

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Section 3.5 of the GP/CLUP Final EIR (City of Goleta 2006) describes the following within the existing City boundary:

- environmental setting (existing conditions and regulatory setting) for cultural resources relating to the proposed project;
- the impacts associated with cultural resources that would result from the proposed project; and
- mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts.

Alternative 2a includes proposed policy amendment OS 1.10, which would involve removal of the reference to the Coastal Development Permit requirement for any temporary event that proposes to use a sandy beach area. Removal of this language could potentially allow for temporary events to take place in culturally sensitive areas and remove the ability of the City to control methods of access or develop mitigation to reduce potential cultural resource impacts. However, future temporary events would still be required to undergo regulatory review by the City via a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) per the adopted Coastal Zoning Ordinance. In addition, any temporary event would be subject to the California Coastal Commission regulations and would be required to minimize and mitigate potential cultural resource impacts to public access and recreation along the shoreline. The California Coastal Commission currently requires a CDP for temporary events that occupy all or part of a sandy beach area. Removal of the reference to the CDP from the GP/CLUP would have no effect on the applicability of the City's CDP requirement per the Coastal Zoning Ordinance, nor the Coastal Commission Permit requirements that remain in effect. Alternatives 2b and 3 propose the same policy amendments as Alternative 2a.

Alternative 2a includes proposed policy amendment CE 2.2, which proposes the streamside protection area (SPA) buffer width for creeks outside developed areas be the same as in developed areas (50 feet). Although the reduction in the buffer width (100 to 50 feet) could introduce additional development in these areas, resulting in potential impacts to cultural resources, such impacts are highly project-specific and would be addressed through future project-level review. Such review would include considering the project's consistency with overall GP/CLUP goals and policies and the requirements that apply to cultural and historic resources under federal and state regulations, including CEQA.

Alternative 2b includes proposed policy amendment CE 2.2, which states that the width of SPAs will be determined in accordance with the City's adopted Streamside Protection Plan and that the Streamside Protection Plan should reflect varying buffer widths based on differences in stream class/order and levels of adjacent development. Potential impacts to cultural resources from future development would be reviewed on a project-specific basis and would be addressed through future project-level review. Similar to Alternative 2a, such review would include considering the project's consistency with overall GP/CLUP goals and policies and the requirements that apply to cultural and historic resources under federal and state regulations, including CEQA.

Alternative 3, similar to Alternative 2a, also includes a proposed policy amendment to CE 2.2 that would set the SPA upland buffer at 50 feet. The amendment allows for decreasing the upland buffer on a case-by-case basis for siting infeasibility and low-impact projects. This

amended policy would not affect other protections for cultural and historic resources under federal and state regulations, including CEQA.

Alternative 2a includes proposed policy amendments CE 2.3 (which would allow for public work projects to take place in SPAs only where there are no feasible, less environmentally damaging alternatives) and CE 2.5 (which would encourage the location of bridge abutments or piers outside of creek beds and banks, where feasible). Construction and development of these projects could result in impacts to cultural resources; however, Policy 2.3 currently allows for other compatible land uses in SPAs such as agricultural operations, the construction of public road crossings and utilities, foot-trails, and bicycle paths. Potential impacts to cultural resources from the development of public works projects could be similar to impacts caused from the construction and development of these other allowable land uses. Potential impacts to cultural resources from future public works projects would be reviewed on through future project-level review. Such review would include considering the project's consistency with overall GP/CLUP goals and policies and the requirements that apply to cultural and historic resources under federal and state regulations, including CEQA. Alternatives 2b and 3 propose the same policy amendments as Alternative 2a.

Alternative 2a includes proposed policy amendment CE 3.4, which includes policy changes that could reduce or change the minimum width of wetland buffers in the Coastal Zone. Although the reduction in the buffer width could introduce additional development, resulting in potential impacts to cultural resources, such impacts are highly project-specific and would be addressed through the project review required under the amended policy. In addition, none of the policy changes under Alternatives 2a would amend the GP/CLUP in ways that eliminate or substantially change the requirements to avoid, minimize, and mitigate potentially significant impacts to cultural resources as stated in other City policies. Alternative 2b includes preparing a Riparian and Wetland Mitigation Ordinance to establish buffers and mitigation requirements. Alternative 3 proposes the same policy change as Alternative 2a. None of policy changes under these Alternatives alter the resource protection and impact mitigation requirements that apply to cultural resources under federal and state regulations, including CEQA.

Alternatives 2a, 2b, and 3 includes proposed policy amendment CE 3.5, which includes policy changes that could reduce or change the minimum width of wetland buffers outside of the Coastal Zone. Although the reduction in the buffer width could introduce additional development, resulting in potential impacts to cultural resources, such impacts are highly project-specific and would be addressed through the project review required under the amended policy. Alternative 2b again requires the preparation of a Riparian and Wetland Mitigation Ordinance to establish buffers and mitigation requirements. Alternative 3 specifies the considerations for setting buffer areas, including the size of development, the sensitivity of the wetland resources, natural features, functions and values of the wetland, and the need for upland transitional habitat. None of the policy changes under Alternatives 2a, 2b, and 3 would amend the GP/CLUP in ways that eliminate or substantially change the requirements to avoid, minimize, and mitigate potentially significant impacts to cultural resources as stated in other City policies. In addition, none of policy changes under Alternatives 2a, 2b, and 3 alter the resource protection and impact mitigation requirements that apply to cultural resources under federal and state regulations, including CEQA.

The GP/CLUP amendments listed in Table 2-1 of this Supplemental EIR would not result in greater or different impacts to cultural resources than those analyzed in the Final EIR, do not have the potential to result in new potentially significant impacts to cultural resources, and are not proposed to policies cited as mitigation for potential impacts to cultural resources in the Final

EIR. Accordingly, the proposed GP/CLUP amendments would not affect the analysis presented in Section 3.5 of the Final EIR, and no further discussion need be presented in this Supplemental EIR.

This page intentionally left blank.