

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section summarizes the characteristics of the proposed project and the project alternatives, the environmental impacts associated with the project and alternatives, and required and recommended mitigation measures.

### PROJECT SYNOPSIS

#### Lead Agency

City of Goleta  
Planning & Environmental Review  
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B  
Goleta, California 93117

#### Project Applicant

John Price  
Cortona Corner LP  
P.O. Box 61106  
Santa Barbara, CA 93160

#### Project Description

A detailed description of the applicant's proposal is included in Section 2.0, *Project Description*. The key characteristics of the proposed project are summarized below.

##### Project Characteristics

The proposed Cortona Apartments project involves a Development Plan for 176 apartments contained within eight residential buildings (four two-story and four three-story). The 176 apartments would be comprised of a mix of one, two, and three bedroom units (66 one-bedroom units, 100 two-bedroom units, and 10 three-bedroom units). The project also includes a 4,587-square foot two-story clubhouse/rental office building, a pool/spa, a 672-square foot maintenance building, and an additional recreation area in the northwest corner of the site for a volleyball court or similar facility. Proposed onsite parking includes 178 carports and 152 uncovered parking spaces for a total of 330 parking spaces.

The project proposes a density of 21.2 units per acre in order to meet the requirements of an Affordable Housing Opportunity Site from the City's General Plan Housing Element that requires a minimum of 20 units per acre. Based on an average household size of 2.73 persons per household and a total of 176 residential units, the project's estimated population would be approximately 480 persons.

##### Site Layout/Coverage and Architecture

The eight residential buildings would be dispersed over the central portion of the site and an internal system of pedestrian pathways would connect the residential buildings, clubhouse building, recreation areas (volleyball court, tot lot, picnic areas), and the parking areas. The uncovered parking spaces and carports would be located on the perimeter of the site. The architectural style of the project is



contemporary. This architecture features a mix of stucco in earth tones and stone exterior finishes, pitched roofs, heavy exterior wood beams supported by wood corbels, and wrought iron accents. The project's buildings would be designed in a contemporary style to complement the surrounding/ adjacent buildings along Cortona Drive.

#### Site Access and Parking

Access to the site would be from Cortona Drive via a 60-foot driveway with two 24-foot wide driveways and a center median at the entrance. Proposed internal driveway widths are 25 feet 6 inches clear between parking spaces.

A total of 330 parking spaces are proposed for the site, including 178 carport spaces and 152 uncovered spaces. The project application requests modifications to the DR zone district development standards to allow the carports to be located within the 10-foot side and rear yard setback. The project would also provide 30 bike parking spaces.

#### Grading/Walls

The project would include mass grading to prepare the site to support the residential development. Grading operations would include the construction of individual building pads for each structure, over-excavation as needed for roadways and driveways, and trenching and backfilling for installation of underground utilities. Estimated preliminary project grading would include approximately 5,700 cubic yards of cut and 8,500 cubic yards of fill, for a net import of 2,800 cubic yards of material. Grading would involve the placement of fill on most of the project site, with up to approximately three feet of fill under buildings 4 and 6. Where a small knoll currently exists on the southeastern portion of the site, grading would involve up to four feet of cut prior to paving the driveway on-site.

A masonry sound wall with a height of eight feet is proposed along the northern site boundary in order to limit noise associated with the adjacent Union Pacific Railroad and U.S. 101, both of which lie directly to the north. Additionally, six-foot high masonry privacy walls are proposed on the east and west sides of the site.

#### Landscaping

Based on a Preliminary Landscape Plan prepared for the project site, suggested plant species include but are not limited to Coast Live Oak, California Sycamore, Fruitless Olive, New Zealand Christmas Tree, Saratoga Bay Laurel, Bottle Tree, Camphor Tree, Southern Oak, and Mexican Fan Palm. Trees, shrubs and other vegetation would be planted throughout the development as well as drought tolerant, Mediterranean and wildlife habitat plant species. In addition, non-native ornamental street trees are proposed along parking aisles and roadways. Some of the existing native trees, including three existing oak trees (twelve total currently exist on site), would remain on site. In addition, some of the site's existing palms, pines and eucalyptus trees would be retained to provide screening and to retain some of the current site character. The total landscaped area of the project is approximately 166,410 square feet.



### Stormwater and Drainage

As discussed in Section 4.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, the proposed project would be required to incorporate best management practices (BMPs) to reduce stormwater runoff from the site, consistent with the City's *Storm Water Guidance Document*. Any stormwater runoff from the project site would be directed to flow into the curb/gutter on Cortona Drive and subsequently to one of two catch basins within the roadway east of the project site where it would enter the City's stormdrain system that discharges into Tecolotito Creek at the eastern terminus of Cortona Drive. Onsite, the proposed stormwater drainage plan for the project would collect stormwater from both pervious as well as impervious surfaces through a system of catch basins and transport that runoff to a system of underground cisterns within the drive aisles of the internal circulation system before release into the curb/gutter on Cortona Drive and ultimately discharge into Tecolotito Creek.

### Lighting

The proposed project's lighting plan would include twelve-foot tall shielded pole lights throughout the uncovered parking areas, pedestrian walkways and along the perimeter of each building. In addition, 42-inch shielded bollard lights would also provide safety lighting throughout the site. The carports would also be lighted underneath the overhang.

### Utilities

The water supply system would be looped to water mains on Cortona Drive. Utility easements would be recorded for utility services. All electrical distribution lines, fiber optic lines, cable television lines, phone lines, gas lines, water lines, and sewer lines, and etcetera would be undergrounded. Other components of the site's utility infrastructure, such as backflow preventers, transformers, water meter assemblies, gas meters, power meters, cable TV pedestals, and etcetera would be installed aboveground.

### Construction

It is assumed that project construction would occur over approximately 14 months. Construction activities would include site preparation, grading, building construction, paving and architectural coating phases. No phasing plan is proposed at this time. Public infrastructure improvements would include fire hydrants, sidewalks, curb and gutter.

### Project Objectives

The objectives of the proposed project are to:

1. Develop rental housing that meets a multitude of the City's housing needs including workforce housing for employees in the surrounding business parks and produces an economically viable project. Workforce housing is intended to be occupied by households whose head is in the workforce as well as housing affordable to people that the community relies on to supply basic services such as teachers, police, nurses, etc. (GP/CLUP, Housing Element).
2. Maintain a density of residential units sufficient to accommodate units affordable by design and to provide the densities outlined in the General Plan as anticipated by the City in its Land Use and Housing Elements so as to meet its "Regional Housing



Needs Assessment” requirements for the project site and to help address the local affordable housing deficit through provision of rental housing.

3. Provide common recreation areas, including a clubhouse, pool/spa, tot lot, picnic areas, and open space opportunities for residents of the project site.
4. Develop the project site such that it minimizes the potential for compatibility conflicts with neighboring properties by integrating residential development with the research park development, including provision of parking on-site as required by the City’s Zoning Ordinance to prevent spillover of parking off-site.
5. Provide building design for neighborhood compatibility with two story buildings at the front of the site.

## ALTERNATIVES

As required by CEQA, the EIR examines a range of alternatives to the proposed project. The alternatives, described and evaluated in Section 6.0, include the following:

- No Project Alternative. This alternative assumes that the proposed project is not implemented and that the project site remains in its current condition.
- Alternative 2: Avoid CA-SBA-54. This alternative would involve eliminating the portion of the proposed development that lies within the boundaries of the CA-SBA-54 archaeological site. In order to accommodate the units lost by eliminating Building 6, buildings 1, 2, 7, 8 would increase from two to three stories. A 400-foot portion of the sound wall would not be built.
- Alternative 3: Increase Railroad/Freeway Buffer and Higher Sound Wall. This alternative would reconfigure the development to provide a larger buffer between the railroad and the U.S. 101 and increase the height of the sound wall to 12 feet to reduce noise impacts. Buildings 3 and 6 would be removed and buildings 4 and 5 would be reduced in size. Therefore, buildings 1, 2, 7, and 8 would increase to three stories so that the overall number of units would remain the same as the proposed project.
- Alternative 4: Reduced Building Height. This alternative would reduce buildings 3, 4, 5, and 6 from three stories to two stories, reducing the overall number of on-site units from 176 to 136.
- Alternative 5: Business Park Development. This alternative would involve a business park in place of the proposed residential development. The business park would include approximately 260,400 square feet of building area and would be two stories in height.

The No Project Alternative would be the overall environmentally superior alternative, but would not achieve the basic project objectives. Each of the development alternatives would reduce one or more project impacts. Alternative 2 would avoid the potentially significant, but mitigable impact to cultural resources while Alternative 3 would avoid the potentially significant, but mitigable impact related to exposure of site residents to noise. Alternatives 2 and 3 would both meet some of the basic project objectives, but may not meet objectives 4 or 5. In addition, Alternative 3 may not meet objectives 1 and 2 related to density and affordability. By reducing the number of sensitive receptors on-site, Alternative 4 would incrementally reduce noise impacts, but would not meet Objective 5 and may not meet



Objective 4. Alternative 5 would reduce noise impacts from U.S. 101 and the Union Pacific Railroad tracks to a less than significant level since it does not include noise-sensitive uses and would avoid residential exposure to risk of upset impacts. However, Alternative 5 may increase traffic impacts and would not meet any of the project objectives that relate to the provision of housing.

## SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table ES-1 summarizes the identified environmental impacts for each issue area studied in the EIR, recommended mitigation measures (if any), and the level of significance after mitigation. Class I impacts are defined as significant, unavoidable adverse impacts which require a statement of overriding considerations to be issued per CEQA Guidelines § 15093 if the project is approved. Class II impacts are significant adverse impacts that can be feasibly mitigated to less than significant levels and which require findings to be made under Section 15091 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Class III impacts are considered less than significant impacts. Class IV impacts are those for which the project's impact would be beneficial.

**Table ES-1**  
**Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<b><i>Aesthetics</i></b>		
<b>Impact AES-1</b> The proposed project would not impact scenic resources identified in the City's Visual and Historic Resources Element, including without limitation, to the Santa Ynez Mountains, coastal mesas, bluffs, and the Pacific Ocean. Impacts to such scenic resources would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
<b>Impact AES-2</b> The proposed project would convert an undeveloped parcel into a multi-family housing complex with two- and three-story buildings. Due to the location of the site with respect to designated scenic view corridors, and the heights of proposed buildings on-site, the project would not substantially affect designated view corridors of the Santa Ynez Mountains to the north or the coastal plain to the south. Therefore, impacts to scenic view corridors, views of mountains, and private views would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
<b>Impact AES-3</b> Construction of the proposed multi-family housing development would involve removal of mature trees and shrubs on the eastern and northern portions of the site. However, important specimen trees would be transplanted to off-site locations, and existing oak saplings would remain where feasible at the east property line. Therefore, impacts to natural landforms would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
<b>Impact AES-4</b> The proposed project would permanently alter the project site, replacing	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.



**Table ES-1  
 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>open and undeveloped land with a residential complex. However, the visual character of proposed buildings and landscaping would be compatible with that of surrounding business parks. Impacts to the visual character of the site and surroundings would be Class III, less than significant.</p>		
<p><b>Impact AES-5</b> The proposed project would introduce on-site sources of lighting and glare to an open, undeveloped parcel that currently has none. Impacts would be Class II, significant but mitigable.</p>	<p><b>AES-5 Lighting Specifications.</b> Any exterior lighting installed on the project site must be of low intensity, low glare design, and must be hooded to direct light downward onto the subject parcel and prevent spill-over onto adjacent parcels and must otherwise meet dark night sky requirements. Exterior lighting fixtures must be kept to the minimum number and intensity needed to ensure public safety. These lights must be dimmed after 11 p.m. to the maximum extent practical without compromising public safety as determined by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee. Upward directed exterior lighting is prohibited. Lighting fixtures must be appropriate for the architectural style of the structure and surrounding area. The final lighting plan must be amended to include identification of all types, sizes, and intensities of wall mounted building lights and landscape accent lighting, and a photometric map must be provided. "Moonlighting" type fixtures that illuminate entire tree canopies should also be avoided.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> The locations of all exterior lighting fixtures, complete cut-sheets of all exterior lighting fixtures, and a photometric plan prepared by a registered professional engineer showing the extent of all light and glare emitted by all exterior lighting fixtures must be reviewed and approved by the DRB, and the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee, before the City issues a building permit for construction.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> Before the City issues a certificate of occupancy, the Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must inspect exterior lighting features to ensure that they have been installed consistent with approved plans.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>



<b>Air Quality</b>		
<p><b>Impact AQ-1</b> Project construction would generate temporary increases in localized air pollutant emissions. Such emissions may result in temporary adverse impacts to local air quality but are below SBCAPCD guideline thresholds for construction emissions. Additionally, standard dust and emissions control measures are required by the SBCAPCD. Impacts would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation.</p>
<p><b>Impact AQ-2</b> The proposed project would generate operational air pollutant emissions from area sources, energy use, and increased vehicular traffic. However, the increase in emissions would not exceed thresholds established by SBCAPCD and impacts would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation.</p>
<p><b>Impact AQ-3</b> Population growth associated with the proposed project would not exceed the 2010 CAP population forecasts for Goleta. Impacts related to CAP consistency would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation.</p>
<p><b>Impact AQ-4</b> New sensitive receptors on the project site would be exposed to hazardous air pollutants at levels that may cause health risks. The proposed residences closest to U.S. 101 and the Union Pacific Railroad (approximately 120 feet away) would be exposed to hazardous air pollutants that exceed significance thresholds. This impact would be Class II, significant but mitigable.</p>	<p><b>AQ-4 Indoor Air Pollution.</b> The mitigation actions listed below applies to all new residential units on the project site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forced air ventilation with filter screens on outside air intake ducts must be provided for all residential units proposed on the project site (MERV 13 or better). The filter screens must be capable of removing at least 85% of the particulate matter including fine particulate matter (PM&lt;2.5 micron).</li> <li>• For individual residential units with separate HVAC systems, a brochure notifying the future residents of the need for maintaining the filter screens must be prepared and provided at the time of ownership exchange. In addition, a notice of the diesel particulates risk hazard and the need for screen maintenance must be placed in the property title or lease.</li> <li>• For residential units with conjoined HVAC (e.g. apartments), the agent (e.g., HOA or landlord) is responsible for maintaining the filter screens annually. In addition, a notice of the diesel particulates risk hazard and the need for screen maintenance must be placed in the property title or lease.</li> <li>• Windows and doors must be fully weatherproofed with caulking and weather-stripping that is rated to last at least 20 years.</li> </ul>	<p>Less than significant.</p>



	<p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> The above-noted emissions avoidance measures must be incorporated into the project and shown on the plans submitted for building plan check. The brochure and the specifications for the filter screens must also be submitted to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee for review and acceptance before issuance of a building permit.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must review the hazard avoidance measures and confirm acceptable wording in the brochure and the suitability of the proposed screens before issuance of zoning clearance. City building inspectors must check for installation of the filter screens and adequate weather-proofing in the appropriate units before issuance of certificate of occupancy.</p>	
<p><b>Impact AQ-5</b> The proposed project involves residential uses that would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation.</p>
<p><b>Biological Resources</b></p>		
<p><b>Impact BIO-1</b> Biological surveys of the project site identified a lack of special-status plant species or suitable habitat for special-status wildlife species. However, the project site contains habitat that could support nesting birds protected under state and federal law. Impacts on sensitive species are Class II, significant but mitigable.</p>	<p><b>BIO-1 Nesting Bird Surveys.</b> If vegetation removal or construction activities are expected to commence during the avian breeding season (typically February to August, but variable based on seasonal climatic conditions) a survey for active nests must be conducted by a qualified avian biologist approved by the City at the site one week before any scheduled tree removal. If active nests are located, all project work must be conducted at a distance (buffer) determined by the City-approved biologist to ensure that active nests are not disturbed and that any young have fledged and become independent of the adults. Project activities may encroach into the buffer at the discretion of the City-approved biologist.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the permittee must submit the name and qualifications of the project biologist that will conduct such survey work to the City for staff review and approval. The results of the survey must be submitted to the City for staff review and approval before the issuance of any grading or building permits for the project.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> City Planning and Environmental Review staff must verify compliance before the issuance of any</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>



	grading/building permits for the project. Further, conduct periodic site inspections by Planning and Environmental Review Staff must take place during grading operations to verify compliance with any restrictions on construction activity posed by either this mitigation measure and/or the biological survey.	
<b>Impact BIO-2</b> The Goleta General Plan identifies the presence of coastal sage scrub, an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat (ESHA), on the project site. However, biological assessment surveys for this EIR indicate that no protected habitat ESHAs are present on-site. Impacts on sensitive habitats would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
<b>Impact BIO-3</b> The project site lacks hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and wetland hydrology and therefore does not meet any of the City's criteria for wetland determinations. Impacts on wetlands would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
<b>Impact BIO-4</b> The project site does not serve as a corridor for wildlife movement, due to its poor connectivity with other undeveloped spaces and its location within a highly developed area. Therefore, impacts on wildlife movement would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
<b>Impact BIO-5</b> Construction of the proposed project would involve removal of coast live oak trees that are protected by the Policy 9.1 in the Conservation Element of the Goleta General Plan. Mitigation of these protected trees would be required. Impacts would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	<p><b>BIO-5 Tree Protection.</b> Construction impacts to the coast live oaks which are to be preserved must be minimized. A tree protection zone (dripline plus five feet) must be established before any ground disturbance by the installation of exclusionary fencing. If any areas of the protection zone would be intruded upon by excavation activity, areas within the protection zone should be hand dug and overseen by a qualified arborist. Mitigation for removed trees must be implemented with like species trees at a ratio of 10:1 if using one gallon container size trees or 3:1 if using 24-inch box trees (Goleta Municipal Code Title 15, Chapter 15.09 Appendix A Grading Ordinance Guidelines for Native Oak Tree Removal). A long-term maintenance program of no less than five years of monitoring should be implemented to insure mitigation success.</p> <p>Any unanticipated damage to trees or sensitive habitats identified for protection/preservation on the approved Land Use Permit plans from construction activities must be mitigated in a manner approved by the City. This mitigation must include, without limitation, posting of a performance security, tree replacement on a</p>	Less than significant.



	<p>10:1 ratio, and hiring of an outside consulting biologist or arborist approved by the City to assess damage and recommend mitigation. The required mitigation must be done under the direction of the City-approved biologist or arborist before any further work occurring on site. Any performance securities required for installation and maintenance of replacement trees will be released by City staff after its inspection and approval of such installation and maintenance.</p> <p>To help ensure the long-term survival of on-site oaks, no permanent irrigation systems are permitted within six (6) feet of the dripline of any oaks. Any landscaping must be of compatible species requiring minimal irrigation. Drainage plans must be designed so that tree trunk areas are properly drained to avoid ponding.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> This condition must be printed on project plans submitted for grading and building plan approval. Fencing must be graphically depicted on all project plans submitted for approval of the project or issuance of any building or grading permit.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> City Planning and Environmental Review staff must review plans and confirm fence installation before grading/building permit issuance. City Planning and Environmental Review staff must conduct site inspections to ensure compliance during all grading and construction activities.</p>	
<p><b>Impact BIO-6</b> Landscaping on the project site could facilitate the spread of invasive plant species in existing natural habitats in surrounding areas. Impacts would be Class II, significant but mitigable.</p>	<p><b>BIO-6 Landscaping.</b> Landscaping. Invasive plant species must not be used for project landscaping. Excluded species must include those listed as problematic and/or invasive by CNPS, Cal-IPC, or which are listed as 'noxious weeds' by the State of California or the U.S. Federal Government and/or otherwise determined to be problematic and/or invasive by the City of Goleta. Boston ivy (<i>Parthenocissus tricuspidata</i>), Japanese honeysuckle (<i>Lonicera japonica</i>), and rockrose (<i>Cistus ladanifer</i>) must be among those species excluded from use in landscaping.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> The final landscape plan must identify all existing and new trees, shrubs, and groundcovers by species. No species included in the final landscape plan may be listed as problematic and/or invasive by the California Native Plant Society or the California Invasive Plant Council, or listed as a 'noxious weed' by the</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>



	<p>State, Federal, or City government.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> The final landscape plan must be reviewed and approved by the DRB and submitted to Planning and Environmental Review Director for final review and approval before the City issues a grading permit. All landscaping in or near an open space area must be subject to Santa Barbara County Fire Department Protection District approval before the City issues a building permit for construction. The approved plant palette must be adhered to throughout the life of the project.</p>	
<p><b>Cultural Resources</b></p>		
<p><b>Impact CR-1</b> Based on subsurface archaeological investigations conducted for the project site, there is evidence that an intact subsurface archaeological deposit (CA-SBA-54) is present. Activities associated with construction of onsite development could potentially have a significant impact on CA-SBA-54. This would be a Class II, significant but mitigable, impact.</p>	<p><b>CR-1(a) Capping and Limited Data Recovery Collection.</b> In order to cap identified portions of CA-SBA-54, placement of fill soils within the project site must include the following surface preparation and fill placement measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Remove all organic material from the archaeological site surface by hand (including brushing, raking, or use of power blower). Use of motorized vehicles for vegetation removal is prohibited. All vegetation must be removed at ground surface such that no soil disturbance results;</li> <li>2) Remaining root balls and masses in the ground after hand removal of vegetation stems/trunks must be sprayed with topical pesticide per the pesticide manufacturer’s specifications to ensure no further growth. The resulting dead vegetation masses must be left in place. Complete surface vegetation removal and die-off of root massing must be achieved before geotextile placement;</li> <li>3) No remedial grading, sub-grade preparation or scarification may occur before placement of the geotextile fabric;</li> <li>4) A bioaxial geogrid (Tensar BX1200, TX 160, or equivalent) must be laid over the ground surface throughout CA-SBA-54 site boundaries and a minimum buffer area to be determined by the City through consultation with the applicant’s archaeologist and Chumash consultants as the final grading plans are prepared. The geogrid type and verification of its technological capability shall be provided by a qualified geotechnical engineer during plan check of final grading plans;</li> <li>5) Placement of fill soils on top of the geotextile fabric must be done in no greater than 8-inch lifts with rubber-tired equipment;</li> <li>6) The first six inches of fill must be yellow sand that signals to any future subsurface</li> </ol>	<p>Less than significant.</p>



	<p>activity (e.g. landscaping activity) that excavation may not extend deeper;</p> <p>7) Geotextile fabric must be capable of preventing compaction and load impacts on underlying archaeological resources;</p> <p>8) Fill soils must have a pH ranging from 5.5 to 7.5 only;</p> <p>9) Fill soils must be free of archaeological resources;</p> <p>10) Fill soils must be spread from the outside with rubber track heavy equipment, such that the equipment would only be working on top of the fill soils. The fill soils must be placed ahead of the loading equipment so that the machine does not have contact with the archaeological site surface;</p> <p>11) The fill soils must be sufficiently moist so that they are cohesive under the weight of the heavy equipment as the material is spread out over the archaeological site and buffer area.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> The permittee must provide the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee with a grading plan for review and approval. Planning and Environmental Review must provide a meeting with interested local Chumash individuals and tribal representatives to review and provide comment on the revised grading plan before submittal to the City for plan check. Site deposits on which fill would be placed would no longer be accessible to research and a data collection program would be required. The program must include, but not be limited to, the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Mapping the location of surface artifacts within the proposed areas of fill;</li><li>2) Surface collection of artifacts;</li><li>3) The excavation of a small sample of deposit to characterize the nature of the buried portions of the site;</li><li>4) All material used as fill must be culturally sterile and chemically neutral;</li><li>5) And curation of the excavated sample must occur as specified by the City-approved archaeologist.</li></ol> <p>The program must be prepared and conducted by a City-approved archaeologist and must be funded by the permittee. The fill/data collection program proposal must be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee before the City issues a permit for grading.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> The grading plan must be approved prior to issuance of a</p>	
--	---	--



	<p>grading permit. The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must site inspect to ensure that recommendations are carried out in the field.</p> <p><b>CR-1(b) Phase III Data Recovery Excavation.</b> For any excavation required for utilities or infrastructure disturbs areas of potentially intact resources, the project permittee must complete a Phase III Data Recovery Excavation Program to document resources at the project site in a comprehensive manner. The Phase III Data Recovery Excavation Program must be conducted in accordance with Open Space Element Policy 8.5, the California Office of Historic Preservation’s (1990) Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and Format, and CEQA Statutes section 21083.2 and Guidelines section 15126.4(b). The Phase III Data Recovery Excavation Program must be prepared by a City-approved archaeologist. In preparing the Phase III Data Recovery Program, the City-approved archaeologist will prepare a research design that includes a preliminary assessment of available artifacts recovered from the project site and nearby archaeological sites, and any corresponding field notes, graphics, lab analysis and results. It is anticipated that the artifacts would be curated at UCSB, the Natural History Museum, or other location in consultation with the local Chumash consultant(s). A Phase III Data Recovery Excavation Program involving additional soil surveys (excavations) must be completed in accordance with the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) A “to be” determined number of controlled excavation units be excavated to obtain supplemental data. The placement of these units must be determined to avoid previously disturbed areas. The units must be placed in areas being, or to be, directly impacted by the current development area and where the most information may be obtained.</li><li>2) All excavations must be conducted under the supervision of a City-approved archaeologist with a trained archaeological field crew. All field work must be undertaken in the presence of a local Chumash consultant(s).</li></ol> <p>If it is necessary to complete a Phase III investigation, impacts to archaeological resources could occur as a result of greater soil disturbances. It is preferred that these</p>	
--	---	--



	<p>additional potential impacts be avoided. However, with monitoring and limiting the number of test pits, and given the fact that the Phase III analysis would retrieve archaeological information before future access to the resources is prevented as a result of the project, potential impacts associated with conducting the Phase III excavations would be considered less than significant.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> A Phase III Data Recovery Evacuation Program report must be submitted to the City Planning and Environmental Review staff within 90 days of completion of the archaeological investigation and before project-related ground disturbance.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> The City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must confirm that the report is submitted within 90 days of completion of the archaeological investigation. The permittee must obtain City Planning and Environmental Review approval of any Phase III archaeological report before ground-disturbing activities can occur.</p> <p><b>CR-1(c) Monitoring.</b> A City-approved archaeologist and local Chumash consultant must monitor project implementation during the initial grading and excavation activities until such time as sufficient subsurface soil has been uncovered/ excavated to ascertain that no prehistoric archaeological/ cultural resources are located on the project site. The monitor(s) must have the following authority:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) The Chumash monitor(s) and Native American monitor(s) must be on-site on a full-time basis during any earthmoving activities, including preparation of the area for capping, grading, trenching, vegetation removal, or other excavation activities. The monitors will continue their duties until it is determined through consultation with the permittee, City Planning and Environmental Review staff, archaeological consultant, and Chumash consultant that monitoring is no longer warranted;</li><li>2) The monitor(s) must halt any activities impacting previously unidentified cultural resources and conduct an initial assessment of the resource(s);</li><li>3) If an artifact is identified as an isolated find, the monitor(s) must recover the artifact(s) with the appropriate locational data and include the item in the overall</li></ol>	
--	---	--



	<p>inventory for the site;</p> <p>4) If a feature or concentration of artifacts is identified, the monitor must halt activities in the vicinity of the find, notify the permittee and City Planning and Environmental Review staff and prepare a proposal for the assessment and treatment of the find(s). This treatment may range from additional study to avoidance, depending on the nature of the find(s);</p> <p>5) The monitor must prepare a comprehensive archaeological technical report documenting the results of the monitoring program and include an inventory of recovered artifacts, features, etc.;</p> <p>6) The monitor must prepare the artifact assemblage for curation with an appropriate curation facility (e.g., UCSB or local Chumash facility) and include an inventory with the transfer of the collection; and</p> <p>7) The monitor must file an updated archaeological site survey record with the UCSB Central Coastal Information Center.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> This requirement must be printed on all plans submitted for building or grading permits. The permittee must enter into a contract with a City-approved archaeologist and Chumash consultant and must fund the provision of onsite archaeological/ cultural resource monitoring during initial grading, excavation, and/or demolition activities before issuance of a grading permit. Plan specifications for the monitoring must be printed on all plans submitted for grading, and building permits.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> City Planning and Environmental Review staff must conduct periodic field inspections to verify compliance during ground disturbing activities.</p> <p><b>CR-1(d) Continued Chumash Consultation.</b> Initial Chumash consultation with the City of Goleta and project applicant has indicated that archaeological site CA-SBA-54 is important to the Chumash community. Continued Chumash consultation should occur throughout the remainder of the project including any design changes, alternatives analysis, or mitigation measure implementation to ensure that impacts to CA-SBA-54 are mitigated in a manner that would be respectful of the site's Chumash heritage.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> This</p>	
--	---	--



	<p>condition must be printed on all building and grading plans.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> The City Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must check plans before issuance of a grading and/or building permit and must spot check in the field throughout grading and construction.</p> <p><b>CR-1(e) Human Remains.</b> Before initiating any staging areas, vegetation clearing, or grading activity, the permittee and construction crew must meet on-site with a City-approved archaeologist and appropriate local Chumash consultant(s) and present the procedures to be followed in the unlikely event human remains are uncovered. These procedures must include those identified by California Public Resources Code § 5097.98. In addition, a satisfactory disposition of the remains must be agreed upon by the City-approved archaeologist and appropriate local Chumash consultant(s) so as to limit future disturbance. If the remains are determined to be of Chumash descent, the County Coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) of the deceased Chumash, who will then help determine what course of action should be taken in dealing with the remains.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> Before the City issues grading permits, the permittee must provide the City Planning and Environmental Review staff the contact information of the Chumash consultant and the agreed upon procedures to be followed. In the event that remains are found and if the remains are found to be of Chumash origin, the County Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission and the Commission will name the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The MLD, consulting archaeologist, permittee, and City Planning and Environmental Review staff will consult as to the disposition of the remains. If the remains are identified as non-Chumash, the County Coroner will take possession of the remains and comply with all state and local requirements in the treatment of the remains.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> The City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must confirm that the County Coroner is notified in the event human remains are</p>	
--	---	--



	<p>found, and that the Native American Heritage Commission is contacted if the remains are of Chumash origin.</p> <p><b>CR-1(f) Archaeological Reporting.</b> The results of all archaeological investigations must be reported by the permittee to the City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee as an addendum to the Phase III data recovery excavation described in Mitigation Measure CR-1(c) (if completed) or as a formal technical report.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> This report by the permittee must be submitted to the City within 180 days of completion of the archaeological monitoring described in Mitigation Measure CR-1(c).</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> The City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee must confirm that the Archaeological Report is submitted within 180 days of completion of archaeological monitoring described in Mitigation Measure CR-1(c).</p> <p><b>CR-1(g) Undiscovered Resources.</b> In the event that previously undiscovered archaeological resources are encountered during grading, work must be stopped immediately or redirected until a City-approved archaeologist and appropriate local Chumash consultant(s) observer can evaluate the significance of the find pursuant to Phase II investigation standards set forth in the City Archaeological Guidelines.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> During construction if undiscovered archaeological resources are found as appropriate.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> The City Planning and Environmental Review staff must inspect the project site to ensure that recommendations are carried out in the field.</p>	
<p><b>Geology and Soils</b></p>		
<p><b>Impact GEO-1</b> Project site soils are prone to liquefaction, which could cause settlement in a seismic event and expose on-site structures to property damage. This is a Class II, significant but mitigable impact.</p>	<p><b>GEO-1 Geotechnical Design Considerations.</b> The recommendations in the 2009 Preliminary Foundation Investigation conducted by Pacific Materials Laboratory of Santa Barbara (Appendix E) related to soil engineering must be incorporated into the proposed project grading and building plans. These recommendations are summarized here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site grading, compaction, fill and drainage.</li> </ul>	<p>Less than significant.</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foundation/footing, slab design, soil bearing value and waterproofing methods for sub-grade interior spaces.</li> <li>• Retaining wall design, soil pressure, waterproofing, and backfill.</li> <li>• Pavement soil foundation, application, dimensions, waterproofing and maintenance.</li> <li>• Swimming pool wall and deck concrete design and reinforcement standards.</li> <li>• Adjacent load effect on footings at varying elevations.</li> <li>• Angular distortion, settlement and soil bearing values.</li> </ul> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> Grading and building plans must be submitted for review and approval by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee before issuance of grading and building permits.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> The Project Geotechnical Engineer must observe all excavations before placement of compacted soil, gravel backfill, or rebar and concrete.</p>	
<p><b>Impact GEO-2</b> On-site construction and grading activity may temporarily increase soil erosion on the project site. Temporary impacts related to soil erosion would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation.</p>
<p><b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b></p>		
<p><b>Impact GHG-1</b> The proposed project would generate temporary as well as long-term GHG emissions which would incrementally contribute to climate change. Total construction-related emissions are estimated to be approximately 835 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E, while operational indirect and stationary direct emissions are estimated to be 1,686 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E/year. However, total combined project emissions of about 3.5 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E /SP/year would not exceed the 4.6 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E/SP/year threshold. Impacts would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation.</p>
<p><b>Impact GHG-2</b> The proposed project is consistent with applicable plans and policies adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions, including AB 32, EO S-3-05, SB 375, and SB 97. Impacts would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation.</p>
<p><b>Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset</b></p>		
<p><b>Impact HAZ-1</b> Businesses that use and store hazardous materials are located in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, soil and/or ground water contamination could be present at the site due to past releases of</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation.</p>



<p>contaminants. However, no hazardous materials are known to be present on the site or to be migrating onto the site. Therefore, impacts associated with past releases would be Class III, less than significant.</p>		
<p><b>Impact HAZ-2</b> Implementation of the proposed project would place residential structures and persons in proximity to existing businesses that use, store, and transport hazardous chemicals, a high-pressure natural gas pipeline, as well as to the UPRR railroad tracks and U.S. 101 where the transport of hazardous materials occurs. Onsite residents would therefore be exposed to a potential risk of upset associated with chemical leaks and fire from nearby businesses, derailed trains, truck accidents, and pipeline accidents involving the release of natural gas. Although the probability of such incidents would be low the consequences to residents could be catastrophic. Therefore, this impact would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>None available.</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable.</p>
<p><b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b></p>		
<p><b>Impact HWQ 1</b> During grading for and construction of the proposed project, the soil surface would be subject to erosion and downstream watersheds could be subject to temporary sedimentation and discharges of various pollutants. Given compliance with NPDES requirements to minimize the discharge of pollutants, including sediment, during grading and construction, hydrologic impacts from construction would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation.</p>
<p><b>Impact HWQ-2</b> The project would alter on-site drainage patterns and increase impermeable surfaces. Although proposed drainage facilities and compliance with the City's Interim Low Impact Development Criteria would reduce post-project runoff volumes and flow rates, reparation of a maintenance agreement would be required to assure long-term protection and maintenance of drainage facilities. Impacts on site drainage would be Class II, significant but mitigable.</p>	<p><b>HWQ-2 Maintenance Agreement.</b> The permittee must prepare a maintenance agreement that addresses maintenance requirements for all improvements associated with all BMPs described in the final approved comprehensive drainage report.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> At a minimum, the maintenance agreement between the permittee and City must include requirements that all inline stormdrain filters must be inspected, repaired, and cleaned per manufacture specifications and at a minimum before September 30th of each year. Additional inspections, repairs, and maintenance must be performed after storm events as needed throughout the rainy season (November 1st to April 15th) and/or per manufacture specifications. Any necessary major repairs must be completed before the next rainy</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>



	<p>season. Before September 30th of each year, the permittee must submit to the City Planning and Environmental Review staff for its review and approval a report summarizing all inspections, repairs, and maintenance work done during the prior year. The permittee must submit the required maintenance agreement to City Planning and Environmental Review staff for review, approval, and execution before approval of any occupancy permit for the project.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> City Planning and Environmental Review staff must verify compliance before approval of any occupancy permit for the project. City Planning and Environmental Review staff must verify compliance with the provisions of the agreement periodically and respond to instances of non-compliance with the agreement.</p>	
<p><b>Impact HWQ-3</b> New sources of pollution associated with operation of the proposed residential development have the potential to affect impaired waterways in Goleta. However, with the required implementation of BMPs, impacts from water pollutants would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
<p><b>Impact HWQ-4</b> The proposed project is located outside of a FEMA-mapped flood area. Impacts related to flood hazards would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
<p><b>Land Use and Planning</b></p>		
<p><b>Impact LU-1</b> With mitigation included in this EIR, the proposed project would be consistent with the Goleta GP/CLUP, 2006, as amended. Impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.</p>	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
<p><b>Impact LU-2</b> The proposed project would be consistent with the City of Goleta’s Inland Zoning Ordinance with approval of the requested modification to the required side-yard setback. Impacts would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
<p><b>Impact LU-3</b> Temporary construction activities associated with development of the proposed project would potentially generate short-term compatibility effects on surrounding uses. However, temporary impacts would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures included in Section 4.10, Noise of this EIR. This would be a Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated, impact with mitigation measures for construction noise, as stated in Section 4.10, Noise.</p>	Mitigation Measures N-1 and N-2 in Section 4.10 would reduce construction noise impacts to levels that would avoid significant land use compatibility impacts during construction.	Less than significant.



<p><b>Impact LU-4</b> Quality of life issues identified in the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual include loss of privacy, neighborhood incompatibility, nuisance noise, not exceeding noise thresholds, increased traffic in quiet neighborhoods, and loss of sunlight/solar access. Impacts related to privacy, incompatibility, noise, and sunlight/solar access would be Class III, less than significant. Neighborhood traffic impacts at the Cortona/Hollister intersection are potentially significant, Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated, with mitigation discussed in Section 4.13, Transportation/Traffic.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure T-2 in Section 4.13, Transportation and Circulation, would reduce intersection traffic impacts to levels that would avoid significant impacts related to quality of life.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p><b>Impact LU-5</b> The proposed project would generate demand for parking and could lead to overflow parking on adjoining City streets. However, the on-site parking supply would be adequate to meet peak parking demand. Impacts would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation.</p>
<p><b>Noise</b></p>		
<p><b>Impact N-1</b> Construction activities would be located within 1,600 feet of sensitive receptors, including existing residential uses approximately 500 feet to the southwest and a proposed hotel about 400 feet to the south; therefore, temporary construction-related noise could exceed City of Goleta Municipal Code Chapter 9.09 noise regulations. However, general mitigation is available to address construction noise; therefore, impacts would be Class II, significant but mitigable.</p>	<p><b>N-1(a) Construction Timing.</b> Construction activity and equipment maintenance must be limited to the hours between 8 AM and 5 PM, Monday through Friday. No construction can occur on State holidays (e.g., Thanksgiving, Labor Day). Non-noise generating construction activities such as interior painting are not subject to these restrictions.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> At least one sign near the project site entrance on Cortona Drive stating these restrictions must be posted on the site. Signs must be a minimum size of 24” x 48.” Signs must be in place before the beginning of and throughout grading and construction activities. Violations may result in suspension of permits.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> City Planning and Environmental Review staff must monitor compliance with restrictions on construction hours and must promptly investigate and respond to all complaints.</p> <p><b>N-1(b) Construction Vehicle Travel Route.</b> Construction vehicles and haul trucks must utilize roadways which avoid residential neighborhoods and sensitive receptors where possible.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> The permittee must submit a proposed construction vehicle and hauling route. This information must be reviewed and approved</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>



	<p>by City staff before issuance of a grading permit for the project. The approved route must be used for the duration of construction.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> City Planning and Environmental Review staff must periodically inspect the site to ensure compliance.</p> <p><b>N-1(c) Electrical Power.</b> Electrical power must be used to run air compressors and similar power tools.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> The equipment area with appropriate acoustic shielding must be designated on building and grading plans. Equipment and shielding must remain in the designated location throughout construction activities.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> City Planning and Environmental Review staff must periodically inspect the site to ensure compliance with all noise attenuation requirements.</p> <p><b>N-1(d) Construction Noise Complaint Line.</b> The permittee must provide a non-automated telephone number for local residents and employees to call to submit complaints associated with construction noise before issuance of a grading permit.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> The telephone number must be included in the notice indicated in Measure N-1(a) and posted on the project site and must be easily viewed from adjacent public areas. Proof of mailing the notices must be provided to the Planning and Environmental Review Department before the City issues a grading permit. At least one sign near the project site entrance on Cortona Drive with the phone number must be posted onsite. The permittee must inform the Planning and Environmental Review Department of any complaints within one week of receipt of the complaint. Signs must be in place before beginning of and throughout grading and construction activities. Violations may result in suspension of permits as determined by the Planning and Environmental Review Director.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> Planning and Environmental Review Department staff may periodically inspect and respond to complaints.</p>	
<p><b>Impact N-2</b> Project construction activities could generate intermittent levels of</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation.</p>



<p>groundborne vibration affecting surrounding business park development. Impacts would be Class III, less than significant.</p>		
<p><b>Impact N-3</b> Project-generated traffic would incrementally increase traffic-related noise on study area roadway segments. However, the change in noise levels would not exceed significance thresholds. Therefore, the effect of increased traffic noise on existing uses would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation.</p>
<p><b>Impact N-4</b> Operation of the proposed project would generate noise typically associated with residential development. However, noise would not affect sensitive receptors and noise levels would not exceed City thresholds. Impacts would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation.</p>
<p><b>Impact N-5</b> Development of the proposed project near the Union Pacific Railroad, U.S. 101, and existing business park development could expose future residents on the project site to noise levels exceeding City standards. This impact would be Class II, potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated.</p>	<p><b>N-5(a) Outdoor Living Area Noise Attenuation.</b> Residential outdoor living space (e.g., patios and balconies) associated with residential units located in the proposed Buildings 3, 4, 5, and 6, and with a line of sight of U.S. 101 and/or the UPRR line (second floor or above), must be protected from sound intrusion so that they meet the City’s standard of 65 dBA CNEL for outdoor living spaces. Protective measures may consist of, without limitation, installation of glass, plexiglas, wood, or metal sound attenuation barriers along the perimeter of outdoor living spaces for those residential units. The sound attenuation barriers must be of a size and material to adequately mitigate this impact as determined by an acoustical study to be performed to determine Project specific requirements for each proposed residential building. The acoustical study must conclusively demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed noise attenuation measures.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> These requirements must be incorporated into all construction documents submitted for approval before the issuance of a building permit for the residential units in Buildings 3, 4, 5, and 6 that include a line of sight of U.S. 101 and/or the UPRR line.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must review and approve acoustical report and recommendations and must verify compliance before the issuance of a building permit for the residential units in Buildings 3, 4, 5, and 6 that are have a line of sight of U.S. 101 and/or the UPRR line. The City Planning and Environmental Review Department staff must verify compliance in the field, including acoustical testing</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>



	<p>provided by the permittee before the City issues a certificate of occupancy for an affected unit. No certificate of occupancy will be issued unless compliance is achieved.</p> <p>Implementation of Mitigation Measure N-5(b) is required to reduce interior noise levels in the proposed buildings to acceptable levels.</p> <p><b>N-5(b) Interior Noise Attenuation.</b> The permittee must include features in the design of all onsite buildings that will attenuate the interior noise levels of all onsite residences to levels not exceeding 45 dBA. Specific features may include, without limitation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Windows and sliding glass doors facing the noise source with a minimum Standard Transmission Class (STC) of 35 that are properly installed, weather stripped, and insulated</i></li> <li>• <i>Exterior doors facing noise sources with a minimum STC of 35 and insulated in conformance with Title 24 requirements</i></li> <li>• <i>Exterior wall facing material designed for a minimum STC of 35 (this can typically be achieved by adding absorptive insulation [i.e., fiberglass batts] in the wall cavity)</i></li> <li>• <i>Roof or attic vents either facing away from the noise source or baffled.</i></li> <li>• <i>Air conditioning or a mechanical ventilation system so that windows and doors may remain closed</i></li> </ul> <p>Buildings 3, 4, 5, and 6 would experience the greatest level of noise exposure and, therefore, may require all of the above or their equivalent in order to achieve an acceptable interior noise levels on second and higher floors. Other onsite buildings/units may not require all of the above in order to achieve an acceptable interior noise environment.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> The permittee must submit an acoustical analysis, prepared by a licensed engineer with expertise in environmental noise assessment and architectural acoustics, before the City issues any building permits for the proposed project. Noise attenuation features must address interior noise levels resulting from the project's proximity to the railroad and U. S. 101 corridor as well as noise generated by adjacent business parks.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> During construction, Planning and Environmental Review staff must confirmation that adequate noise</p>	
--	---	--



	attenuation measures for apartment units pursuant to the acoustical analysis noted above are being installed per plans.	
<b>Impact N-6</b> Development of the proposed project near the Union Pacific Railroad could expose future residents to groundborne vibration generated by passing trains. Impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
<b>Public Services</b>		
<b>Impact PS-1</b> The proposed project would increase the number of residents and the amount of structural development dependent on fire protection service from the Santa Barbara County Fire Department Protection District. However, service ratios and response times would remain acceptable, Fire Department requirements would be incorporated into the project to ensure adequate access to the project site, and development impact fees for fire protection would be paid. Therefore, impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
<b>Recreation</b>		
<b>Impact REC-1</b> The proposed project would accommodate an estimated 480 residents, resulting in demand for 2.25 acres of parkland. Although the project would provide private recreational facilities, these would not count fully toward meeting demand. However, the permittee would be required to offset the development's demand for parkland through the payment of mitigation fees. With payment of these fees, impacts related to recreation would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
<b>Transportation/Circulation</b>		
<b>Impact T-1</b> Project-generated traffic would substantially increase existing traffic volumes on the segment of Storke Road north of Hollister Avenue. A new northbound lane on Storke Road would be required to increase roadway capacity. Impacts related to roadway segment volume increases would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	<b>T-1 Storke Road North of Hollister Avenue.</b> The permittee must construct or monetarily contribute to the construction of an additional northbound lane along Storke Road that would extend from Hollister Avenue to the existing right-turn that serves the U.S. 101 southbound on-ramp at the Storke Road interchange. The new northbound lane must be designed to increase the Acceptable Capacity of Storke Road from Hollister Avenue to the U.S. 101 southbound on-ramp to 47,000 ADT and serve as an acceptor lane and would allow westbound right-turns from Hollister Avenue onto Storke Road to become a free movement. Full improvements for a northbound lane are required as Development Plan conditions/mitigation	Less than significant.



	<p>measures of approval for traffic impacts associated with other nearby projects, including the Westar Mixed-Use Village project, Cabrillo Business Park project, and Rincon Palms Hotel. If another project implements these traffic improvements before the City issues the first certificate of occupancy clearance at the Cortona Apartments project, the permittee must pay a fair-share contribution of the cost incurred to implement this improvement.</p> <p>The construction of the additional northbound through lane improvements along Storke Road or the monetary contribution to construction of these improvements must be implemented under one of the following scenarios:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) If another project has implemented these improvements, then the permittee must pay the project’s fair-share contribution to the developer of the improvements in accordance with any City reimbursement agreement for these improvements in effect at that time.</li> <li>2) If another project has not implemented these improvements before the timing requirements for implementation of this mitigation measure, the permittee must design and construct the additional lane improvements. Under this scenario, the City would establish a reimbursement agreement that would require future projects contributing to traffic impacts necessitating these improvements to pay the project developer their pro-rata share of the improvement costs.</li> <li>3) If GTIP improvements are identified for this location before project approval, the permittee must pay GTIP fees to the GTIP fund.</li> </ol> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b></p> <p><u>Scenario #1</u>          In the event that the permittee pays a monetary contribution for the additional northbound through lane improvements, such contribution must be paid pursuant to any applicable reimbursement agreement and before any Certificate of Occupancy.</p> <p><u>Scenario #2</u>          In the event that the permittee constructs the additional northbound lane improvements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The design plans of the additional northbound through lane improvements described above must be</li> </ol>	
--	---	--



	<p>submitted to the Public Works Director, or designee for review before issuance of a grading permit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. Plans must be approved prior to the issuance of the first grading permit for residential buildings.</li> <li>c. The permittee must enter into an improvement agreement for the construction of the additional northbound lane improvements, in a form approved by the City Attorney and post a performance security deemed adequate by the Public Works Director, or designee, to cover the cost of all such improvements before issuance of a grading permit and construct the improvements before the first certificate of occupancy.</li> </ul> <p><u>Scenario #3</u>          In the event that the permittee must pay a monetary contribution for the additional northbound lane improvements such contribution must be paid per the current GTIP ordinance.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> The Public Works Director, or designee, must verify roadway design and approval the issuance of any Land Use Permit for the project. The Public Works Director, or designee, must verify posting of an adequate performance security in an amount accepted by the Public Works Director, or designee, for these improvements before issuance of a Land Use Permit and verify completion of construction of the improvement per the approved plans prior to issuance of the first occupancy clearance.</p> <p>In the event that the permittee pays a monetary contribution for the additional northbound lane improvements under scenarios 1 or 3, the Public Works Director, or designee, must verify such contribution was consistent with the reimbursement agreement or applicable GTIP fees.</p>	
<p><b>Impact T-2</b> Project-generated traffic would increase existing turning volumes at intersections in the study area. However, Existing + Project traffic levels at intersections would operate at LOS C or better. In addition, the project’s driveway to Cortona Drive would not result in substantial vehicle queues or delay. However, queuing on Hollister Avenue at the Hollister Avenue/Cortona Drive intersection may cause delay. Impacts would be Class II, significant but mitigable.</p>	<p><b>T-2 Hollister Avenue/Cortona Drive Intersection.</b> The median on eastbound Hollister Avenue at the Hollister Avenue/Cortona Drive intersection shall be extended to maximize the striped left-turn storage area. Median extension and restriping shall expand the length of the striped left-turn pocket to 145 feet.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> The permittee shall design and construct the median extension and restriping. Such mitigation must be completed before issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>



	<p><b>Monitoring:</b> The Public Works Director, or designee, must verify that the roadway design has been approved before issuance of a grading permit. The Public Works Director or designee must verify that the required work was satisfactorily completed before certificate of occupancy.</p>	
<p><b>Impact T-3</b> Six intersections and a highway segment in the CMP network are located in the vicinity of the project site. With the addition of project-generated traffic to existing traffic volumes, CMP intersections are forecast to operate at LOS C or better. Therefore, impacts to the CMP network would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation.</p>
<p><b>Impact T-4</b> The proposed project would generate additional demand for public transportation. Improvements of the existing bus stop on eastbound Hollister Avenue at the K Mart commercial center would be necessary to accommodate additional demand for public buses. Impacts to alternative transportation would be Class II, significant but mitigable.</p>	<p><b>T-4 Bus Stop.</b> The permittee must construct an additional bus shelter (including but not limited to an additional shelter with solar night lighting, a 4-foot bench inside the shelter, and an additional trash/ recycling receptacle) at the existing bus stop on Hollister in front of the K Mart commercial center, consistent with Transportation Element Policy TE 7.12 in the Goleta General Plan. The bus stop must be constructed in accordance with MTD Bus Stop Standards for LNI Manufacture Design Shelters and City standards.</p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing:</b> The bus stop improvement must be designed before issuance of a building permit and constructed before issuance of the first certificate of occupancy.</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> The Public Works Director, or designee, must ensure that the bus stop design has been completed before issuance of any building permit for the project. The Public Works Director, or designee, must verify completion of the bus stop per the approved design before the first certificate of occupancy.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p><b>Impact T-5</b> The proposed project would provide 330 parking spaces on-site. Based on various measures of parking demand, the proposed supply of parking would be sufficient to meet anticipated demand from future residents and visitors to the project site. Therefore, impacts related to parking would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation.</p>
<p><b>Utilities and Service Systems</b></p>		
<p><b>Impact UTL-1</b> The proposed project would generate a net water demand of approximately 47.14 AFY. This level of demand is within the GWD's current 3,070 AFY surplus. Therefore, impacts to water supply would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	<p>None required</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation.</p>



<p><b>Impact UTL-2</b> Wastewater generated by future residents on the project site would flow through GWSD's conveyance system and into GSD's wastewater treatment plant. Existing wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities have sufficient capacity to accommodate project-related flows and a Sewer Service Connection Permit would be necessary. Therefore, impacts would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation.</p>
<p><b>Impact UTL-3</b> Although the proposed project would generate solid waste during construction, a plan would be required to recycle 65 percent of construction materials. Therefore, impacts would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation.</p>
<p><b>Impact UTL-4</b> The proposed project would generate an estimated 119.6 tons of non-recyclable solid waste per year during operation. This amount does not exceed the City's project-specific threshold of 196 tons per year. Implementation of a Solid Waste Management Program would be required to implement waste diversion. Therefore, impacts would be Class III, less than significant.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Less than significant without mitigation.</p>



*This page intentionally left blank.*

