacts to occupied sites would occur. The amendment would not be expected to impact any other environmental resource area.	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	CE 9.1 Definition of Protected Trees. [GP/CP] New development, where feasible, shall be sited and designed to preserve the following species of native trees: oaks (<i>Quercus</i> spp.), walnut (<i>Juglans californica</i>), sycamore (<i>Platanus racemosa</i>), cottonwood (<i>Populus</i> spp.), willows (<i>Salix</i> spp.), teyoh (<i>Heteromeles arbutifolia</i>) , or other native trees that are not otherwise protected in ESHAs. <u>If total avoidance of the native tree is not feasible, relocation should be permitted, and if relocation is not feasible, replacement in accordance with subpolicy CE 9.5 should be permitted.</u>	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	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. <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> A minimum buffer area shall be established through the Citywide Habitat Management Plan. 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	CE 9.4 Tree Protection Standards. [GP/CP] The following impacts to native trees and woodlands <u>shall be avoided in the design of projects except where no other feasible alternative exists:</u> 1) removal of native trees; 2) fragmentation of habitat; 3) removal of understory; 4) disruption of the canopy, and 5)	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	1) & 2). No, because revision does not substantively change the existing CE polices regarding Protected

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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>
	alteration of drainage patterns. Structures, including roads and driveways, should shall be sited to prevent any encroachment into the <u>protection zone of any protected tree critical root zone</u> and to provide an adequate buffer outside of the <u>protection zone critical root zone</u> of individual native trees in order to allow for future growth. Tree protection standards shall be detailed in the Tree Protection Ordinance called for in CE-IA-4.		is not feasible).	Trees.
CE 9.5	CE 9.5 Mitigation of Impacts to Native Trees. [GP/CP] Where the removal of mature native trees cannot be avoided through the implementation of project alternatives or where development encroaches into the protected zone and could threaten the continued viability of the tree(s), mitigation measures shall include, at a minimum, the planting of replacement trees on site, if suitable area exists on the subject site, <u>or offsite if suitable onsite area is unavailable, consistent with the Tree Protection Ordinance (see also CE-IA-4). The Tree Protection Ordinance shall establish the mitigation ratios for replacement trees for every tree removed, at a ratio of 10 replacement trees for every one tree removed.</u> Where onsite mitigation is not feasible, offsite mitigation shall be provided by planting of replacement trees at a site within the same watershed. If the tree removal occurs at a site within the Coastal Zone, any offsite mitigation area shall also be located within the Coastal Zone. Minimum sizes for various species of replacement trees shall be established <u>in the Tree Protection Ordinance.</u> by ordinance. Mitigation sites shall be monitored for a period of 5 years. The City may require replanting of trees that do not survive.	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 requirements and standards of the Central Coast Regional Water</u>	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 the existing sub-policy.

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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>Quality Control Board. Post construction structural BMPs shall be designed to treat, infiltrate, or filter stormwater runoff in accordance with <u>adopted State Legislation, and the City's Stormwater Management Plan as approved by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.</u> Examples of BMPs include 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 <u>identified in the City's adopted Stormwater Management Plan, 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.</u> 			
CE-IA-4	<p>CE-IA-4 Preparation of a Tree Protection Ordinance. The City may prepare and adopt a Tree Protection Ordinance that addresses standards for: heritage trees; public right-of-way trees; parking lot shade trees; native trees; <u>protective buffer widths for native trees, tree protection zones, mitigation ratios, street and parkway trees; and anti-topping.</u></p> <p><u>Time period:</u> 20082010</p> <p><u>Responsible party:</u> Planning and Environmental Services Department; Community Services Department</p>	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	<p>The following habitats occur within Goleta and are considered to be <u>may be designated as ESHAs based upon site specific environmental studies:</u> marine resources, beach and shoreline resources, coastal dunes, coastal bluff scrub, foredune, oak woodlands/savannah, dense stands of native grasslands, all wetlands such as vernal pools, riparian habitats, butterfly roosts, raptor roosts and nests, and habitats that support special-status</p>	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	NA

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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>
	plant and wildlife species, including western snowy plover (<i>Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus</i>) habitat.		revised retroactively.	
CE Table 4-2	Change Table 4-2 to include coastal bluff scrub as a significant native plant community and to add the word “designated” before reference to coastal beaches and bluffs and before the reference to Planning Area.	No	No, the revision does not change policies regarding protection of sensitive biological resources or GP/CLUP development patterns and related activities.	No, because the revision is not a substantive change to the existing sub-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.	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	<p>Policy LU 11: Nonresidential Growth Management [GP] Objective: To manage the amount and timing of nonresidential development within the city based upon actual residential construction so as to maintain an appropriate balance between jobs and housing in the city.</p> <p>LU 11.1 No Limitation on Annual Residential Permits. [GP] The City shall not place limitations on the number of building permits for new residential units that can be approved each year.</p> <p>LU 11.2 Nonresidential Growth Limit Based on New Housing Production. [GP] The quantity of new nonresidential floor area that may be approved for construction each year shall be limited based upon the number of residential units authorized for construction in the preceding year. The nonresidential growth management system may allow carryover of all or part of any unused portion of the total allocation to the following year.</p> <p>LU 11.3 Annual Cap on Total Allocation. [GP] The growth management system may establish an annual cap on the total allocation of floor area that is available to be assigned to nonresidential projects each year.</p> <p>LU 11.4 Exemption of Certain Old Town Projects. [GP] The</p>	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-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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>growth management system may exempt projects located on selected sites within the redevelopment project area defined by the Goleta Old Town Revitalization Plan.</p> <p>LU 11.5 Priority Projects. [GP] The growth management system may establish a list of priority projects, or categories of projects, that shall have priority for assignment of allocations of floor area each year.</p> <p>LU 11.6 Competitive Assignment of Annual Allocation. [GP] The growth management system shall establish a method of evaluating projects that are not exempt or in a priority category and a method for determining which projects are to be assigned allocations based upon their relative scores from the evaluation. The growth management system may include a procedure of assigning annual allocations for larger projects that are phased over a period of several years.</p>			
LU 3.2	<p>LU 3.2 Regional Commercial (C-R). [GP] This category is intended to provide for a wide range of retail commercial uses, including, but not limited to, larger scale commercial uses that serve the community, the region, and the traveling public. These uses are typically land-extensive. The Regional Commercial use designation provides for commercial uses that require large sites or attract large volumes of activity, such as “large box” retail uses, restaurants, high-volume retail businesses, and professional, personal, and financial services. <u>New areas for regional commercial development may be determined as appropriate through project review. In order to limit regional traffic impacts, lands designated in this category shall be limited to existing locations of “large box” uses as of 2005, shown on the Land Use Plan map in Figure 2-1, and no additional areas shall be designated.</u></p>	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 may need to be amended to conform to the provisions of this plan. The ordinance</p>	No.	No. Figure 2-3 of the GP/CLUP specifies the amount, type, and location of land uses within the City	1) & 2). No, because the revision does not alter the amount, type, and

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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>may be codified as part of the new zoning code. Time period: 2006 to 2007 Responsible parties: Planning and Environmental Services Department, Planning Commission, and City Council.</p>		<p>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.</p>	<p>location of land uses planned for the City.</p>
OS 1.10	<p>OS 1.10 Management of Public Lateral Access Areas. [GP/CP] The following criteria and standards shall apply to use and management of lateral shoreline access areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Private commercial uses of public beach areas shall be limited to coastal dependent recreational uses, including but not limited to surfing schools, ocean kayaking, and similar uses. All commercial uses of beach areas and other lateral accessways shall be subject to approval of a permit by the City. The number, size, duration, and other characteristics of commercial uses of beach areas may be limited in order to preserve opportunities for use and enjoyment of the beach area by the general public. For-profit commercial uses at the City-owned Santa Barbara Shores Park and Sperling Preserve (the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space and Habitat Management Plan OSHMP area) are prohibited (see related Policy OS 5). b. Temporary special events shall minimize impacts to public access and recreation along the shoreline. Coastal Development Permits shall be required for any temporary event that proposes to use a sandy beach area and involves a charge for admission or participation. c. Where sensitive habitat resources are present, limited or controlled methods of access and/or mitigation designed to 	No.	<p>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 requirements that remain in effect.</p>	<p>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.</p>

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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>eliminate or reduce impacts to ESHAs shall be implemented.</p> <p>d. The hours during which coastal access areas are available for public use shall be the maximum feasible while maintaining compatibility with nearby neighborhoods and land uses. The hours for public use shall be set forth in each individual coastal development permit. Unless specific hours are described within a permit, the access shall be deemed to be 24 hours per day and 7 days per week.</p> <p>e. In order to maximize public use and enjoyment, user fees for access to lateral beach and shoreline areas shall be prohibited. Activities and/or uses that would deter or obstruct public lateral access shall be prohibited.</p> <p>f. Overnight camping and use of motorized vehicles, except for public safety vehicles and vehicles associated with construction of access improvements and maintenance and restoration or enhancement activities, shall be prohibited in lateral shoreline access areas.</p>			
OS 7.3	<p>OS 7.3 Open Space for Preservation of Natural Resources. [GP] Goleta's natural resource lands include sandy beaches and dunes, rocky intertidal areas, coastal lagoons, coastal bluffs, eucalyptus groves and monarch butterfly aggregation sites, native grasslands, streams and associated riparian areas, wetlands, lakes and ponds, and habitats for various protected plant and animal species. Figure 3-5 designates areas that may be all environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHA) and could be as protected as open space depending upon the findings of site-specific biological studies. The following standards shall apply to these areas.</p> <p>a. The designated natural resource areas shall be managed by the City in accord with the policies described in the Conservation Element.</p> <p>b. The City may require dedication of open space easements as a condition of approval of development on sites that have</p>	Yes	<p>Yes, certain biological resources potentially would receive less protection and therefore would be more at risk than under the existing sub-policy.</p> <p>The amendment could also potentially result in different impacts for Land Use and Recreation.</p>	1) & 2). Yes, because the change has the potential to increase the impacts to special status species and habitats (Biological Resources) under the GP/CLUP.

**TABLE B-1
IMPACT SCREENING—ALTERNATIVE 2A**

<u>Policy ID #</u>	<u>Alt 2a - 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>open space resources as shown in Figure 3-5.</p> <p>c. The City encourages the donation of easements or fee-simple interests in open space lands to the City or other appropriate non-profit entity, such as a land trust.</p>			
TE 13.4	<p>TE 13.4 Options If Traffic Mitigations Are Not Fully Funded. [GP] If the transportation capital improvements needed to maintain adopted transportation LOS standards are not able to be funded, then the City shall take one or more of the following four actions:</p> <p>a. Phase or delay development until such time that adequate fiscal resources can be provided to build the necessary facilities transportation improvements (or to include them in the impact fee system).</p> <p>b. Require the developer to construct the necessary transportation system improvements, with a reimbursement agreement that uses future payments of impact fees by other projects.</p> <p>c. Reduce the scope of the development to reduce the traffic generation below the thresholds set in Policy TE 4.</p> <p>d. Require the developer to identify alternative strategies, such as transit improvements, improving signalization, improving other streets, adding pedestrian or bicycle improvements, etc., to <u>mitigate minimize</u> potential traffic impacts.</p>	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.