Table of Contents

Tables

Figures

No table of figures entries found.

Executive Summary

This document is an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) analyzing the environmental effects of the proposed Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project (hereafter referred to as the "proposed project") in the City of Goleta. This section summarizes the characteristics of the proposed project, alternatives to the proposed project, and the environmental impacts and mitigation measures associated with the proposed project.

Project Synopsis

Project Applicant

Sandpiper Golf Trust, LLC
280 Chestnut Avenue
Westmont, Illinois 60559

Lead Agency Contact Person

Mary Chang, Supervising Planner
City of Goleta
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, California 93117
(805) 961-7567

Project Description

This EIR has been prepared to examine the potential environmental effects of the proposed project. The following is a summary of the full project description, which can be found in Section 2, *Project Description*.

Project Location

The approximately 193-acre project site is located at 7925 Hollister Avenue (Assessor's Parcel Number 079-210-059) in Goleta, California. The project site is currently developed with the Sandpiper Golf Club, maintenance yard, and the vacant historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. Site access is provided from Hollister Avenue, west of the Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oaks Road intersection. The project site is located adjacent to the Pacific Ocean and within the Coastal Zone. Portions of the project site are designated as Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) in the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Conservation Element. ESHA designations on the project site include Open Water (the golf course pond), Riparian/Marsh/Vernal Pool (along Devereux Creek [in the eastern portion of the project site] and Bell Canyon Creek [in the western portion of the project site]), Sage Scrub/Dune/Bluff Scrub (along the southern bluffs), and Monarch Butterfly and/or Raptor Roosting Habitat (along the eastern project site boundary and in Bell Creek Canyon in the west.

Historic and Current Land Use and Zoning

The project site was previously occupied by the former Ellwood Oil Field, which ceased operation in the 1960s after over 30 years of operations. There are thirteen abandoned oil wells on the project site, all of which are shown to be near the southern portion of the project site, with the exception of one well near the eastern boundary. In 2023, the California State Lands Commission removed the last two oil production shore zone piers associated with the on-site facility, concluding the plugging, removal, and abandonment of the oil field and related infrastructure near or on the project site.

Most of the project site is currently used for recreational purposes, and is developed with the Sandpiper Golf Club, which includes a golf course, clubhouse, parking lot with 124 spaces for golfers and employees, comfort station,[1] and maintenance yard (consisting of buildings, trailers, sheds, and a fuel station). The Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, located along Hollister Avenue in the northeastern portion of the project site, was originally constructed in 1929 and has been vacant since the 1960s. The gas station was designated as a historic landmark by the County of Santa Barbara in 1990 and is currently listed within the Goleta Historic Resources Inventory and is a City designated Historic Landmark. The western portion of the project site is undeveloped, consisting of a vegetated open space area with Bell Canyon Creek, which flows south into the Pacific Ocean. Surface waters that occur on the project site include Bell Canyon Creek, Devereaux Creek, and a man-made pond within the golf course.

The project site is zoned as Open Space/Active Recreation (City of Goleta 2024). This zoning designation is intended for public parks or active recreational activities and facilities and is implemented through the Open Space/Active Recreation land use designation in the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. Allowed uses within this zoning designation include recreational facilities with the approval of a CUP and passive open space.

Project Characteristics

The proposed project involves the demolition of the existing clubhouse; construction of a new, two-story clubhouse with basement; provision of additional parking spaces; modifications to and re-routing of the existing 18-hole golf course; landscaping and irrigation improvements; replacement of existing maintenance facilities; replacement of an existing comfort station; construction of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop adjacent to the historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station; adaptive reuse and restoration of the historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station to provide seating and bicycle amenities for the Rio Grande Coffee Shop; incorporation of the new clubhouse and comfort station into the Sphere of Influence area for the Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD); right-of-way (ROW) vacation from the City; and improvements along Hollister Avenue, including revised entry points, a new public trail, undergrounding of electrical and utility lines, bus station relocation, and curb and sidewalk improvements.

Golf Clubhouse

The existing 9,305 square foot clubhouse and parking lot would be demolished and replaced with a new, 37,179 square foot, two-level clubhouse and basement with 162 parking spaces. Two levels would be located above ground and would cover 16,019 square feet; one level would be located below ground and would cover 21,160 square feet. The new clubhouse would feature glass windows, a glass elevator enclosed within a glass structure in the center of the clubhouse, sloped turf walls, and a turf roof. The modern design of the new clubhouse would emulate the natural topography of the project site by integrating the structure within the green landscape and complementing the grassy hills, blufftops, and ocean waves. The basement level of the new clubhouse would be dedicated to receiving materials and supplies and supporting golf operations. The first above ground level of the

[1] A comfort station is a place on a golf course that offers food, beverages, and restrooms to golfers, often as a break during their round.

clubhouse would be dedicated to golf operations and accessory uses. The second story level of the clubhouse would be dedicated to food and beverage services, consisting of a new restaurant and kitchen, cocktail bar, restrooms, meeting room, and a waiting lounge.

The majority of the new clubhouse would not exceed the Open Space/Active Recreation Zone's 25-foot height limit; however, a minor portion of the main roof structure would have a maximum height of 29 feet exceeding the height limit and the passenger elevator structure would have a maximum architectural projection height of 33 feet.[2] The project applicant requests an adjustment to allow this portion of the clubhouse to exceed the 25-foot height limit.

Golf Course Improvements

The proposed project includes redesigning the existing 18-hole golf course, including grading and rerouting holes of the course, re-landscaping, reduction of 50 percent of irrigated turf, installation of new drought-tolerant turf, and replacement of irrigation systems with a new weather control system. The rerouting plan includes the conversion of the existing Hole 18 to an event lawn near the clubhouse. The proposed project would include new cart return paths only at tee boxes and greens, which would reduce the amount of concrete cart paths from the current 154,829 square feet to 92,346 square feet. The redesign would also include new drought-tolerant turf, an upgraded irrigation system, and sand capping[3] of turf areas of the golf course. The proposed redesign would reduce the amount of irrigated turf from 125 acres to 62 acres, with a corresponding reduction in the amount of nutrients and agrichemicals required for golf course maintenance. The remaining 63 acres would be converted to native landscaping around the golf course.

The proposed project would include removal of the concrete cart path and existing Arizona-style[4] concrete crossing and culvert west of Hole 4, which pass through Devereaux Creek and associated ESHA. In place of the crossing and culvert in Devereaux Creek, a free-standing wooden bridge with abutments would be installed outside the top of the bank.

Maintenance Facility

The project would include demolition, repair, upgrade, and/or modernization of the existing maintenance buildings, trailers, and sheds east of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. The existing 7,555 square foot maintenance facility would be replaced with a 7,476 square foot maintenance facility consisting of two structures. The new maintenance facility would include offices, employee restrooms, lockers, and small equipment storage in a new 4,316 square foot structure, as well as vehicle and golf course equipment storage in the renovated and expanded 3,160 square foot storage structure. Additionally, the proposed project would include installation of unenclosed structures within this maintenance facility, such as:

- A fenced and covered trash and recycling area
- A 2,531 square foot roofed materials and landscape amendment storage (e.g., mulch, sand, soil) and fertilization station
- A 956 square foot roofed cart wash utilizing biodegradable soaps and a recycled water system
- Pump equipment on a concrete slab

[2] The existing clubhouse has a maximum height of 28 feet 6 inches and also exceeds the 25-foot height limit.
[3] Sand capping is a technique used primarily in golf course maintenance to improve turf growing conditions. It involves adding several inches of sand or a high-sand mix to the surface of the soil.
[4] An Arizona crossing is a type of at-grade culvert crossing that was developed for use in the southwestern United States.

The existing refueling station would remain in its current location.

Comfort Station

The existing 290 square foot comfort station would be replaced with a new, two-structure, 329 square foot comfort station located adjacent to Green 6. The proposed comfort station would consist of a 121 square foot restroom adjacent to a 208 square foot refreshment center and storage, with a counter area for light snacks, as well as television monitors and informal seating to track local tournament play or other sport events. The maximum height of the new comfort station would be 15 feet. The new comfort station would be integrated into the natural landscape and would feature gently sloped, turfed roofs. The existing septic system that serves the existing comfort station would be abandoned and the new comfort station would be connected to GWSD's sewer system through an agreement.

Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station/Rio Grande Coffee Shop

The Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, designated by the City and County as a historic landmark, would be restored and adaptively reused as part of a new quick stop café, renamed the Rio Grande Coffee Shop. The Rio Grande Coffee Shop would consist of two parts: the restored existing 349 square foot Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station to serve as seating for the café and a new 695 square foot café building designed to resemble a 1920s gas station service bay, located to the east of the existing gas station building.

Hollister Avenue Improvements

The project applicant proposes the realignment of the Hollister Avenue right-of-way (ROW) in front of the project site. A City ROW easement is located along the northern portion of the project site adjacent to Hollister Avenue. As part of the proposed project, the City would abandon 17,306 square feet of ROW to the property owner (the Sandpiper Golf Trust). The ROW area to be retained by the City may be used in the future for the construction of a roundabout at the Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oak intersection. The construction of a roundabout is not part of the proposed project, and a roundabout at this location is not currently included in any City Capital Improvement Plan. Due to the configuration of the realigned ROW on the project site, eight proposed vehicle parking spaces would encroach into a required 10-foot wide front yard setback, as measured from the proposed ROW alignment. To facilitate the location of the eight parking spaces that would encroach into the required front yard setback, the proposed project would require a Modification request pursuant to the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 17.62 (Modifications), as discussed in Section 2, *Project Description*, subsection 2.9, *Required Approvals*.

The proposed project would include improvements to Hollister Avenue and project site entrances, as well as landscape enhancements on both sides of Hollister Avenue. Proposed improvements would include:

- Improvements to the Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oaks Road intersection;
- Reconfiguration of the striped median of Hollister Avenue and addition of a left-hand turn lane for the clubhouse parking lot;
- Undergrounding of overhead utility lines along the project's frontage of Hollister Avenue into a joint power and communications trench;

- Construction of a Type 4[5] path and landscaping trail along the south side of Hollister Avenue;
- Construction of a 6-inch concrete curb and gutter along the south side of Hollister Avenue;
- Undergrounding of overhead utility lines along the project's frontage of Hollister Avenue into a joint power and communications trench approximately 3- to 4-feet south of the proposed curb;
- Relocation of the existing bus stop and pocket[6] approximately 200 feet east, across from a planned fire station;
- Improvements to Hollister Avenue at the Rio Grande Coffee Shop;
- Installation of pedestrian ramps and striping to create new crosswalks at the west and south legs of the Hollister Avenue/Las Armas Road intersection, to provide for improved public access to Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve; and
- Reconstruction of the maintenance facility driveway access and striping for the addition of a left-hand turn lane to enter the maintenance yard.

Coastal Access Improvements and Easement Dedication

To enhance coastal access, the project applicant would:

- Construct a sidewalk east of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station to connect with an existing sidewalk at the northeast project site boundary that provides access to Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve;
- Stripe a crosswalk across Hollister Avenue to provide coastal connectivity for residences on the north side of Hollister Avenue; and
- Construct a Type 4 path along the Hollister Avenue ROW, which would extend westerly from the Rio Grande Coffee Shop to the proposed western clubhouse parking lot. The Type 4 path would offer views of the Pacific Ocean along the majority of the pathway, and would serve as a continuation of the De Anza Trail identified in the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Open Space Element.

Additionally, the proposed project includes the dedication of a lateral access easement along the beach frontage on the sand and along Hollister Avenue when the sand is impassable because of tides/storms. The project would also include the dedication of five acres of Bell Canyon to a qualified land conservation entity. These easements would be retained as open space.

Site Access and Parking

SITE ACCESS

Existing access to the project site is provided by three driveways: one leading to the clubhouse and golf course, another to the maintenance yard, and a third to the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. The proposed project would reconfigure and add new access points, resulting in five driveways.

Bicyclists would access the Rio Grande Coffee Shop via Hollister Avenue, through a 10-foot wide dedicated bicycle entrance that would connect to the new Type 4 trail or existing Class II path on Hollister Avenue. Golfers would access the Rio Grande Coffee Shop via a golf cart path from Green 1 to a pickup window. Pedestrians would access the project site via the new Type 4 decomposed granite path along the south side of Hollister Avenue.

[5] A Type 4 trail provides a 6-foot-wide path for pedestrian bike and equestrian use.
[6] On October 31, 2022, the Metropolitan Transportation District approved the proposed layout of the relocated bus station and pocket.

PARKING

The proposed project would provide a total of 162 parking spaces. This represents an increase of 26 parking spaces compared to existing conditions. Existing parking lots on the project site are located at the clubhouse (124 spaces), at the maintenance yard (10 spaces), and at the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station (5 spaces). The proposed project would include the redesign of parking areas such that the clubhouse parking lot would provide 138 spaces, the maintenance facility would provide 10 spaces, and the Rio Grande Coffee Shop would provide 14 spaces. Parking spaces include 8 accessible and 18 electric vehicle charging spaces (some of which are both accessible and electric vehicle charging spaces), including 6 accessible and 15 electric vehicle charging spaces at the clubhouse, 1 accessible space at the maintenance facility, and 1 accessible and 3 electric vehicle charging spaces at the Rio Grande Coffee Shop.

Utility Connections

Table ES-1 summarizes the utility providers for the proposed project.

Table ES-1 Utility Service Providers

Utility	Service Provider
Water Service	Goleta Water District
Sewer	Goleta West Sanitary District
Natural Gas	Southern California Gas Company
Electricity	Southern California Edison
Cable	Cox Communications
Telecommunications	Verizon, Qwest, AT&T, Level 3
Solid Waste	Marborg Industries

Stormwater and Drainage

Under existing conditions, the project site slopes moderately toward watercourses throughout the site and is primarily drained by surface flow. After the proposed renovation, drainage on the project site would generally follow historic drainage patterns, with the exception of the clubhouse area. Under existing conditions, the clubhouse parking lot drains to a storm drain system in Hollister Avenue, which outlets to Bell Canyon Creek. The proposed project would redirect this flow onto the golf course to provide stormwater quality treatment. Most of the project site is self-treating,[7] due to substantial existing on-site landscaping and the general lack of impervious surfaces. However, the proposed project includes the installation of six bioretention basins which would be designed to treat water from impervious surfaces associated with the proposed structures, parking lots, and pathways. The bioretention basins would be vegetated, would treat water via natural means, and would be routinely maintained for removal of debris and vegetative overgrowth. Treated water and high-flow bypass from all proposed basins would discharge onto the golf course.

The proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surface areas by 12,250 square feet, for a total of 156,740 square feet across the approximately 193-acre project site. These impervious surfaces consist of replaced and new concrete and asphalt at the maintenance facility, Rio Grande

[7] A “self-treating” area refers to an area where natural processes remove pollutants from stormwater. The efficiency of a self-treating area is maintained by ensuring a dense, healthy vegetated cover, and by keeping the area pervious.

Coffee Shop, and clubhouse.[8] Therefore, impervious surfaces would constitute 1.9 percent of the total project site, which represents an increase in impervious surfaces of 0.2 percent.

The project site contains FEMA-designated Zone AE regulatory floodways along Bell Canyon Creek and Devereaux Creek as well as Zone VE areas along the coastline. All proposed structures would be located outside of the special flood hazard areas.

Landscaping

VEGETATION

The proposed planting palette would supplement existing project site vegetation and would include a variety of native plants and shrubs compatible with the project site's coastal climate. The project would include the removal of an oak tree within the Hollister Avenue ROW as well as 39 non-native trees. The project would disturb an additional 12 non-native trees through root damage during grading activities. Trees to be removed are generally located within the proposed parking areas at the new clubhouse and maintenance facility, and within the golf course playing areas. Four eucalyptus trees (three live, one dead) located in riparian Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area associated with Devereaux Creek would be removed. The proposed project would not remove any native trees. To offset the removal of the oak tree, the project would include the planting of a replacement 72-inch box oak on the project site. To offset the removal of non-native trees, the proposed project includes the planting of 116 trees, resulting in a net increase of 65 trees on the project site.

PROPOSED BRIDGE

The project would include the construction of a new golf cart path bridge crossing Devereaux Creek southwest of the relocated Holes 4 and 5. The bridge would replace an existing 10- to 12-inch concrete culvert and would be a free-standing wooden bridge with abutments outside the top of the bank, which would improve Devereaux Creek's flow conditions. An existing bridge north of Hole 3 would be repaired and maintained.

ESHA RESTORATION

The project would include the restoration of Devereaux Creek through removal of 5,134 square feet of cart path within the Devereaux Creek ESHA, removal of the existing 10- to 12-inch culvert with concrete, and restoration of approximately 2,831 square feet of riparian and upland overwintering monarch butterfly habitat ESHA. Habitat restoration would occur southwest of the proposed bridge crossing north of Hole 3. Restoration activities would consist of re-establishment of the natural creek channel with sandstone boulders and planting of riparian vegetation on the creek bank.

GATES AND FENCING

The proposed project would install a 36- to 42-inch high three-rail split fence along the northern project site boundary. The fence would be designed to demarcate the project site, provide security, and allow views through the fence. The proposed project would also install a 6-foot high chain-link fence with a 6-foot high sliding gate around the maintenance facility. The proposed project would not include new, formal gates on the perimeter of the golf course. When the course is closed, a chain

[8] For the purposes of stormwater control calculations, the amount of impervious surfaces is based on the facilities which would require implementation of stormwater control features. The golf cart paths and comfort station are not included in the impervious surface square footage, as these features drain to the golf course which is self-treating. Due to the reduction in golf cart paths, impervious surfaces on the golf course would be decreased compared to the existing golf course.

would be drawn across parking areas at the clubhouse and Rio Grande Coffee Shop to limit unauthorized entry.

Exterior Lighting

Proposed lighting at the clubhouse, Rio Grande Coffee shop, parking lots, and maintenance facility would consist of a combination of exterior path lights, bollard lights, down lights with tree straps, in-wall lights, under-step and handrail strip lights, and sign lighting at entries and directional signage. Exterior lighting would consist of downward, directed fixtures. Lighting for the project site would be designed to conform with Goleta Municipal Code Chapter 17.35. The proposed project would not include lighting to accommodate night play, as night play neither occurs under existing operational conditions nor is planned as part of the project.

Facilities Operations

The proposed project would maintain the operating hours of the golf course from Monday through Sunday, 6:30 am to 8:30 pm. The clubhouse and restaurant would remain open until 10:00 pm and the bar would remain open until midnight. The Rio Grande Coffee Shop’s operating hours would be 6:30 am to 4:30 pm.

The golf course currently supports an average of 35,368 rounds of golf per year. The proposed project would reduce golf rounds to approximately 32,000 rounds per year.

The project site hosts approximately 40 special events of various types and size per year, including wedding receptions, corporate events, and charity events. The proposed project would provide upgraded facilities for these special events, such as dedicated event lawn space and additional parking. However, the upgraded facilities would not affect the size or number of events currently held at the golf course, and special events would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Special events would conclude by 10:00 pm.

Currently, the project site provides employment for 35 full-time staff members within the clubhouse, restaurant, and maintenance yard. The proposed project would provide an additional 21 full-time employment opportunities, for a total of 56 projected full-time staff. The proposed project would include expansion of the clubhouse restaurant and construction of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, which would result in increased visitors to the Sandpiper Golf Club.

Construction and Grading

Construction activities would include demolition, site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, architectural coating, and landscaping phases. Construction is anticipated to last 18 months, starting in July 2026 and ending in December 2027. Construction staging and parking would occur on-site. Construction debris would be hauled via U.S. 101 to the Tajiguas Landfill, located at 14470 Calle Real. Construction vehicles and equipment would access the project site and staging areas via Hollister Avenue.

Project grading would require approximately 86,500 cubic yards (CY) of soil cut and 56,000 CY of soil fill. After compaction and shrinking, the remaining soil (30,500 CY) would be distributed around graded areas to achieve the proposed golf course design. Due to the potential for stained or odiferous soil to be encountered during golf course recontouring approximately 2,422 CY of soil may be exported off-site via 158 total truck trips over 13 days. The maximum fill slope would be 27 feet, located at the clubhouse where it transitions to the event lawn to the southwest. The maximum cut slope would be 11 feet, located on the golf course. Use of retaining walls would be limited, except for adjacent to the proposed clubhouse basement, where a 15-foot retaining wall is needed to facilitate delivery access underneath the clubhouse.

Following the completion of grading activities, a subsurface drainage profile,[9] including a 6-inch sand cap, would occur over the 62 acres of irrigated turf. Proposed sand capping would consist of approximately 60,000 tons of sand distributed on the turfed golf areas. Sand import would involve approximately 2,500 one-way truck trips over the course of construction (based on an estimated 24 tons per truckload). Trucks used for sand import would arrive and depart from Hollister Avenue using the freeway on and off ramps on Calle Real, north of U.S. 101.

Project Objectives

The primary objectives for the proposed project are as follows:

1. Maintain and improve golf course playability and establish a new golf course routing plan that more closely follows the natural topography of the project site.
2. Reduce golf course turf area and replace with native and coastal appropriate landscaping to restore the golf course to a more natural state, thereby reducing water usage and agrichemical application.
3. Provide improved recreational and dining facilities for golfers, diners, and special event attendees at the Sandpiper Golf Club.
4. Provide enhanced maintenance facilities to support Sandpiper Golf Club operations.
5. Rehabilitate, preserve, and adaptively reuse the historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station.
6. Protect water quality and bluff stability by converting existing private septic systems to public sewers and utilizing sand capping to filter stormwater.
7. Improve public views across the property from Hollister Avenue by undergrounding overhead utility lines and implementing other improvements.
8. Improve coastal access for the public in the vicinity of the project site.

Alternatives

As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this EIR examines alternatives to the proposed project. Studied alternatives include the following three alternatives.

- Alternative 1: No Project Alternative
- Alternative 2: Clubhouse Renovation
- Alternative 3: Revised Site Plan
- Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path

Alternative 1 (No Project Alternative) assumes that the proposed project is not approved and the Sandpiper Golf Club is not renovated. The existing project site would be maintained, and the golf course operations would continue, unchanged compared to existing conditions. The No Project Alternative would not upgrade the existing clubhouse, comfort station, or maintenance yard; would not rehabilitate/adaptively reuse the aging Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station; would not reduce the

[9] A subsurface drainage profile refers to the layout and design of a system of perforated piping that removes excess water from below the ground surface.

irrigated turf area of the golf course; would not provide lateral access or open space easements; and would not eliminate septic system use.

Alternative 2 (Clubhouse Renovation) would consist of just demolition of the existing clubhouse facility and reconstructing a new clubhouse building, and would not involve golf course recontouring, replacement of the existing comfort station or maintenance yard, construction of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop (including restoration and adaptive reuse of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station), coastal access improvements, dedication of a lateral access easement, dedication of an open space easement in Bell Canyon, or Hollister Avenue improvements. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would involve the demolition of the existing 9,305 square foot clubhouse, and construction of a new 37,179 square foot, two-level clubhouse and basement, and 138 parking spaces. The new clubhouse would feature expanded storage areas for materials and supplies needed for golf course operations, employee support spaces, a lobby, pro-shop, grab and go café, kitchens, gallery, offices, golf simulator rooms, a guest lounge, a new restaurant and kitchen, and a cocktail bar. The new clubhouse would expand outdoor dining terrace areas by 4,416 square feet, indoor restaurant seating by 47 seats, and outdoor restaurant seating by 54 seats. The new clubhouse would require an additional 12 employees, for a total of 47 projected full-time staff at the Sandpiper Golf Club. Similar to the proposed project, the project applicant would request a zoning code adjustment to allow a portion of the clubhouse to exceed the 25-foot height limit for the Open Space/Active Recreation zone.

Operation of the golf course would be similar to existing conditions, as the number of golf rounds would not change, maintenance activities would be the same as existing conditions, and the amount of turf would not be reduced.

Alternative 3 (Revised Site Plan) would consist of revising the site plan for the proposed project to shift the proposed location of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop 75 feet southwest, such that the Coffee Shop and associated parking lot would be located approximately 50 feet southwest of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station to ensure vibration from construction vehicles and equipment would not damage the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. Under the proposed project the new coffee shop would be directly east of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. Restoration of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, construction of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, and connection of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop to the existing sewer under Alternative 3 would be similar to the proposed project, with the only change being a 75-foot shift in the location of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop.

To further reduce potential vibration impacts, Alternative 3 would not include the Hollister Avenue improvements (with the exception of undergrounding the utility lines) and would not include the construction of the free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would include the construction of a new clubhouse, comfort station, maintenance yard, golf course recontouring, Type 4 trail, dedication of lateral access easements, dedication of open space easement at Bell Canyon, and undergrounding of existing utility lines, which would be the same as the proposed project.

Similar to the proposed project, the project applicant would request a zoning code adjustment to allow a portion of the clubhouse to exceed the 25-foot height limit for the Open Space/Active Recreation zone. Operation of the Sandpiper Golf Club under Alternative 3 would be the same as for the proposed project, as Alternative 3 would require the same number of employees and maintenance activities for the recontoured golf course.

Alternative 4 (Extended Bicycle Path) would include the construction of a new clubhouse, comfort station, Rio Grande Coffee Shop, maintenance yard, golf course recontouring, dedication of lateral access easements, dedication of conservation easement at Bell Canyon, and undergrounding of existing utility lines, which would be the same as the proposed project. Additionally, Alternative 4 would include most of the Hollister Avenue improvements as described for the proposed project. However, rather than a Type 4 path along the south side of Hollister Avenue, Alternative 4 would include a 10- to 14-foot Class I bicycle path within Hollister Avenue's southern right-of-way, extending approximately from the Hollister Avenue and Cathedral Oaks Road intersection to an existing Class I bicycle path just west of Pebble Beach Drive. The proposed Class I bicycle path would facilitate the use of other alternative modes of transportation. Alternative 4 would accommodate an existing bus stop just north of a parking area for the Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve, as well as a proposed bus stop just east of the Hollister Avenue and Cathedral Oaks Road intersection. Similar to the proposed project, the project applicant would request a zoning code adjustment to allow a portion of the proposed clubhouse to exceed the 25-foot height limit for the Open Space/Active Recreation zone, a Modification request to allow eight (8) vehicle parking spaces to be partially located in a required front yard setback, and the Sphere of Influence request would remain. Operation of the Sandpiper Golf Club under Alternative 4 would be the same as for the proposed project, as Alternative 4 would require the same number of employees and maintenance activities for the recontoured golf course.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

Based on the alternatives analysis, Alternative 2 (Clubhouse Renovation) was determined to be the environmentally superior alternative. Due to Alternative 2's reduced construction footprint and schedule, Alternative 2 would have less potential than the proposed project, Alternative 3, and Alternative 4 to result in impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, hydrology and water quality, land use, transportation, and tribal cultural resources. However, Alternative 2 would fail to meet most project objectives, and would only partially meet project objectives related to providing improved recreational and dining facilities and converting existing private septic systems to public sewers. Refer to Section 6, *Alternatives*, for the complete alternatives analysis.

Areas of Known Controversy

Pursuant to Section 15123(b)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR shall identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency including issues raised by agencies and the public. Issues raised by agencies and the public during the EIR scoping process involve project impacts to archaeological resources, biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, transportation, utilities and service systems, and tribal cultural resources. Responses to the Notice of Preparation of a Draft EIR and input received at the EIR scoping meeting held by the City are summarized in Section 1, *Introduction*.

Required Approvals

The proposed project requires the following approvals from the Agencies listed:

City of Goleta

- **Conditional Use Permit (22-0009-DP-GPAM-CUP).** The Conditional Use Permit would allow the proposed golf course use within the Open Space/Active Recreation Zone, as well as allow special events (e.g., weddings). The Planning Commission would make a recommendation on the merits of the request to the City Council.

- **Development Plan/Coastal Development Plan (in concept) with adjustments and design approval (22-0001-CDPH).** The DP/CDP (in concept) would permit all placement and architectural design of buildings, structures, landscape and lighting improvements, parking, golf course redesign, and other similar improvements. The proposed adjustment is to allow an increase in peak building height from 25 feet to 29 feet and allow parking of vehicles within the front yard setback. The Planning Commission would make a recommendation to the City Council on the merits of the DP/CDP in concept. As part of the Development Plan, the City Council will decide whether or not to grant the ROW vacation request. As a component of the review process, the City's Historic Preservation Commission would make a recommendation regarding the merits of the adaptive reuse/rehabilitation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station to City decision-makers. Also, the City's Design Review Board would make a recommendation to City decision-makers on the design merits of project components, including the proposed building design, landscaping, lighting, alterations to the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, and general design-related improvements.
- **Demolition Permit.** The City would have ministerial approval over the issuance of a permit for the demolition of the existing clubhouse and comfort station after consideration and approval by the CCC.
- **Building Permit.** The City would have ministerial approval over the issuance of a permit for the construction of the proposed clubhouse, comfort station, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop after consideration and approval by the CCC.
- **Grading Permit**. The City would have ministerial approval over the issuance of a permit for the grading of the project site prior to construction activities.
- **Encroachment Permit**. The City would have ministerial approval over the issuance of a permit for the creation of crosswalks, reconfiguration of the striped median and addition of a left-hand turn lane, relocation of the existing bus stop, reconstruction of the maintenance facility driveway access and striping, and changes to driveways providing access to the project site from Hollister Avenue.
- **Modification Request**. The Modification request would allow eight parking spaces associated with the proposed clubhouse to be partially located within the required front yard setback, as measured from the proposed ROW alignment.

Other public agencies whose approval may be required include the following:

- **California Coastal Commission.** Because the City does not have an adopted Local Coastal Program, the project applicant would need to gain approval of a Coastal Development Permit that encompasses the project components (Development Plan with height adjustment, and the CUP), which must be reviewed and approved by the CCC following City review and action on the proposed project. The City would evaluate and determine the proposed project's consistency with City policies and regulations. The proposed project would be required to obtain a Coastal Development Permit from the CCC. The CCC would evaluate the proposed project's consistency with State of California Coastal Act policies and regulations. Following discretionary approval from the CCC, the City has authority to effectuate the Coastal Development Permit and the Development Plan through issuance of a Zoning Clearance (ministerial level).

- **California Department of Fish and Wildlife.** Prior to construction, a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife would be required to be obtained for impacts to potential jurisdictional non-wetland waters and associated with the proposed bridge crossing of Devereaux Creek.
- **Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).** Prior to construction, the Central Coast RWQCB would require the proposed project to obtain a Water Quality Certification in accordance with Section 401 of the Clean Water Act for discharge to Devereaux Creek and Bell Canyon Creek. Dewatering discharge to surface waters would require coverage under the Central Coast RWQCB's *Waste Discharge Requirements National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Discharges with Limited Threat to Water Quality*; Order No. R3-2022-0035, NPDES No. CAG99304. Based on the concentrations of chemical constituents of potentially contaminated groundwater, the Central Coast RWQCB may require that an individual National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit and/or waste discharge requirements be obtained for dewatering activities. The Barnsdall Rio Grande service station was previously investigated for subsurface petroleum contamination related to removed underground fuel storage tanks. After cleanup, the file was closed by Santa Barbara County EHS in 1997. The Central Coast RWQCB now has jurisdiction over leaking underground fuel tank sites in Santa Barbara County, should soil contamination be found at the Barnsdall site. In the event of on-site groundwater contamination, coordination between Santa Barbara County EHS and the Central Coast RWQCB would be required.
- **Santa Barbara County Fire District.** The Santa Barbara County Fire District would provide site plan review and building safety inspection in accordance with Santa Barbara County Fire District standards. The Santa Barbara County Fire District would ensure site design is consistent with the fire safe standards within the Goleta Community Wildfire Protection Plan.
- **State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB).** Prior to construction, coverage would be obtained under the SWRCB's *General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities*, Order No. 2022-0057-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000002 (Construction Stormwater General Permit).
- **United States Army Corps of Engineers.** Prior to construction, the United States Army Corps of Engineers would require the proposed project to obtain a permit in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act for impacts to potential jurisdictional non-wetland waters.
- **Goleta West Sanitary District.** Prior to construction, GWSD would revise their Sphere of Influence and require the project applicant to obtain a Sewer Connection Permit. The project applicant would enter into an Out of Area Service Agreement with GWSD such that the proposed development may be connected to existing GWSD facilities.
- **Goleta Water District.** Prior to construction, the Goleta Water District would require the project applicant to obtain a Can and Will Serve Letter.
- **Santa Barbara County Local Agency Formation Commission.** The Santa Barbara County Local Agency Formation Commission would approve the requested changes to GWSD's Sphere of Influence.
- **Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Services.** Santa Barbara County EHS would approve the abandonment of the existing, on-site, private septic systems. Santa Barbara County EHS is regulating the project site under its Site Mitigation Unit program based on previously reported (2001) petroleum impacted soil. At this time, EHS is deferring its review of the July 25, 2023 Soils Management Plan document, prepared by Campbell Geo. "Based upon the historical and forthcoming data, EHS will likely require a formal Corrective Action Plan for this project. Once the

corrective action has been completed, the Soils Management Plan can be revised to include all historical and post-remediation assessment data" (excerpt from June 20, 2024 letter from EHS).

Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Table ES-2 summarizes the environmental impacts of the proposed project, proposed mitigation measures, and residual impacts (the impact after application of mitigation, if required). Impacts are categorized as follows:

- **Class I, Significant and Unavoidable.** An impact that cannot be reduced to below the threshold level given reasonably available and feasible mitigation measures. Such an impact requires a Statement of Overriding Considerations to be issued if the project is approved per Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines.
- **Class II, Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** An impact that can be reduced to below the threshold level given reasonably available and feasible mitigation measures. Such an impact requires findings under Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines.
- **Class III, Less than Significant.** An impact that may be adverse, but does not exceed the threshold levels and does not require mitigation measures. However, mitigation measures that could further lessen the environmental effect may be suggested if readily available and easily achievable.
- **Class IV, Beneficial.** An impact that would reduce existing environmental problems or hazards.

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
Aesthetics		
Impact AES-1. Construction and operation of the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Although portions of the project would be visible from designated scenic corridors and viewpoints, these impacts would be temporary during construction, minimized through construction screening, and offset during operation by strategic tree planting and undergrounding of utilities to enhance visual quality. Therefore, impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact AES-2. The project site is located approximately 430 feet from United States Route 101, which is eligible for designation as a state scenic highway throughout Goleta. The proposed project would not impact scenic resources within a State scenic highway. There would be no impact.	None required.	No impact.
Impact AES-3. The proposed project would be consistent with applicable zoning and other regulations that govern scenic quality, including the California Coastal Act, Goleta Zoning Code, and City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. Impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact AES-4. The proposed project would introduce on-site sources of light and glare; however, such sources would be consistent with City lighting regulations. Therefore, impacts involving light and glare would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative aesthetic impacts would be potentially significant, but the proposed project's contribution would not be considerable.	None required.	Cumulative impacts would be potentially significant. The project's contribution would not be considerable.
Air Quality		
Impact AQ-1. The proposed project's indirect growth would not result in a population exceeding the growth forecasts used within the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District 2022 Ozone Plan, which is the applicable Air Quality Management Plan for the project site. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact AQ-2. Construction and operation of the proposed project would generate criteria air pollutant emissions; however, these emissions would not exceed applicable thresholds set forth by the Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District. Therefore, the proposed project's emissions would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the South Central Coast Air Basin region is in nonattainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact AQ-3. Construction of the proposed project would result in pollutant emissions; however, these emissions would be short-term, and existing on-site wind patterns would carry pollutants away from receptors. Operation of the proposed project does not involve the use of equipment that would result in substantial pollutant concentrations and therefore would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact AQ-4. Construction of the proposed project would result in odors associated with equipment use, and operation of the proposed project would result in odors associated with food preparation and maintenance activities. Odors would dissipate rapidly from their sources and would not be carried toward receptors due to on-site wind patterns. Accordingly, the project would not result in substantial emissions leading to odors, that would adversely affect a substantial number of people. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative impacts related to exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would be significant, but the proposed project's contribution would not be considerable.	None required.	Cumulative impacts would be potentially significant. The project's contribution would not be considerable.

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
Biological Resources		
Impact BIO-1. Construction of the proposed project has the potential to result in direct and indirect impacts to special-status plant and wildlife species. Operation of the proposed project would be similar to existing conditions and would have a Class II, less than significant, impact to special-status species. Following implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-10, the project's construction impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation.	**BIO-1 Pre-Construction Special-Status Plant Survey and Avoidance** Prior to the start of construction activities, a City-approved, qualified biologist (retained by the project applicant) shall conduct a pre-construction special-status plant survey within the areas of proposed ground disturbance. The survey shall be conducted at the appropriate season, and in appropriate habitat, for identifying potentially occurring special-status plant species, including cliff malacothrix, woolly seablite, and Santa Barbara honeysuckle. The special-status plant survey shall be conducted in conformance with the California Native Plant Society Botanical Survey Guidelines (CNPS 2001), Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities (CDFW 2018), and the USFWS's General Rare Plant Survey Guidelines (Cypher 2002). Reference sites shall be visited to document if target species are detectable prior to the special-status plant survey. If special-status plant species are encountered, the qualified biologist shall flag an appropriate buffer for avoidance prior to the start of construction activities, including landscaping activities. Any habitat area supporting special-status plants shall be considered ESHA, and appropriate setbacks shall be established within which no construction activities may occur and no landscaping may occur that will result in removal of or harm to rare plants. If construction has not commenced within two years of the most recent plant survey, the special-status plant survey shall be repeated prior to the start of construction. The qualified biologist shall submit a summary of the survey results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to initiation of construction activities, including landscaping activities. **Plan Requirements and Timing**. The qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction special-status plant survey and submit a summary of the pre-construction special-status plant survey results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, within two years prior to the start of construction activities, including landscaping activities. If special-status plant species are detected, the qualified biologist shall flag an appropriate avoidance buffer prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. **Monitoring**: The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the survey results and keep the results on file with the City. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall conduct periodic spot checks to ensure that construction does not occur within the buffer during construction. **BIO-2 Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Fencing and Protection** Prior to initiation of construction activities, the project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to delineate all ESHA, aquatic resources, and required setbacks with temporary construction fencing and/or flagging and signage. The fencing shall serve as a visual boundary for construction personnel and be maintained throughout the duration of construction. The construction contractor shall ensure that construction personnel and equipment do not enter the setback areas during the duration of construction activities. No non-native or invasive plant species that have a potential to displace or alter sensitive vegetation communities or vegetation communities supporting sensitive species shall be planted within ESHA or ESHA buffers. Areas protected under this measure shall include sensitive coastal sage scrub and coastal bluff scrub communities, riparian habitats associated with Devereux Creek, coastal wetlands, native grasslands, open water associated with the golf course pond, areas supporting special-status plant species, and aquatic resources. Unless otherwise authorized, the setbacks shall be as follows: ▪ Sensitive scrub communities: 25 feet ▪ Riparian vegetation: 100 feet unless otherwise authorized ▪ Coastal wetlands: 100 feet ▪ Native grasslands: 10 feet ▪ Monarch roost: 100 feet ▪ Aquatic resources and open water: 100 feet unless otherwise authorized No grading, vehicles or heavy machinery, or construction shall be permitted with the setbacks, unless reduced setbacks are approved by the City for specific activities and locations. No grading, sand capping, vehicles, heavy machinery, or construction activities shall be permitted within any ESHA at any time, unless these activities are covered under compensatory mitigation described in Mitigation Measure BIO-11. **Plan Requirements and Timing**. The project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to delineate all ESHA and required setbacks with temporary construction fencing and/or flagging and signage prior to the start of construction activities. **Monitoring**: The qualified biologist and construction contractor shall provide evidence of ESHA delineation and BMP installation to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to the start of construction. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall conduct periodic spot checks to ensure that construction does not occur within the buffer during construction.	Construction impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	BIO-3 Biological Monitoring and Worker Education Prior to initiation of construction activities, the project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist familiar with special-status plant and wildlife species with the potential to occur in the project work area. The qualified biologist shall be present on-site daily during grading and vegetation removal. The monitor shall be responsible for the following: ▪ Ensure that procedures for verifying compliance with biological resource mitigation measures are followed. ▪ Lines of communication and reporting methods. ▪ Guiding the construction contractor in marking/flagging construction area limits. ▪ Conducting construction crew Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training. ▪ Authority to stop non-emergency work. ▪ Action to be taken in the event of non-compliance. ▪ Conducting daily wildlife clearance surveys prior to any grading, turf removal, other vegetation removal. ▪ Inspecting ESHA fencing around sensitive habitats. ▪ Preparing monitoring summaries of special-status species' presence, or the lack thereof, on the project site during grading or vegetation removal. All construction personnel shall attend a WEAP training conducted by the qualified biologist prior to commencement of construction activities. The construction contractor(s) shall be responsible for ensuring that all new personnel receive the training after construction is initiated. The WEAP shall include a description of a special-status species potentially present in the area, jurisdictional habitats present proximate to the Project site, information on sensitive habitats to be avoided, and specific measures that shall be implemented to protect special-status species. Special-status plant species addressed in the WEAP training shall include, at a minimum, cliff malacothrix, red sand verbena, Santa Barbara honeysuckle, Southern California black walnut, and woolly seablite. Species-status wildlife species addressed in the WEAP, at a minimum, shall include California red-legged frog, tidewater goby, monarch butterfly, Crotch's bumble bee, Cooper's hawk, southwestern pond turtle, yellow warbler, and white-tailed kite. **Plan Requirements and Timing**. The qualified biologist shall be present on-site daily during grading and vegetation removal. This measure shall be incorporated into the grading plans and the WEAP shall be available on-site during construction. The qualified biologist shall submit a monitoring summary to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director within 30 days after completing each phase of construction. **Monitoring**: Records of construction worker WEAP participation shall be kept on file with the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director for the duration of construction. Monitoring summaries shall be kept on file with the City for the duration of construction. **BIO-4 General Best Management Practices** The construction contractor shall ensure that all construction personnel are informed of and adhere to the general requirements listed below prior to the start of construction activities. This measure shall be incorporated into the construction plans, including demolition, grading, building, and landscaping plans. The project applicant shall submit the construction plans to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the construction plans to ensure the below measures are included. ▪ Best management practices, such as silt fending or straw wattles, shall be installed prior to conducting any project activity within 100 feet of any aquatic resource, including sand capping, grading, cart path construction, or bridge construction. Implementation of BMPs shall be consistent with any requirements from the approved Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the Project. ▪ Project-related vehicles shall observe a 5-mile-per-hour speed limit within the unpaved limits of construction. ▪ All open trenches shall be fenced and sloped to prevent entrapment of wildlife species. ▪ All hollow posts and pipes shall be capped, and metal fence stakes shall be plugged with bolts or other plugging materials to prevent wildlife entrapment and mortality. ▪ All food-related trash items such as wrappers, cans, bottles, and food scraps generated during proposed project construction shall be disposed of in closed containers and removed daily from the project site. ▪ No deliberate feeding of wildlife shall be allowed. ▪ No pets shall be allowed on the project site. ▪ No firearms shall be allowed on the project site. ▪ If vehicle or equipment maintenance is necessary, it shall be performed in the designated staging areas. ▪ During construction, heavy equipment shall be operated in accordance with standard BMPs. All equipment used on-site shall be properly maintained to avoid leaks of oil, fuel, or residues. The construction contractor shall prevent oil, petroleum products, or any other pollutants	

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	from contaminating the soil or entering a watercourse (dry or otherwise). When vehicles or equipment are stationary, mats or drip pans shall be placed below vehicles to contain fluid leaks. Provisions shall be in place to remediate any accidental spills. ▪ Refueling of any equipment shall only occur in designated staging areas. Designated areas shall not be located near any storm drain inlets, drainage swales, or surface waterways. When refueling gas powered equipment or mixing herbicide, workers shall refuel or mix over drip pan which is appropriately sized to catch any spillage. The designated refueling area shall be inspected frequently to ensure no spill of hazardous materials have occurred and could contaminate the ground or water. The construction contractor shall advise workers to clean and report spills immediately. ▪ Standard dust control measures shall be implemented to reduce impacts on nearby plants and wildlife. This includes a variety of options to reduce dust including replacing ground cover in disturbed areas as quickly as possible, watering active sites regularly, and suspending all excavating and grading operations during periods of high winds. **Plan Requirements and Timing**. This measure shall be incorporated into the construction plans, including demolition, grading, building, and landscaping plans. The project applicant shall submit the construction plans to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The construction contractor shall ensure that all construction personnel are informed of and adhere to the general requirements listed above prior to the start of construction activities. **Monitoring**: The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the construction plans to ensure this measure is included. **BIO-5 Crotch's Bumble Bee Pre-construction Survey and Avoidance** Should ground-disturbing activities, including grading, trenching, and vegetation removal such as grubbing, be scheduled to occur during the Crotch's bumble bee colony active period (typically spring to late summer), a qualified biologist shall conduct a habitat assessment prior to ground-disturbing activities to identify areas containing suitable habitat for Crotch's bumble bee. The habitat assessment shall be conducted in areas supporting suitable vegetation communities and land covers and shall focus on presence of suitable floral resources and potential nest sites, and shall be conducted within areas of proposed ground disturbance that meet the preceding criteria. The qualified biologist shall submit the habitat assessment results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director for review and approval within five days of completing the habitat assessment. Following completion of the habitat assessment, if suitable habitat is present, the qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for Crotch's bumble bee in the areas identified as suitable, using a methodology (including number of surveys, timing of surveys, suitable survey conditions, and time of day) accepted by CDFW. The pre-construction surveys shall be conducted prior to ground-disturbing activities. The qualified biologist shall submit the pre-construction survey results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director for review and approval within five days of completing the pre-construction surveys. If Crotch's bumble bees are not detected during the pre-construction surveys but suitable habitat is present, a qualified biologist shall be present during ground-disturbing project activities that occur during the Crotch's bumble bee colony active period, to ensure that no impacts occur to a previously unidentified Crotch's bumble bee nest. No additional work restrictions with regard to Crotch's bumble bee shall be implemented for the remainder of the colony active period. If Crotch's bumble bees are detected, ground-disturbing activities shall be prohibited within 100 feet of any known, occupied Crotch's bumble bee nest, or as determined by the qualified biologist, who shall demarcate the 100-foot buffer via flagging. Work shall not resume in this area for the duration of the Crotch's bumble bee colony active period, unless the qualified biologist determines the nest is inactive, with concurrence from CDFW. If Crotch's bumble bee remains a State candidate species or is listed as endangered or threatened under the California Endangered Species Act, and should ground-disturbing activities in areas potentially supporting habitat extend into one or more subsequent years, the habitat assessment and, if necessary, the surveys, shall be repeated in areas where ground disturbance may occur that year. Prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities, should the California Fish and Game Commission remove the candidate status of Crotch's bumble bee and determine the species shall not be listed, then no measures protecting Crotch's bumble bee shall be required. **Plan Requirements and Timing**. The qualified biologist shall conduct a habitat assessment prior to any ground-disturbing activities during the Crotch's bumble bee colony active period. Following the habitat assessment, the qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys in the identified suitable areas. If Crotch's bumble bees are detected, prior to ground-disturbing activities, the qualified biologist shall demarcate a 100-foot buffer for any known, occupied nest via flagging. If Crotch's bumble bees are not detected, a qualified biologist shall be present during ground-disturbing activities. The qualified biologist shall submit the habitat assessment results and pre-construction survey results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to ground-disturbing activities. The qualified biologist shall submit monitoring results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, following the completion of ground-disturbing activities. **Monitoring**: The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the habitat assessment results, pre-construction survey results, and monitoring results. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall conduct periodic spot checks to ensure that construction does not occur within the buffer during construction.	

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	BIO-6 Monarch Butterfly Roost Protection Construction activities (including grading and sand capping) within 200 feet of monarch butterfly ESHA shall be scheduled by the construction contractor to occur between April 1 and September 30 where feasible, to avoid overwintering monarch butterflies. If construction activities within 200 feet of monarch butterfly ESHA cannot feasibly be scheduled to avoid the overwintering season, the project applicant shall ensure the following measures are implemented prior to construction activities: ▪ A monarch specialist or qualified biologist shall conduct a survey for roosting monarchs prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities, including vegetation removal, and confirm the absence of roosting monarchs before the work can commence. Roosting monarch surveys must follow the Xerces Society Protocol (2022). Surveys shall be conducted in the early morning while temperatures are low enough that monarch butterflies remain clustered from the evening before (usually when temperatures are below 13 °C or 55 °F). ▪ Surveys shall be spaced sufficiently apart to capture roosting individuals during this timeframe and conducted during a time when monarchs are present at a local reference site as feasible. Depending on the observed monarch behavior, more than two site visits may be necessary to conclude the presence/absence of roosting monarchs throughout the season. ▪ During the overwintering season and during construction activities, roosting monarch surveys shall be conducted routinely to confirm continued absence or to identify, map, and describe roost locations if presence of roosting monarchs is confirmed. Mapped roosting locations may be adjusted as needed under the guidance of a monarch specialist or qualified biologist. ▪ Any construction activities within 200 ft of roosting monarchs within the monarch butterfly ESHA shall be prohibited (consistent with CE 4.5 and CE 4.6d). ▪ A monarch specialist or qualified biologist shall be present during ground-disturbing activities, including vegetation removal, to document monarch butterfly protection. The monarch monitor shall document that roosting monarchs are not disturbed by ground-disturbing activities. The monarch monitor shall have authority to stop ground-disturbing activities if monarchs show signs of unnatural disturbance. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: If construction activities within 200 feet of monarch butterfly ESHA cannot feasibly be scheduled to avoid the overwintering season, the project applicant shall retain a monarch specialist or qualified biologist to conduct surveys for roosting monarchs prior to the start of construction activities. The monarch specialist or qualified biologist shall submit survey results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, within five days of completing the pre-construction survey. The monarch specialist or qualified biologist shall monitor ground-disturbing activities, including vegetation removal, during construction. The monarch specialist or qualified biologist shall submit monitoring results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director following the completion of construction activities within 200 feet of monarch butterfly ESHA. **Monitoring**. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the survey and monitoring results. **BIO-7 Implementation of Monarch Roost Protection Plan** The project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to prepare a Monarch Roost Protection Plan prior to the start of construction activities. The Monarch Roost Protection Plan shall include the following. ▪ Trees majorly impacted by construction, grading, and trenching of the project improvement elements within the monarch butterfly ESHA shall be replaced at a 3:1 ratio within the ESHA and as close to the impacted tree as is reasonably feasible. ▪ If understory vegetation that supports overwintering habitat is removed within monarch butterfly ESHA, as determined by a monarch specialist, the vegetation shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio as close to the removed vegetation as is feasible. ▪ Grading or other activities that could alter the surface hydrology that sustains the groves of trees within monarch butterfly ESHA are prohibited within the ESHA buffer (50- or 100- feet depending on whether the site is transitory or overwintering habitat). The qualified biologist shall submit the Monarch Roost Protection Plan to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to the start of construction activities. The construction contractor shall implement the Monarch Roost Protection Plan for the duration of construction. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: The qualified biologist shall prepare a Monarch Roost Protection Plan, which shall be submitted to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. **Monitoring**: The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the Monarch Roost Protection Plan prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. **BIO-8 Tree Protection Measures** The construction contractor shall implement the following tree protection measures to ensure that impacts to mature native (protected) trees are minimized to the extent feasible or avoided, consistent with the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Policy CE 4 and CE 9, prior to the start of project construction. The following tree protection measures shall be included within the project construction plans, including the	

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	grading and landscaping plans. All measures below shall be conducted by or under the direct supervision of an International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) certified arborist retained by the project applicant: **Prior to Construction** ▪ A certified arborist or qualified biologist under the supervision of the certified arborist shall monitor any ground disturbance or vegetation removal activities that have a potential to impact protected trees. ▪ Temporary fencing such as snow fencing, not less than 3 feet high with tree protection signs shall be erected around all protected trees (or tree groups) to be preserved that have a potential to be impacted during construction. The protective fence shall be installed at the protected zone boundary of each tree (or tree group), which is defined as the critical root zone. The contractor shall maintain the fence to keep it upright, taut and aligned during active construction. Fencing shall be in place and inspected by a City approved biologist prior to the start of activities with the potential to impact protected trees. Fencing shall be removed only after all construction activities with the potential to impact protected trees are complete. ▪ A pre-construction meeting shall be held between all contractors (including grading, tree removal/pruning, builders, etc.) and the project arborist. The meeting shall focus on instructing the contractors on tree protection practices. All equipment operators and spotters, assistants, or those directing operators from the ground shall provide written acknowledgement of their receiving tree protection training. This training shall include information on the location and marking of protected trees, the necessity of preventing damage, and the discussion of work practices that will accomplish such. **Protection and Maintenance During Construction** ▪ Contractors shall avoid heavy equipment operations, grade changes, ponding water, and fill or compaction within the protected tree zone unless where specifically approved and under the supervision of a Certified Arborist or qualified biologist in direct communication with the Certified Arborist. ▪ Contractors shall ensure that damage to the tree be avoided to the extent feasible when transporting or moving construction materials and working within or adjacent to the protected zone). If contact with the tree crown is unavoidable, affected branches may be pruned by a qualified arborist under supervision of a Certified Arborist and shall adhere to industry standards. ▪ Except where specifically approved in writing beforehand, all trenching shall be done outside of the fenced protected zone. Where trenching is necessary in areas that contain roots from retained trees, contractors should use trenching techniques that include the use of either a root pruner or an Air-Spade to limit root impacts. A Certified Arborist or qualified biologist in direct communication with the Certified Arborist shall ensure that all pruning cuts be clean and sharp to minimize ripping, tearing, and fracturing of the root system. Use of both root-pruning and Air-Spade equipment shall be accompanied only by hand tools to remove soil from trench locations. The trench should be made no deeper than necessary, and when possible, alternatives to trenching should be utilized. ▪ The contractor shall be responsible for irrigating (deep watering) the trees in the summer and fall irrigation as necessary and determined by a Certified Arborist. One irrigation cycle shall thoroughly soak the root zones of the trees to a depth of two feet. The soil shall be allowed to dry out between watering to avoid keeping a consistently wet soil.. Soil moisture shall be checked with a soil probe before irrigating. The area within three feet of the trunk shall never be soaked, especially in summer months. ▪ If any protected trees are damaged to the point where continued viability is threatened, as determined by a certified arborist, the tree shall be replaced at a 3:1 ratio with like species grown from locally obtained seed. Replacement shall occur on site as feasible, or off site (within the same watershed) if on site replacement is not feasible. Replacement trees shall be monitored for a period of 5 years. **Maintenance After Construction** ▪ The contractors shall ensure that the mulch is kept a minimum one foot away from the trunk base and no more than 8 inches deep to avoid creating conditions favorable to the establishment and growth of decay-causing fungal pathogens. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: The project applicant shall submit the construction plans that include the tree protection measures to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director for review and approval prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. **Monitoring**: The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the construction plans to ensure this measure is included. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall approve the arborist prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. **BIO-9 Preconstruction Semi-Aquatic Species Survey, Avoidance, and Relocation** Prior to the start of construction activities, a qualified biologist (retained by the project applicant) shall conduct a pre-construction survey for semi-aquatic species (e.g., California red-legged frog, southwestern pond turtle) within areas of proposed ground disturbance. The survey shall be completed seven days prior to ground disturbance in dry conditions or 48 hours prior to ground disturbance in favorable conditions for upland amphibian migration (e.g., during or immediately after heavy rain events, heavy fog, or high humidity). The qualified biologist shall	

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	submit a summary of the survey results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to initiation of ground disturbance. If a special status species is identified during construction, the construction contractor shall halt construction activities within 100 feet of the location and contact the qualified biologist. If identified during pre-construction surveys or during construction, individual special-status species in the work area shall be allowed to move out of the work area of their own volition. If special-status species are detected and do not move out of the work area, a Species Relocation and Exclusion Plan shall be prepared by the qualified biologist and submitted to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for approval prior to relocation. The Species Relocation and Exclusion Plan shall specify that if relocation by humans is required, the animal shall be captured by a qualified biologist and relocated out of harm's way to the nearest suitable habitat, a minimum of 100 feet from the project work area where it was found. Species listed as threatened or endangered (e.g., California red-legged frog) shall only be handled as authorized by United States Fish and Wildlife Service. The qualified biologist shall document observations of special-status species on California Natural Diversity Database forms and submit the documentation to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife upon project completion. If one or more special status semi-aquatic species are detected, surveys are required each day prior to construction activities until the species has moved out of the work area or the qualified biologist has determined that construction may resume. Construction can commence when the semi-aquatic species moves or is relocated out of the work area and when approved by the qualified biologist. If construction ceases for more than 30 days, a new special status survey is required. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: Prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit, the qualified biologist shall submit a summary of the survey results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director. If no special-status species are found, grading activities can commence and no further reporting is required. If species are detected and do not move out of the work area, a Species Relocation and Exclusion Plan shall be prepared by the qualified biologist and submitted to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for approval prior to relocation and commencing construction. If construction ceases for more than 30 days, a new special status survey is required. **Monitoring**: The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review any biological survey, relocation, or exclusion reports in consultation with CDFW or USFWS. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall conduct periodic site inspections to verify compliance with survey recommendations in the field. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall conduct periodic spot checks to ensure that construction does not occur within the buffer during construction. **BIO-10 Preconstruction Nesting Bird Surveys and Avoidance** To avoid construction impacts to nesting birds and raptors, the construction contractor shall conduct vegetation removal and initial ground disturbance outside the bird and raptor breeding season, which is typically February 1 through September 1 but can vary based on local and annual climatic conditions. If construction begins within the breeding season, then not more than seven days before demolition, ground disturbance, and/or vegetation removal commences, a bird and raptor preconstruction survey shall be conducted by a City-approved biologist (retained by the project applicant) within the disturbance footprint, plus a 300-foot buffer. The survey shall be conducted by a biologist familiar with the identification of bird species known to occur in southern California. The City-approved biologist shall conduct the preconstruction nesting bird and raptor surveys during the time of day when bird species are active and for a sufficient duration to reliably conclude presence/absence of nesting birds and raptors within the 300-foot buffer. The City-approved biologist shall submit a summary of the nesting bird and raptor survey results to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee. Survey conclusions shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to initiation of construction. If no bird nests are observed no further mitigation is required. If an active nest of species protected by the California Fish and Game Code (§ 3503) or Migratory Bird Treaty Act are found within 300 feet of the disturbance footprint, the City-approved biologist shall flag their locations and map their locations on an aerial photograph of the disturbance footprint at a scale no less than 1"=200' and/or recorded with the use of a Global Positioning System (GPS) unit. If active raptor nests are detected, the map shall include topographic lines, parcel boundaries, adjacent roads, known historical nests for protected nesting species, and known roosting or foraging areas, as required by the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Policy CE 8.3. The buffer shall be 300 feet in compliance with the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Policy CE 8.4. If the 300-foot buffer is infeasible, the City-approved biologist may reduce the buffer distance as appropriate, depending upon the species and the proposed work activities. If any active non-raptor bird nests are found, the City-approved biologist shall establish a suitable buffer area (varying from 25 to 300 feet), depending on the species. The construction contractor shall ensure that no ground disturbance occurs within the buffer until the City-approved biologist confirms that the breeding/nesting is completed and all the young have fledged, and removes the buffer. If work within the buffer is necessary, a City-contracted biological monitor (funded by the project applicant) shall monitor the active nest full-time during construction activities within the buffer to ensure project activities are not indirectly impacting protected nesting birds and raptors. If work ceases for more than 30 days, a new nesting bird survey shall be conducted in accordance with this measure. **Plan Requirements and Timing**: The survey shall be conducted no more than seven (7) days prior to commencement of any demolition, grading, and/or vegetation removal activities. Survey conclusions shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental	

<table>
<tr><th>Impact</th><th>Mitigation Measure (s)</th><th>Residual Impact</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Review Director, or designee, prior to the commencement of construction activities that could disturb suitable nesting habitat, such as demolition, grading, and/or vegetation removal. This measure, and any buffer requirements, shall be incorporated into the grading plans.
Monitoring: The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review any biological survey reports and conduct periodic site inspections to verify compliance with survey recommendations in the field. The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall conduct periodic spot checks to ensure that construction does not occur within the buffer during construction.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Impact BIO-2. Construction of the proposed project has the potential to result in direct and indirect impacts to arroyo willow thickets, Devereux Creek and associated riparian habitat, coastal bluff scrub/coastal sage scrub, and Monarch Butterfly Roosting Habitat. Operation of the proposed project would be similar to existing conditions and would have a Class III, less than significant, impact on riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities. Following implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, and BIO-11, the project’s construction impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation.</td><td>Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, and BIO-11 would be required.
BIO-11 Compensatory Mitigation for Impacts on Sensitive Communities and Riparian Habitat
Onsite mitigation shall be provided to compensate for the permanent loss of arroyo willow thickets/riparian habitat (0.002 acre) at a ratio of 5:1. Temporary impacts to arroyo willow thickets/riparian habitat (0.005 acre), eucalyptus woodland/riparian habitat (0.04 acre), and non-wetland waters of the United States and State (0.002 acre) shall be restored at a 1:1 ratio. Details of the mitigation program requirements shall be described in a Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Program (HMMP). A qualified biologist, retained by the project applicant, shall prepare the HMMP.
Final landscape plans for the project shall not include removal of sensitive vegetation or aquatic resources in areas for landscaping purposes only (where no construction ground disturbances, including grading, trenching, excavation for bioretention basins or other drainage or utility features, is proposed).
Requirements described in the HMMP shall include:
Specification that mitigation shall be on-site and shall occur adjacent, or as near as possible, to any removed habitat area. Mitigation for loss of arroyo willow/riparian habitat associated with Devereux Creek shall occur only along Devereux Creek, and near the area of impacts to the extent possible.
Mitigation for the loss of riparian habitat and non-wetland waters of the United States and State shall conform with any requirements included within a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement provided by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, a Clean Water Act 401 Certification issued by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, or USACE Clean Water Act Section 404 permit.
The mitigation program shall conform with all requirements of the City of Goleta’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan and the City of Goleta Creeks and Watershed Management Plan.
Specification of a 5-year monitoring period for all restoration areas.
Development of a plant palate for each restoration area (arroyo willow thicket/riparian, eucalyptus woodland, non-wetland waters of the United States and State) in keeping with the character and plant composition of the native community being restored.
Restoration for temporary impacts within monarch butterfly winter roosting habitat shall conform with requirements of the City of Goleta’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan.
Defined attainable and measurable goals and objectives to be achieved through implementation of the HMMP.
A restoration work plan that details methodologies, a restoration schedule, plant materials (seed), and implementation strategies. Performance standards for the restoration work plan shall include achievement of vegetation cover, species diversity, and soil stability standards.
A detailed maintenance plan to include removal of invasive non-native species.
A monitoring plan that includes methods and analysis of results, goals for success or failure, and an adaptive management plan and suggestions for failed restoration efforts.
Restoration activities using native species from locally collected stock.
The qualified biologist shall submit the HMPP to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to initiation of construction activities.
Plan Requirements and Timing: The project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to prepare an HMMP prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The qualified biologist shall submit the HMMP to the City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.
Monitoring: The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the HMMP prior to the start of construction activities. The City of Goleta’s Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall ensure compliance with the onsite mitigation requirements and monitor the restoration efforts throughout the 5-year monitoring period.</td><td>Construction impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
Operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.</td></tr>
</table>

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
Impact BIO-3. Project construction has the potential to result in direct and indirect substantial adverse effects to aquatic resources, including Devereux Creek and the Golf Course Pond. Operation of the proposed project would be similar to existing conditions and would have a less than significant impact to aquatic resources. Following implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, and BIO-11, the project's construction impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation.	Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, and BIO-11 would be required.	Construction impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.
Impact BIO-4. Project construction would have the potential to result in substantial disturbances to wildlife movement through the introduction of noise, light, and increased human presence, which would be a potentially significant impact. Project operation would not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. With implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, the project's construction impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.	Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would be required.	Construction impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.
Impact BIO-5. The proposed project would be potentially inconsistent with the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policies CE 1.6, CE 2.2, CE 4.4, and CE 9.5, as well as Section 17.30.040 of the Goleta Municipal Code, as construction of the proposed project could directly or indirectly impact ESHA, ESHA buffers, or protected trees. Following implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, and BIO-11, the proposed project's impact involving conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation.	Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, and BIO-11 would be required.	Construction impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.
Impact BIO-6. The proposed project is not within the jurisdiction of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan. No impact would occur.	None required.	No impact.
Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative development could result in a potentially significant impact on biological resources, but the proposed project's contribution to such impacts would not be considerable with implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, NOI-1, and BIO-1 through BIO-11.	None required beyond project-level mitigation measures.	Cumulative impacts would be potentially significant. The project's contribution would not be considerable.
Cultural Resources		
Impact CUL-1. The Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station qualifies as a historical resource. The proposed restoration and adaptive reuse of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station would be consistent with all of the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the City of Goleta Historic Preservation Ordinance with implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1. Vibration from construction activities has the potential to damage the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. With implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2, the proposed project's construction impacts to the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operation of the proposed project would involve maintenance of the restored Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station and impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	Mitigation Measures NOI-2 and CUL-1 would be required. **CUL-1 Architectural Monitoring for Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station** The project applicant shall retain a Secretary of Interior's Professionally Qualified architectural historian and/or the City's Urban Historian (qualified historian) to ensure the project implementation utilizes the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and guidelines from the National Park Service including: ▪ Preservation Brief #9, The Repair of Historic Wood Windows ▪ Preservation Brief #10, Exterior Paint Problems on Historic Woodwork ▪ Preservation Brief #32, The Preservation and Repair of Historic Stuccowork ▪ Preservation Brief #45, Preserving Historic Wood Porches The project applicant shall provide proof of retainment of the qualified historian to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the building permit for the renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. The requirement shall be referenced in the construction plans for the Rio Grande Coffee Shop intended for use by the construction contractor(s). Prior to the start of renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, the qualified historian shall review the replacements, materials, finishes, designs, colors, textures, and other visual qualities for consistency with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. During renovation of the Barnsdall Grande Gas Station, the qualified historian shall conduct weekly spot checks to monitor construction progress for consistency with the Standards for Rehabilitation. Monitoring may be increased or reduced as deemed necessary by the qualified historian with approval by the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee. The qualified historian shall have the authority to halt work if inconsistent with the Standards for Rehabilitation and develop a plan to revise the work for consistency with the Standards for Rehabilitation in consultation with the City and contractor(s). Throughout the renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, the qualified historian shall submit a weekly update to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director to document compliance. The update shall include date of monitoring, project progress, compliance or non-compliance with the Standards for Rehabilitation, and necessary actions to ensure compliance with the Standards for Rehabilitation. **Plan Requirements and Timing**. Prior to renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, the project applicant shall retain a qualified historian. The qualified historian shall review project plans for replacements, materials, finishes, designs, colors, textures, and other visual	Construction impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	qualities for consistency with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation prior to and during renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. Proof of retainment shall be provided to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the building permit for the renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. **Monitoring.** Throughout the renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, the qualified historian shall submit a weekly update to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director to document compliance. The update shall include date of monitoring, project progress, and compliance or non-compliance with the Standards for Rehabilitation, and necessary actions to ensure compliance with the Standards for Rehabilitation. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review the weekly updates.	
Impact CUL-2. The proposed project would not result in a significant impact to known archaeological resources. However, the proposed project may result in a potentially significant impact to unknown archaeological resources through ground disturbance during project construction. Following implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4, construction impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operation of the proposed project would be similar to existing conditions and impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	**CUL-2 Archaeological Monitoring** Prior to ground disturbance activities, the project applicant shall retain an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (qualified archaeologist) and has experience in California prehistoric and historic resources (experience within City of Goleta or Santa Barbara County preferred). The project applicant shall provide proof of retainment of the qualified archaeologist to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The qualified archaeologist shall prepare a Cultural Resource Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan (Plan), conduct archaeological monitoring, and address any inadvertent discoveries identified during project implementation (refer to Mitigation Measure CUL-4). The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the Plan prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The Plan shall outline archaeological and Native American resource monitoring protocols, as well as a program for treatment and mitigation in the case of an inadvertent discovery of cultural resources during project-related ground-disturbance. The Plan shall also provide for the proper identification, evaluation, treatment, and protection of any cultural resources in accordance with CEQA throughout the duration of the project. The Plan shall be incorporated and referenced in all grading and construction plans intended for use by the construction contractor(s). The qualified archaeologist shall manage archaeological monitoring during initial ground disturbance activities, defined as construction-related earth moving of sediments from their place of deposition. This definition excludes movement of sediments after they have been initially disturbed or displaced by project-related construction. The qualified archaeologist shall oversee and establish monitoring efforts as needed (increase, decrease, or discontinue monitoring frequency) based on the observed potential for construction activities to encounter cultural deposits or material. The qualified archaeologist shall ensure all daily monitoring logs are maintained. The requirement for archaeological monitoring shall be noted on all demolition and grading plans. The qualified archaeologist shall prepare an archaeological monitoring report within 60 days following completion of ground disturbance, and shall submit the archaeological monitoring report to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review. The archaeological monitoring report shall document compliance with approved cultural resource mitigation measures, include all monitoring efforts, and include an appendix with the daily monitoring logs. The qualified archaeological shall submit the final archaeological monitoring report to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director and the Central Coast Information Center. **Plan Requirements and Timing**. Prior to ground disturbance, the project applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist. The qualified archaeologist shall create a Plan, conduct monitoring, and address any discoveries during project construction. Proof of retainment shall be provided to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The Plan shall outline monitoring protocols and treatment for any discovered cultural resources, ensuring compliance with CEQA. The Plan shall be referenced in all grading and construction plans. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the Plan prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. **Monitoring**. The qualified archaeologist shall manage monitoring during initial ground disturbance, adjusting efforts based on the potential to encounter cultural deposits. Daily monitoring logs shall be maintained. The qualified archaeologist shall prepare an archaeological monitoring report, documenting compliance and monitoring efforts, and shall submit the archaeological monitoring report to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review, within 60 days following completion of ground disturbance. The qualified archaeological shall submit the final archaeological monitoring report to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director and the Central Coast Information Center. **CUL-3 Workers Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) Training** All construction personnel and monitors who are not trained archaeologists shall be briefed regarding unanticipated discoveries of archaeological resources prior to the start of construction activities. A basic presentation shall be prepared and presented by the qualified archaeologist, or their designee, to inform all construction personnel working on the project about the archaeological sensitivity of the area. The purpose of the WEAP training is to provide specific details on the kinds of archaeological materials that may be identified during construction and explain the importance of and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. Each worker shall also learn the proper procedures to follow in the event archaeological resources or human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities. These procedures include work curtailment or redirection, and the immediate contact of the qualified archaeologist and if appropriate, Native American representative. If new construction personnel are added to the project, the crew foreman shall ensure the new personnel receive the WEAP training before starting work. The necessity of training attendance shall be stated on all demolition, grading, or construction plans and	Construction impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	the project applicant shall maintain records demonstrating construction worker WEAP participation. The project applicant shall submit the records of construction worker WEAP participation to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to construction activities and as-needed after the addition of new personnel. **Plan Requirements and Timing**. This measure shall be incorporated into the grading, demolition, and construction plans and the WEAP shall be available on-site during construction. **Monitoring**. Records of construction worker WEAP participation shall be kept on file with the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director for the duration of construction. **CUL-4 Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources** If unanticipated cultural resources are discovered during project-related ground disturbance activities, the following procedures shall be implemented: ▪ In the event that archaeological resources are unexpectedly encountered during ground-disturbing activities, the construction contractor(s) shall halt work within 50 feet of the find and contact the qualified archaeologist. The qualified archaeologist retained pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-2 shall immediately evaluate the resource. ▪ If the resource is determined to be potentially significant, then the qualified archaeologist, project applicant, Native American monitor (if resources are Native American in origin), and City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall meet to discuss the significance of the find. At the meeting, a decision shall be made, with the concurrence by the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc.) for the cultural resource. ▪ Treatment and avoidance of the newly discovered resource(s) shall be consistent with the Plan prepared pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-2. This may include avoidance of the cultural resources through project design, in-place preservation of cultural resources located in native soils, and/or re-burial within the immediate vicinity so they are not subject to further disturbance in perpetuity. If avoidance is infeasible, then treatment shall be implemented pursuant to the Plan. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall make the final determination based on the provisions of CEQA with respect to archaeological resources and recommendations of the qualified archaeologist. ▪ Further ground disturbance, including but not limited to grading and trenching, shall not resume within the area of the discovery until the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, has determined the appropriate mitigation has been implemented pursuant to the Plan and the qualified archaeologist has notified the construction contractor(s) to resume work. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the 50-foot buffer area and shall be monitored by additional archaeological monitors, if necessary. ▪ If the resource proves to be eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources and significant impacts to the resource cannot be avoided via project redesign, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare a data recovery plan tailored to the physical nature and characteristics of the resource, pursuant to the requirements of the *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C). The data recovery plan shall identify data recovery excavation methods, measurable objectives, and data thresholds to reduce any significant impacts to cultural resources related to the resource. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the treatment plan and archaeological testing as appropriate. The qualified archaeologist shall submit the resulting documentation to the regional repository of the California Historical Resources Information System pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C). ▪ The qualified archaeologist shall provide evidence of compliance with this mitigation measure, if a significant archaeological resource is found, to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director and the appropriate California Historical Resources Information System Information Center upon completion of the data recovery plan detailing the significance of the resource and treatment findings. **Plan Requirements and Timing**. If unanticipated cultural resources are discovered during ground disturbance, the construction contractor(s) shall halt work within 50 feet of the find and contact the qualified archaeologist. The qualified archaeologist shall evaluate the resource immediately. If the resource is potentially significant, the qualified archaeologist, project applicant, Native American monitor (if applicable), and City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall meet to decide on appropriate mitigation. Treatment and avoidance shall follow the Plan from Mitigation Measure CUL-2. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall make the final determination based on CEQA provisions. Ground disturbance shall not resume in the area until the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, has verified that mitigation is implemented. Work outside the 50-foot buffer shall continue with additional monitoring if necessary. **Monitoring**. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review and approve the data recovery plan (if applicable). The qualified archaeologist shall submit documentation to the California Historical Resources Information System. The qualified archaeologist shall provide evidence of compliance to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director and the California Historical Resources Information System upon completion.	

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
Impact CUL-3. Construction of the proposed project would involve ground disturbing activities such as grading and surface excavation, which have the potential to unearth or adversely impact previously unidentified human remains. With adherence to existing regulatory requirements, this impact would be Class III, less than significant. Operation of the proposed project would be similar to existing conditions and impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative impacts related to the disturbance of archaeological resources would be significant, but the proposed project's contribution would not be considerable with implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4.	None required beyond project-level mitigation measures.	Cumulative impacts would be potentially significant. The project's contribution would not be considerable.
Energy		
Impact E-1. Construction and operation of the proposed project would utilize gasoline, diesel, and electricity, but would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact E-2. The proposed project would consume energy during construction and operation, but energy consumption would not conflict with Senate Bill 100, the City's Climate Action Plan, Strategic Energy Plan, or Municipal Code requirements related to energy. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative impacts related to energy would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Cumulative impacts would be less than significant.
Geology and Soils		
Impact GEO-1. The project site does not overlie an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone but does overlie a portion of the More Ranch Fault. Proposed project activities would not create stresses that could contribute to fault rupture The proposed project would avoid placing structures within 50 feet of the More Ranch Fault. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact GEO-2. The project site is located in a seismically active area and seismic activity could affect structures on the project site. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would require incorporation of seismic design recommendations from geotechnical reports prepared for project structures into the project's structural design, which would reduce impacts involving seismic ground shaking. Construction and operational impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.	**GEO-1 Geotechnical Design** The applicant's project design engineer shall incorporate the recommendations listed below from the *Site-Specific Hazards Study and Preliminary Foundation Investigation* (Appendix F-1), *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed Club House* (Appendix F-2), and the *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed Comfort Station* (Appendix F-3) into the project's grading and building plans. The applicant shall submit the grading and building plans to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee for review and approval prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for the grading and building permits for the project. The applicant shall also retain a licensed geotechnical professional approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee prior to the start of construction. The licensed geotechnical professional shall be responsible for ensuring proper implementation of the recommendations below and providing a report to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee certifying the recommendations below have been incorporated into project design and throughout construction prior to the issuance of a certification of occupancy. **Grading (General)** 1. The area to be graded shall be cleared of surface vegetation, including roots and root structures. 2. If, during the removal and scarification process, excessive root structures are encountered, these areas shall be deep ripped in two directions to the depth of the root structure, after which the disturbed soils and the roots shall be completely removed, and the resulting cavities shall be scarified and processed to receive fill in accordance with recommendations contained in this section. 3. If, during the grading operations, previously placed undocumented fill material is encountered, this fill material shall be removed under the direction of the project design engineer prior to commencement of the filling operations. 4. Removed surface soils and/or imported approved fill will be placed in loose lifts of approximately 6 inches, thoroughly mixed, moistened or dried to near optimum moisture content, and compacted to a minimum of 90 percent relative compaction. 5. Rocks greater than 6 inches in size shall be removed from the soil being spread for compaction. 6. Import soils, if required for compacted fill, shall be granular, non-expansive soils which are equal to, or superior in quality to, the on-site soils as determined by the project design engineer prior to importation of the fill material to the site. 7. The compaction standard shall be the latest adoption of the ASTM D-1557 method of compaction. 8. Positive surface drainage shall direct water away from all slopes and away from the foundation system of the proposed structure.	Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	Grading (Clubhouse) 1. In areas where compacted fill soil is to be placed, the area to receive the fill soil shall be prepared. In the area to be prepared, the loose topsoil and compressible surface soils shall be removed and observed by the project design engineer. Upon approval of excavation, the exposed ground surface shall be scarified an additional 6 to 8 inches, moistened or dried to near the optimum moisture content, and compacted to 90 percent of the relative compaction. 2. The footings of the proposed structures shall be supported completely on firm undisturbed original ground. The structures shall not be supported over a cut/fill transition unless the foundation is engineered to account for the transition. 3. All fill slopes which are created during the grading operation shall be properly shaped to a maximum slope angle of 2 horizontal to 1 vertical, and compacted by rolling the sheepsfoot roller or similar compaction equipment over the slope face at vertical lift intervals of 30 inches or less. **Grading (Comfort Station)** 1. The footings of the proposed structures shall be supported completely by a uniform thickness of non-expansive compacted soil. The structures shall not be supported over a cut/fill transition. 2. Beneath the proposed structures and for a minimum distance of 5 feet beyond the exterior perimeters, the loose topsoil and compressible surface soils shall be removed and observed by a representative of our firm. Upon approval of excavation, the exposed ground surface shall be scarified an additional 6 to 8 inches, moistened or dried to near the optimum moisture content, and compacted to 90 percent of the relative compaction. The minimum depth of removal shall be at least 12 inches below the bottom of the proposed footings. **Grading (Rio Grande Coffee Shop)** 1. It should be noted gas tanks that were buried on the property have been removed and the resulting void was backfilled with an imported yellow sand. If these backfilled areas are located below the proposed structures, backfill soil shall be removed and replaced at 95 percent compaction. 2. The footings of the proposed structures shall either be supported completely by a uniform thickness of non-expansive compacted fill or the foundations shall be designed to penetrate the fill and compressible topsoil such that the structure is supported either completely over fill or completely on firm original ground. The structures shall not be supported over a cut/fill transition unless the foundation is engineered to account for the transition. 3. Beneath the proposed structures and for a minimum distance of 5 feet beyond the exterior perimeters, the loose topsoil and compressible surface soils shall be removed and observed by the project design engineer. Upon approval of excavation, the exposed ground surface shall be scarified an additional 6 to 8 inches, moistened or dried to near the optimum moisture content, and compacted to 90 percent of the relative compaction. The minimum depth of removal shall be at least 12 inches below the bottom of the proposed footings. **Foundations (General)** 1. All footings shall contain a minimum of two No. 4 horizontal rebar; one placed in the base and one in the stem of the footing. The project design engineer shall specify the foundation steel reinforcement. 2. Concrete slab-on-grade floors shall be placed over a subgrade soil conforming to the *Grading* recommendations of this mitigation measure. 3. As a minimum, concrete slabs on grade shall be a full 4 inches thick and shall contain No. 3 rebar spaced 24 inches on center each way. The steel reinforcement shall be placed near the center of the slab. Concrete slabs on grade shall be doweled into all adjacent footings using No. 3 rebar spaced 24 inches on center. The traditional or conventional subgrade preparation below a concrete slab-on-grade floor is some variation of the following: A minimum 4- inch coarse, washed concrete sand layer is placed over the soil subgrade. A 10- mil or heavier impervious membrane is placed over the sand layer. These concrete slab-on-grade and sand layer recommendations shall be modified and/or eliminated as needed by the designers for surcharge loads, wheel loads, concentrated loads, or for moisture control. The floor covering supplier or manufacturer will be contacted for their specifications for design features, which will result in a successful bond between the concrete slab and floor covering. Floor flatness and shrinkage crack control must be addressed by a competent contractor experienced in the skill of concrete placement. The owners or their agents shall inform those designing, building, and installing the concrete slab on grade and flooring of the performance and aesthetics expected. 4. The licensed geotechnical engineer shall be requested to inspect the footing excavation prior to placement of reinforcing steel and timber form boards. 5. Floor elevations located lower than the surrounding exterior grades are recommended to be protected from moisture intrusion. The project design engineer shall consider installation of features, such as waterproofing and French drains. **Foundations (Clubhouse)** 1. These recommendations assume the undisturbed native soil will support the proposed footings. If the final graded conditions positions part of the building over the compacted fill soil, extended footings and/or a pile and grade beam foundation may be required over the fill	

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	sections. The footing depth below the lowest adjacent grade shall be minimum of 24 inches. The soil encountered at this depth must be firm, non-porous, undisturbed native soil and the footing excavation must penetrate at least 12 inches into the firm soil. An allowable soil bearing value of 2,000 pounds per square foot may be assumed for the 24 inch deep footing described above with a one-third increase for wind or seismic forces. 2. Specification No. 1 shall apply at the basement foundation elevation and at the basement level a 20% increase in allowable soil bearing is allowed for each additional 6 inches of depth below the lowest adjacent grade, up to maximum allowable soil bearing value of 3,000 pounds per square foot. 3. Isolated piers may be utilized and shall extend a minimum of 24 inches below the lowest adjacent ground surface. 4. If footings are to be located on, adjacent to, or within 10 feet of the top of a slope, these footings shall extend to such a depth so that the horizontal distance between the bottom outside edge of the footing and the face of the adjacent slope is a minimum distance of 10 feet The slope setback required by the CBC, Figure 1808.7.1, shall also apply. **Foundations (Comfort Station)** 1. These recommendations assume a uniform thickness of compacted soil will support the proposed footings. 2. Isolated piers may be utilized and shall extend a minimum of 18 inches below compacted ground surface. 3. Based upon compliance with these recommendations, an allowable soil bearing value for compacted soil of 1,500 pounds per square foot for 12-inch-deep footings and 2,000 pounds per square foot for 18-inch-deep footings, with a one-third increase when considering wind or seismic forces, may be assumed. **Foundations (Rio Grande Coffee Shop)** 1. These recommendations assume a uniform thickness of compacted soil will support the proposed footings. 2. Footings below two-story portions of the structure shall extend 18 inches below compacted ground surface. 3. Isolated piers may be utilized and shall extend a minimum of 18 inches below compacted ground surface. 4. Based upon compliance with the above recommendations, an allowable soil bearing value for compacted soil of 1,300 pounds per square foot for 12-inch-deep footings and 1,500 pounds per square foot for 18-inch-deep footings, with a one-third increase when considering wind or seismic forces, may be assumed. **Pavement (Clubhouse)** 1. In the areas to be paved, the top loose surface soils shall be removed from below the proposed final soil subgrade elevation, moistened or dried to at or near the optimum moisture content, and compacted to 90 percent relative compaction with the top 9 inches being compacted to 95 percent relative compaction where pavement will be subject to vehicle travel or parking. The subgrade area shall be check rolled in order to detect isolated soft spots. Any areas found to be yielding under the wheel loads of the equipment shall be stabilized by removal and compaction. 2. The Class 2 aggregate base shall be recompacted to a minimum of 95 percent relative compaction in accordance with the ASTM D-1557 test method. Asphalt concrete shall be placed only after the Class 2 aggregate base has been demonstrated to be firm and unyielding. 3. If asphalt pavement is selected for the finished pavement surface, an R-Value of the subgrade soil shall be performed by a licensed geotechnical professional in order to provide appropriate thickness of Class 2 aggregate base and asphalt concrete. 4. Maintenance to assist in reducing the potential for rapid deterioration of the asphalt paved areas shall include surface treatment approximately six months to one year after construction and approximately three years from the first treatment. Pavement conditions shall be reviewed at least once a year for cracks, puddling of surface water, and overall appearance. This review should be done in the fall such that cracks may be repaired which may otherwise allow moisture to pass through the pavement and weaken the subgrade. 5. For concrete slab on grade pavements the slab shall be a minimum of 5.5 inches thick and be placed over a 4 inch thick layer of compacted Class 2 base (at 95 percent relative compaction) and shall be reinforced with No. 3 rebar at 24 inches on center each way and placed at the mid-height of the slab thickness. **Pavement (Rio Grande Coffee Shop)** 1. In the areas to be paved, the top loose surface soils shall be removed from below the proposed final soil subgrade elevation, moistened or dried to at or near the optimum moisture content, and compacted to 90 percent relative compaction with the top 9 inches being compacted to 95 percent relative compaction where pavement will be subject to vehicle travel or parking. The subgrade area shall be check rolled in order to detect isolated soft spots. Any areas found to be yielding under the wheel loads of the equipment shall be stabilized by removal and compaction. 2. The Class 2 aggregate base shall be recompacted to a minimum of 95 percent relative compaction in accordance with the ASTM D-1557 test method. Asphalt concrete shall be placed only after the Class 2 aggregate base has been demonstrated to be firm and unyielding.	

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	3. If asphalt pavement is selected for the finished pavement surface, an R-Value of the subgrade soil shall be performed by a licensed geotechnical professional in order to provide appropriate thickness of Class 2 aggregate base and asphalt concrete. 4. Maintenance to assist in reducing the potential for rapid deterioration of the asphalt paved areas shall include surface treatment approximately six months to one year after construction and approximately three years from the first treatment. Pavement conditions shall be reviewed at least once a year for cracks, puddling of surface water, and overall appearance. This review should be done in the fall such that cracks may be repaired which may otherwise allow moisture to pass through the pavement and weaken the subgrade. **Retaining Walls (Clubhouse)** The following retaining wall recommendations assume a single wall on level ground or a slope of less than 25 degrees. If there is more than one retaining wall, creating a multilevel terraced condition, the upper footing must be at a depth that passes below a 50 percent sloping line projected up from the top of the footing of the retaining wall below. **Cantilevered:** For cantilevered retaining walls, such as site walls and garden walls, which do not form part of the structure, the following shall apply: 1. The cantilevered retaining wall shall be designed assuming an active soil pressure equivalent to a fluid (EFP) whose weight is 35 pounds per cubic foot for level backfill conditions and 52 pounds per cubic foot for backfill slopes, which are constructed at an angle of up to 27 degrees. These values are based on Coulomb's Equation and the following assumed backfill soil values: internal angle of friction equal to 34 degrees, cohesion equal to 0, and a total unit weight of soil equal to 125 pounds per cubic foot. The EFP value does not include surcharge loads and is based on a free-draining condition. The free-draining condition must be created by placing the backfill specified in the *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed Club House*. 2. Retaining walls may be designed using pseudostatic analyses based on a modified Seed Whitman (1970) approach. The need to apply the lateral seismic load is to be determined by the project design engineer or by the building code. The seismic earth force was estimated using the modified Seed Whitman (1970) method, assuming a horizontal peak ground acceleration of 1.142g, and assuming drained backfill conditions. The peak horizontal ground acceleration (PGAm) was determined in accordance with Section 1803.5.12 of the 2019 CBC, Paragraph 2.2. The seismic earth resultant force (ΔPae), acting on the stem of the retaining wall, may be estimated as ΔPae = 34.4H2. The resultant force (ΔPae) may be assumed to act at 0.33H above the base of the wall2. Kh = 0.765. 3. The bottom of the retaining wall footing shall extend a minimum distance of 24 inches below the lowest adjacent undisturbed natural grade or 12 inches into firm, undisturbed original ground (whichever is deeper) and shall be designed assuming an allowable soil bearing value of 2,000 pounds per square foot. For footings placed on slopes, the base of the toe or keyway placed at the toe shall extend to such a depth that there exists 10 horizontal feet between the bottom of the footing and the daylight line of the adjacent slope. The key may be placed adjacent to the downhill edge of the retaining wall footing in order to attain the recommended downhill grade footing embedment. The slope setback required by the CBC, Figure 1808.7.1, shall also apply. 4. A passive soil pressure equivalent to a fluid whose weight is 350 pounds per cubic foot and a coefficient of friction against sliding of 0.35 may be assumed for the footing excavation described in the recommendation above. 5. The use of equipment to compact soil within the wedge of backfill defined by a 1:1 line projected up from behind the retaining wall to the surface shall be limited to handheld rammer plate compactors, such as a Wacker BS 45Y. A string line shall be placed along the top of the wall to monitor possible rotation of the wall due to the compaction surcharge. If the wall begins to bow or lean away from the backfilling operations, the compaction process shall stop and the licensed geotechnical professional shall be notified immediately such that modified compaction recommendations can be given at that time. 6. The finish covering on the face of the wall, such as stucco or paint, may be adversely affected by moisture intrusion from the backfill through the back of the wall. To prevent this, the back of the wall and footing shall be waterproofed. All waterproofing and application of waterproofing shall be in accordance with the specifications of the product supplier. 7. Retaining wall backfill shall be a clean, coarse sand or gravel wrapped in a filter fabric. The gravel shall be separated from adjacent native soil by a filter fabric. The retaining wall shall be serviced by appropriately placed weep holes or a perforated drain. This drainage feature must include at least 2 cubic feet of gravel wrapped in filter fabric. Lower quality native backfill material may be utilized outside the triangular wedge, which extends upwards from the inside edge of the retaining wall and is a minimum width of 60 percent of the wall height at ground surface. The sand between the wall and native soil shall have a Sand Equivalent of 20 or greater and an Expansion Index equal to 0. To avoid excessive amounts of sand and gravel backfill, the construction contractor is prohibited to cut a vertical excavation 2 to 4 feet beyond the back of the retaining wall footing or stem. Cuts shall only occur to the point needed to install the drainpipe and slope the excavation back as specified. 8. It is assumed that the rough grade excavation behind the retaining wall is to be cut at a temporary slope angle of 1 horizontal to 1 vertical in order to comply with Cal-OSHA safety requirements. 9. All soil backfill shall be compacted to a minimum of 90 percent relative compaction. It should be noted, retaining walls designed assuming active soil conditions are anticipated to deflect seasonally. In addition, surface features which obtain their support from retaining wall	

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact

backfill materials are anticipated to express differential movement with respect to the retaining wall as the wall may be resting upon a thinner depth of fill or undisturbed original ground, and the surface features may be resting upon a considerable thickness of compacted fill, which has settlement characteristics differing from that of original ground. The differential movement between the wall and slab patio may be undesirable. In order to hide or prevent such differential movement, an alternate design may be required, such as, but not limited to, placing a planter between the wall and slab, or connecting the slab to the wall, creating a retaining wall which is pinned at the top, not cantilevered.

Partially Restrained: For restrained or partially restrained retaining walls or cantilevered retaining walls which form a portion of the foundation system of the structure, the wall shall be designed as a braced wall utilizing at-rest pressures in accordance with the following recommendations:

1. The retaining wall shall be designed assuming an at-rest soil pressure equivalent to a fluid (EFP) whose weight is 60 pounds per cubic foot for level backfill conditions and 73 pounds per cubic foot for backfill slopes, which are constructed at an angle of up to 27 degrees. These values are based on the same assumed conditions stated in Recommendation No. 1 under the Cantilevered section. The at-rest condition for a level backfill is based on the following equation: $EFP=K_o\gamma$ where $K_o=1-\sin\phi$, γ is the total unit weight of soil, and ϕ is the internal angle of friction.
2. The retaining wall footing shall conform to the *Foundations* recommendations and may be designed assuming an allowable soil bearing value of 2,000 pounds per square foot. For footings placed on or adjacent to slopes, the base of the toe or keyway placed at the toe shall extend to such a depth that there exists 10 horizontal feet between the bottom of the footing and the daylight line of the adjacent slope.
3. A passive soil pressure equivalent to a fluid whose weight is 350 pounds per cubic foot and a coefficient of friction against sliding of 0.35 may be assumed for the footing excavation described in the recommendation above.
4. The retaining wall shall be serviced by a perforated drain which is located a minimum of 12 inches below top of the adjacent interior concrete slab-on-grade floor.
5. Walls, foundations, and connections between walls and foundations forming interior finished rooms of the structure shall be waterproofed by the proper application of a moisture barrier. All waterproofing products shall be applied in strict conformance with the manufacturer's recommendations.
6. It is assumed that the rough grade excavation behind the retaining wall is to be cut at a temporary slope angle of 1 horizontal to 1 vertical in order to comply with Cal-OSHA safety requirements.
7. Footings located near the retaining wall stem and in the zone of the granular backfill material shall extend through the retaining wall backfill, shall be supported on the firm underlying undisturbed ground, and below a 1 horizontal to 1 vertical line projected upward from the base of the wall; whichever is deeper. As an alternative, the footing can be designed to span across the backfill area and be supported by footings able to receive the reaction load of the spanning member. This may include tying into the retaining wall for support, if that portion of the retaining wall has been designed to receive the additional load.
8. Retaining wall backfill shall include 2 cubic feet per linear foot of wall of 3/8- to 1- inch gravel placed around a 4-inch perforated rigid PVC drainpipe. The perforations of the pipe shall be placed down at the positions of 5 and 7 o'clock. A filter fabric shall separate the gravel from the other backfill soils.
9. Retaining wall backfill above the drainpipe shall be a clean, coarse sand or gravel, creating an inverted triangular wedge. Lower quality native backfill material may be utilized outside the triangular wedge which extends upwards from the outside edge of the pipe/gravel at the base of the retaining wall and is a minimum width of 60 percent of the wall height at ground surface. Clean, coarse sand is acceptable when the Sand Equivalent is greater than 20 and the Expansion Index equals 0. To avoid excessive amounts of sand and gravel backfill, do not allow the excavation contractor to cut a vertical excavation 2 to 4 feet beyond the back of the retaining wall footing or stem. Cut only to the point needed to install the drainpipe and slope the excavation back as specified.
10. The use of equipment to compact soil within the wedge of backfill defined by a 1:1 line projected up from behind the retaining wall to the surface shall be limited to handheld rammer plate compactors, such as a Wacker BS 45Y. A string line shall be placed along the top of the wall to monitor possible rotation of the wall due to the compaction surcharge. If the wall begins to bow or lean away from the backfilling operations, the compaction process shall stop and the licensed geotechnical professional shall be notified immediately such that modified compaction recommendations can be given at that time.
11. The project design engineer designing the retaining wall shall address the following conditions:
    a. When a retaining wall is backfilled without a top restraint, such as a wood floor diaphragm, the stem of the retaining wall acts as a cantilever.
    b. Depending on the rigidity of the top restraint, the wall may act as a beam spanning between the top and bottom points, reversing the tension side of the stem to the front of the wall as opposed to the back as in the case of a cantilever condition.
    c. Structure members deflect when loaded. The users guide to the widely used computer program RetainPro recommends the deflection of the wall be checked because the program does not calculate deflection. Refer to Section 9 titled “Related Design Considerations” in the manual titled “Basics of Retaining Wall Design”, Page 50. As an estimate, the Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute (CRSI) manual estimates

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	concrete reinforced stems of cantilevered retaining walls will deflect a horizontal distance at the top of the wall equal to the height of the wall divided by 240. The appropriate deflection equation and values corresponding to load, condition, and material shall be employed to determine the deflection corresponding to the lateral loads recommended herein such that appropriate connections, tiebacks, bracing, or construction joints can be placed within the structural design to properly account for the deflection. The total deflection may not occur during the backfilling operation, but rather sometime after the frame structure is built over and adjacent to the retaining wall. **Adjacent Loads (General)** 1. Where footings are placed at varying elevations, the effect of adjacent loads will be calculated using the widely published Formulas for Stresses in Semi-infinite Elastic Foundations or the Boussinesq figures and equations for both vertical and horizontal surcharge loads. **Settlement (General)** 1. It is the intent of the recommendations contained in this report to achieve angular distortions of approximately 1/480. A total settlement of approximately 1 inch or less is anticipated for foundations supported on the undisturbed native soil and approximately 1 percent to 1.5 percent of the fill height is the anticipated total settlement at areas where compacted fill soil is placed in accordance with the *Grading* measures provided in this mitigation measure. The soil bearing values and estimated settlements contained in this report are preliminary and can be modified after the foundation and grading plans are substantially complete. **Plan Requirements and Timing.** Grading and building plans shall be submitted for review and approval by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee before the City issues a Zoning Clearance for the grading and building permits. The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall approve the licensed geotechnical professional prior to the start of construction. The licensed geotechnical professional shall submit the report to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee certifying the recommendations have been incorporated prior to the issuance of a certification of occupancy. **Monitoring.** Once during the grading phase of construction, the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall visit the project site to confirm with the licensed geotechnical professional that the construction contractor is implementing the applicable geotechnical recommendations.	
Impact GEO-3. Soils underlying the proposed clubhouse, Rio Grande Coffee Shop, and comfort station have very low liquefaction potential. Compliance with the CBC would ensure the proposed project would minimize the risk of loss, injury, or death involving liquefaction. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact GEO-4. Portions of the project site have high landslide potential. However, the project would not place structures in these areas and would not create substantial slopes which could otherwise exacerbate on-site landslide risk. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact GEO-5. On-site development has the potential to increase erosion during and after construction. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure construction and operation of the proposed project would minimize the potential for the project to cause substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact GEO-6. The project site is not at risk of substantial lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Implementation of California Building Code requirements into project design would ensure the potential for the proposed project to result in risks related to unstable geologic and soil units is minimized. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact GEO-7. Project site soils have a very low expansion potential, and proposed project facilities would be constructed in accordance with the requirements of the California Building Code, which would minimize the potential for structural hazards associated with expansive soils. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact GEO-8. The proposed project would include the abandonment of the on-site septic tank system and would not require the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No impact would occur.	None required.	No impact.

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
Impact GEO-9. Project ground-disturbing activities would occur on geologic units with a high potential to contain paleontological resources. With implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-2 the proposed project's construction impact on paleontological resources and unique geologic features would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operation of the proposed project would be similar to existing conditions and impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	**GEO-2: Paleontological Resources Impact Plan and Monitoring** Prior to the commencement of any grading activities, the project applicant shall retain a qualified professional paleontologist as defined in the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's *Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources* (2010). The qualified professional paleontologist shall prepare a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program consistent with the guidance provided in the *Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources*. The Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program shall be reviewed and approved by the City's Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee prior to the issuance of a Zoning Clearance for a grading permit. The Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program shall include, but not be limited to, the following: ▪ **Worker Environmental Awareness Program Training.** The qualified professional paleontologist shall conduct WEAP training for construction personnel regarding the appearance of fossils and the procedures for notifying paleontological staff should fossils be discovered by construction staff. A basic presentation shall be prepared and presented by the qualified professional paleontologist to inform all construction personnel working on the project about the paleontological sensitivity of the area. Each worker shall also learn the proper procedures to follow in the event paleontological resources or unique geologic features are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities. These procedures include halting construction and resource assessment. If new construction personnel are added to the project, the construction contractor shall ensure the new personnel receive the training before starting work. The qualified professional paleontologist shall ensure construction personnel sign a form affirming they received WEAP training. The qualified professional paleontologist shall submit this form to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee. ▪ **Monitoring.** The qualified professional paleontologist shall identify the locations on the project site where paleontological monitoring is required. The qualified professional paleontologist, or a paleontological resource monitor designated by the qualified professional paleontologist, shall observe initial grading and drilling activities on-site in areas underlain by late Pleistocene marine terrace deposits, the Sisquoc Formation, and the Monterey Formation. No monitoring is required for ground disturbing activities in areas of artificial fill, subject to the discretion of the qualified professional paleontologist. ▪ **Discovery of Paleontological Resources.** In the event that fossils are unearthed during grading, the qualified professional paleontologist or designated paleontological resource monitor will temporarily halt and/or divert grading activity within a 50-foot radius of the find to allow for recovery of the resource. ▫ **Fossil Salvage.** The qualified professional paleontologist shall salvage (i.e., excavate and recover) the fossil to protect it from damage/destruction. Bulk matrix sampling may be necessary to recover small invertebrates or micro vertebrates from paleontologically sensitive deposits. After the fossil(s) is (are) salvaged, construction activity may resume. ▫ **Fossil Preparation and Curation**. Fossils shall be identified to the lowest (i.e., most-specific) possible taxonomic level, prepared to a curation-ready condition, and curated in a scientific institution with a permanent paleontological collection along with all pertinent field notes, photos, maps, and data required by the curating institution. Fossils of undetermined significance at the time of collection may also warrant curation at the discretion of the qualified professional paleontologist. ▫ **Final Paleontological Mitigation Report.** Upon completion of ground-disturbing activities (or laboratory preparation and curation of fossils, if necessary), the qualified professional paleontologist shall prepare a final report describing the results of the paleontological monitoring efforts. The report shall include a summary of the field and laboratory methods employed; an overview of project geology; and, if fossils were discovered, an analysis of the fossils, including physical description, taxonomic identification, and scientific significance. The report shall be submitted to the City's Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee and, if fossil curation occurred, the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History. **Plan Requirements and Timing.** The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall approve the Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program prior to the issuance of a Zoning Clearance for a grading permit. The qualified professional paleontologist shall conduct WEAP training prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities and submit the signed form to the Planning and Environmental Review Director within 24 hours following the completion of WEAP training. The qualified professional paleontologist or designated paleontological resource monitor shall observe initial grading and drilling activities throughout construction on-site in areas underlain by late Pleistocene marine terrace deposits, the Sisquoc Formation, and the Monterey Formation. If a fossil is discovered, the qualified professional paleontologist shall submit the Final Paleontological Mitigation Report to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee within 90 days of completion of salvage and preparation. If curation occurred, the qualified professional paleontologist shall also submit the Final Paleontological Mitigation Report to the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History. **Monitoring.** The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall review and approve the form provided by the qualified professional paleontologist certifying WEAP training was completed. The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall confirm the qualified professional paleontologist or designated paleontological resource monitor observed grading and drilling activities. The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall review and approve the Final Paleontological Mitigation Report, if applicable.	Construction impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative geology and soils impacts would be less than significant. Cumulative impacts to paleontological resources would be potentially significant, but the proposed project's contribution would not be considerable with implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-2.	None required beyond project-level mitigation measures.	Cumulative impacts to geology and soils would be less than significant. Cumulative impacts to paleontological resources would be potentially significant. The project's contribution would not be considerable.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions		
Impact GHG-1. The proposed project's construction and operation greenhouse gas emissions would not exceed the threshold of 2.63 metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent per year per employee. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact GHG-2. Construction and operation of the proposed project would be consistent with applicable plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, including the 2022 Scoping Plan, 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, and City of Goleta's Climate Action Plan. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Cumulative Impacts. The project would not exceed the County of Santa Barbara greenhouse gas thresholds, nor conflict with greenhouse gas reduction plans. Therefore, the project would not have a considerable contribution to cumulative greenhouse gas impacts.	None required.	Cumulative impacts would be potentially significant. The project's contribution would not be considerable.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
Impact HAZ-1. Construction and operation of the proposed project would involve the transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. However, all hazardous materials would be transported, used, and disposed of in compliance with existing federal, State, and local regulations. Proposed project impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact HAZ-2. Construction and operation of the proposed project could result in the accidental release of hazardous materials through demolition of the existing clubhouse and comfort station, restoration of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, grading of potentially contaminated soils, and future environmental impacts related to potential oil well contamination. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6 would reduce impacts to Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.	**HAZ-1: Asbestos Containing Materials Abatement.** Prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance associated with the demolition permit, the project applicant shall prepare an asbestos abatement plan addressing the items/topics listed below. The asbestos abatement plan shall be reviewed and approved by SBCAPCD. Proof of SBCAPCD approval shall be provided to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee. During project construction and demolition activities, the project applicant shall follow the measures outlined in the asbestos abatement plan, which shall be undertaken by properly trained and licensed asbestos contractors currently registered with Cal/OSHA and/or OSHA (herein referred to as "abatement contractors"). Abatement contractors shall be selected and vetted by the project applicant and reviewed by SBCAPCD ten working days prior to starting demolition as part of the Notification for Renovation and Demolition Form ENF-28 submittal. Project-specific requirements to be addressed in the asbestos abatement plan include the following: ▪ Disturbance activities shall be performed only by abatement contractors using appropriate controls to prevent fiber emissions during the removal process. This may include, but is not limited to, the use of wet methods (water mist), negative pressure containment, high efficiency particulate air filtration, and other engineering controls, as deemed appropriate, to keep fibers from being dispersed in accordance with current federal, State, and local regulations. Presumed asbestos containing roofing materials shall be sampled by abatement contractors prior to demolition to determine proper handling and disposal requirements. ▪ Windows with trace (defined as less than 1 percent) asbestos in putty shall be removed intact to avoid disturbance of the putty, if possible. Other materials with trace asbestos shall be point counted to determine the asbestos concentrations; if asbestos concentrations are not determined, these materials shall be managed as ACMs. ▪ Workers performing removal shall be properly protected to prevent exposure, including the use of respiratory protection with high efficiency particulate air filtration, protective suits, or other protective equipment deemed necessary by abatement contractors. Disturbance of greater than 100 square feet of any ACMs or asbestos-containing construction materials must be performed by trained and licensed abatement contractors. ▪ Asbestos containing waste materials must be properly contained and transported for off-site disposal at a permitted landfill or disposal facility. Friable asbestos with greater than 1 percent asbestos content is considered hazardous waste per current federal and State regulations and must be transported and disposed of using proper manifest documentation. Non-friable asbestos is categorized as non-	Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	hazardous, asbestos containing waste and can typically be disposed to the local Class III landfill with prior approval from landfill operators. As noted, materials with less than 1 percent total asbestos can be disposed of as construction debris if proper lab analysis is provided. ▪ Proper removal techniques must be followed to prevent the dissemination of asbestos fibers. All required notification and permitting shall be administered by the abatement contractor, and proper completion shall be verified by the City's Director of Planning and Environmental Review. ▪ If suspect materials are found during site work, the area shall be isolated, and any suspect materials tested to confirm or deny the presence of asbestos, lead, or other hazards, as determined appropriate by the abatement contractor. **Plan Requirements and Timing.** The project applicant shall prepare the asbestos abatement plan, obtain SBCAPCD's approval, and contract with an abatement contractor prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance associated with the demolition permit. **Monitoring.** The City of Goleta's Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, shall verify SBCAPCD has approved the asbestos abatement plan prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance. The City of Goleta's Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, shall spot-check compliance with the asbestos abatement plan during demolition activities and verify compliance documentation following the proposed project's demolition activities. **HAZ-2: Lead-Based Paint Abatement** Prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance associated with the demolition permit, the project applicant shall prepare an LBP abatement plan. This plan can be combined with the plan required in Mitigation Measure HAZ-1. The LBP abatement plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee. During proposed project construction and demolition activities, the project applicant shall follow the measures outlined in the LBP abatement plan. These requirements shall be undertaken by properly trained contractors that utilize lead-safe work practices (or "abatement contractors"). Abatement contractors shall be selected and vetted by the project applicant and reviewed by the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director. Prior to abatement, the applicant shall notify CDPH of lead-based abatement activities through submittal of CDPH Form 8551, and provide evidence of the notification to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee. Project-specific requirements of the LBP abatement plan include the following: ▪ Any disturbance by abatement contractors that might generate dust or create a lead exposure hazard shall be performed by lead-trained workers using lead-safe work practices. Lead safe work practices include appropriate containment, wet methods, and use of hand tools or similar methods that will minimize the generation of airborne dust emissions and potential lead hazards. ▪ To prevent lead exposure hazard due to the generation of lead dust and debris, lead-painted components (e.g., windows, doors, baseboards) or similar lead-containing items shall be removed intact and segregated from the overall waste stream by abatement contractors. ▪ Lead-containing waste is classified as hazardous waste if total lead concentration exceeds 1,000 milligrams per kilogram (or parts per million) or if soluble lead concentration exceeds 5.0 milligrams per liter. Proper waste characterization testing or waste profiling shall be conducted prior to disposal of lead containing waste. If practicable, lead wastes shall be segregated to minimize the volume of possible hazardous waste. If lead-containing and non-lead waste materials are comingled during demolition, composite samples of representative waste shall be analyzed by a certified lab to determine proper disposal requirements. **Plan Requirements and Timing.** The project applicant shall prepare the LBP abatement plan, notify CDPH, and contract with an abatement contractor prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance associated with the demolition permit. **Monitoring.** The City of Goleta's Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, shall approve the LBP abatement plan and verify CDPH has been notified prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance. The City of Goleta's Director of Planning and Environmental Review, or designee, shall check the abatement contractor's monitoring log to ensure project-specific recommendations are enacted during proposed project demolition activities. **HAZ-3: Corrective Action Plan/Soil and Groundwater Management Plan Revision** Prior to commencement of grading activities at the project site, the project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant approved by Santa Barbara County EHS to revise the existing CAP/SGMP prepared for the project site such that the CAP/SGMP addresses potential contamination in the maintenance yard, and addresses Santa Barbara County EHS's comments on the CAP/SGMP. The revised CAP/SGMP shall address: 1. On-site handling and management of impacted soils or other impacted wastes (e.g., stained soil, and soil or groundwater with solvent or chemical odors) if such soils or impacted wastes are encountered; 2. The notification process if an unknown well or leaking well is discovered (e.g., notification of the Santa Barbara County Petroleum Unit, as well as the California Department of Conservation Geologic Energy Management Division); and, 3. Specific actions to reduce hazards to construction workers and off-site receptors during the construction phase.	

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	The CAP/SGMP must establish engineering controls and soil management practices to ensure construction worker safety, ensure the health of future workers and visitors, and prevent the off-site migration of contaminants from the proposed project. These measures and practices shall include, but are not limited to: ▪ Stockpile management, including stormwater pollution prevention and the installation of best management practices. ▪ Proper disposal procedures of contaminated materials. ▪ Investigation procedures for encountering known and unexpected odorous or visually stained soils, other indications of hydrocarbon piping or equipment, and/or debris during ground-disturbing activities. ▪ Monitoring and reporting. ▪ An environmental health and safety plan for contractors working at the project site that addresses the safety and health hazards of each phase of site construction activities with the requirements and procedures for employee protection. ▪ The environmental health and safety plan shall outline proper soil handling procedures and health and safety requirements to minimize worker and public exposure to hazardous materials during construction. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review the CAP/SGMP and have the authority to propose and include modifications prior to submittal to Santa Barbara County EHS. Santa Barbara County EHS shall review and approve the CAP/SGMP prior to construction (demolition and grading) activities at the project site. The project applicant shall submit proof of Santa Barbara County EHS's approval of the CAP/SGMP to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to construction activities. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall verify Santa Barbara County EHS's approval of the CAP/SGMP and shall review the final CAP/SGMP prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The project applicant shall implement the CAP/SGMP during demolition, grading, and construction at the project site. **Plan Requirements and Timing.** Prior to commencement of construction and grading activities at the project site, the project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant approved by Santa Barbara County EHS to revise the existing CAP/SGMP prepared for the proposed project. The project applicant shall submit proof of Santa Barbara County EHS' approval of the CAP/SGMP to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to construction activities. The project applicant shall implement the CAP/SGMP during demolition, grading, and construction at the project site. **Monitoring.** The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review the CAP/SGMP and have the authority to propose and include modifications prior to submittal to Santa Barbara County EHS. Once Santa Barbara County EHS has reviewed the CAP/SGMP, the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall verify Santa Barbara County EHS' approval of the CAP/SGMP and that Santa Barbara County EHS's comments on the CAP/SGMP have been appropriately addressed by the qualified environmental consultant. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review the final CAP/SGMP prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance of construction or grading permits, and shall review project construction plans to ensure applicable recommendations from the CAP/SGMP are integrated into construction plans. **HAZ-4: Sub-slab Vapor Mitigation System** Where soil vapor is known and is identified to be present at chemical concentrations exceeding regulatory screening thresholds for sub-slab/soil vapor intrusion, the project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant (PG or PE) or other qualified person to prepare a Sub-slab Vapor Mitigation System Design for the proposed project. The plan shall include, but is not limited to, design specifications, material specifications, installation requirements, and monitoring requirements. Santa Barbara County EHS shall review and approve the Sub-slab Vapor Mitigation System Design prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for building permits. The project applicant shall incorporate a sub-slab vapor barrier into the project's building plans, the implementation of which shall prevent the potential for soil vapor VOCs from migrating to indoor air. The project's building plans, which shall include engineering measures or institutional controls, shall be submitted by the qualified environmental consultant to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for building permits. **Plan Requirements and Timing.** The project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant (PG or PE) or other qualified person to prepare a Sub-slab Vapor Mitigation System Design for the proposed project prior to construction. The project applicant shall incorporate a sub-slab vapor barrier during construction. **Monitoring.** Santa Barbara County EHS shall review and approve the Sub-slab Vapor Mitigation System Design prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for building permits. The qualified environmental consultant shall submit the project's building plans, which shall include engineering measures or institutional controls, to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for building permits. **HAZ-5: Groundwater Disposal** If disposal of contaminated groundwater is required during construction of the proposed project, Santa Barbara County EHS shall be consulted to determine if the treated groundwater can be disposed of through one of their waste discharge permit options. Based on the concentrations	

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	of chemical constituents of contaminated groundwater, an individual NPDES permit and/or waste discharge requirements may be required to be obtained for dewatering activities. If disposal of contaminated groundwater is required, proof of consultation with Santa Barbara County EHS and compliance with Santa Barbara County EHS's disposal requirements shall be submitted to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director. **Plan Requirements and Timing.** If dewatering is required, the project applicant shall consult with Santa Barbara County EHS and provide proof of consultation and compliance with EHS's disposal requirements to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance. **Monitoring.** If disposal of contaminated groundwater is required, the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall verify consultation with Santa Barbara County EHS and compliance with Santa Barbara County EHS's disposal requirements has occurred prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance. **HAZ-6: Well Access for Service or Reabandonment** The property owner shall grant access to all wells located on the project site to any public agency or legal inheritor of the wells for the purposes of inspection, maintenance, service, or reabandonment such that future remediation or abandonment of existing wells is not impeded by project-related redevelopment. This access shall be maintained in perpetuity and shall not be restricted by any physical or legal barriers resulting from project construction or operation. **Plan Requirements and Timing.** Prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit, the project applicant shall provide documentation to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director demonstrating that the property owner has agreed to grant access to all wells on the project site to any public agency or legal inheritor of the wells for the purposes of inspection, maintenance, service, or reabandonment. This documentation shall also reference the indemnification provisions outlined in the Condition of Approval. **Monitoring.** The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall verify that the required documentation has been submitted and that it includes provisions for both access and indemnification prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.	
Impact HAZ-3. The proposed project would involve the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of the Ellwood School. Following the implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6, the construction impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. The Operational Impact would be Class III, less than significant.	Implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6 is required.	Construction and operational impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
Impact HAZ-4. The proposed project would be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Ground disturbance during construction of the proposed project may result in exposure to contaminated soil or groundwater, which would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Following implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-3 through HAZ-7, the proposed project's construction and operational impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.	Implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-3 through HAZ-7 is required. **HAZ-7: Regulatory Agency Notification and Oversight** Given the project site is listed as an open Santa Barbara County EHS Cleanup Program Site (EHS case #375) and a closed LUST Cleanup Site (EHS case #51238, Central Coast RWQCB case #213), the EHS case #375, EHS case #51238, and Central Coast RWQCB case #213 shall continue to be utilized for agency oversight of assessment and remediation of the project site. The project applicant shall submit the following documents to the Santa Barbara County EHS project manager of the open Cleanup Program Site case, and the Santa Barbara County EHS and Central Coast RWQCB project managers of the closed LUST Cleanup Site case. The Santa Barbara County EHS project manager and Central Coast RWQCB project manager shall review and approve the following documents prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit at the project site: ▪ Current development plan (e.g., architectural drawings and project description) and any modifications to the development plan ▪ All environmental assessment documents completed for the project site, including the Environmental Impact Report for the Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project (this EIR) ▪ All future hazardous material reports completed for the project site Upon submittal of the listed information, and in accordance with the regulatory agency's voluntary oversight agreement, the regulatory agency may require additional actions such as: development of subsurface investigation workplans; completion of additional soil, soil vapor, and/or groundwater subsurface investigations; installation of soil vapor or groundwater monitoring wells; soil excavation and off-site disposal; completion of human health risk assessments; and/or completion of remediation reports or case closure documents. The project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant (PG or PE) to conduct any required subsurface soil, soil vapor, groundwater investigations, or human health risk assessments in accordance with a sampling plan that shall be reviewed and approved by the regulatory agency. In the event the regulatory agency identifies the need for installation of soil vapor or groundwater monitoring wells to reduce potential hazards to the public or the environment, the project applicant shall identify soil vapor or groundwater monitoring wells on the final project plans for review and approval by the regulatory agency. In the event the regulatory agency identifies the need for soil excavation and off-site disposal to reduce potential hazards to the public or the environment, the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall review the final grading plans to ensure soil excavation and off-site disposal are included, and shall approve the final grading plans prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. If required workplans, investigations, or other mitigation actions require regulatory agency remediation reports or case closure documents, the qualified environmental consultant shall submit these	Construction impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	documents to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. The project applicant shall also provide proof of Santa Barbara County EHS's and Central Coast RWQCB's approval of the current development plan, environmental assessment documents, hazardous material reports, and additional workplans, investigations, human health risk assessments, remediation reports, or case closure documents (as applicable) to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. **Plan Requirements and Timing.** Prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit at the project site, the project applicant shall submit the abovementioned documents to the Santa Barbara County EHS project manager of the open Cleanup Program Site case, and the Santa Barbara County EHS and Central Coast RWQCB project managers of the closed LUST Cleanup Site case. Prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit, the project applicant shall also retain a qualified environmental consultant to conduct any required subsurface soil, soil vapor, groundwater investigations, or human health risk assessments in accordance with a sampling plan that shall be reviewed and approved by Santa Barbara County EHS or the Central Coast RWQCB. **Monitoring.** If required workplans, investigations, or other mitigation actions require regulatory agency remediation reports or case closure documents, the qualified environmental consultant shall submit these documents to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee for review and approval prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit.	
Impact HAZ-5. The project site is located outside of the safety and noise contours for the Santa Barbara Airport. The proposed project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise related to airport operations for people residing or working in the project area. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact HAZ-6. Implementation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan would reduce the potential for construction to result in substantial disruption to evacuation on Hollister Avenue during construction. Proposed project operation would not result in impairment or interference with emergency response or evacuation plans. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact HAZ-7. Implementation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan would reduce the potential for construction to result in substantial disruption to evacuation on Hollister Avenue during construction. Proposed project operation would not result in impairment or interference with emergency response or evacuation plans. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be Class III, less than significant.	None required beyond project-level mitigation measures.	Cumulative impacts would be less than significant.
Hydrology and Water Quality		
Impact HYD-1. Construction of the proposed project could degrade water quality through discharge of hazardous materials, contaminated groundwater, or during work within Devereaux Creek. This impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Project operation would comply with Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements, City Municipal Code requirements, and County requirements, and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	Implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-4, HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5 is required. **HYD-1: Dry Season Construction in Devereaux Creek** Prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit, the project applicant shall include within the construction contract the requirement that work related to culvert removal and bridge installation and maintenance at Devereaux Creek must occur during the dry season (June 1 to October 15) when water flows are low. The construction contractor shall only conduct work related to culvert removal and bridge installation/maintenance at Devereaux Creek during the dry season. **Plan Requirements and Timing.** The construction contract shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for the grading permit. During construction, the construction contractor shall schedule culvert removal and bridge installation to occur during the dry season. The construction contractor shall provide the Planning and Environmental Review Director with a minimum of a 7-day notice for when culvert removal and bridge installation are scheduled to occur. **Monitoring.** The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall visit the site during scheduled culvert removal and bridge installation to confirm such activities are taking place during the dry season.	Construction impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.
Impact HYD-2. The proposed project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge due to the minimal increase in impervious surfaces and the absence of on-site groundwater extraction. Temporary and localized dewatering during construction, if needed, would not result in substantial groundwater loss, and operational water demands would be met within existing allocations under the Wright Judgement. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
Impact HYD-3. The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or surrounding area in a way that would result in substantial erosion or siltation. Construction would include a SWPPP and BMPs to control sedimentation, while project operation would include bioretention basins, drought-tolerant landscaping, and smart irrigation systems that reduce runoff and erosion potential. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact HYD-4. The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site in a way that could result in on- or off-site flooding. Construction would include a SWPPP and BMPs to manage runoff, while project operation would reduce peak stormwater flows through bioretention basins and remove a culvert to improve creek flow conditions. Construction and operational impacts related to flooding would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact HYD-5. The proposed project could introduce additional sources of polluted runoff during construction due to activities such as hazardous materials handling, groundwater dewatering, and work within Devereaux Creek. This impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant, due to reduced turf areas, stormwater treatment through bioretention basins, and decreased use of fertilizers and pesticides.	Implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-4, HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5 are required.	Construction impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.
Impact HYD-6. The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site in a way that could impede or redirect flood flows. All proposed structures would be located outside of designated special flood hazard areas, and the removal of the culvert within Devereaux Creek would improve flow conditions rather than obstruct them. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact HYD-7. The proposed project would not risk the release of pollutants due to inundation from flooding, tsunami, or seiche events. All proposed structures, including those storing hazardous materials, would be located outside designated flood and tsunami hazard areas, and hazardous materials would be stored in compliance with regulatory requirements. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact HYD-8. Construction activities could temporarily degrade water quality in Devereaux and Bell Canyon Creeks due to pollutant discharges, conflicting with the Basin Plan. This impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operation of the proposed project would reduce pollutant loads through bioretention basins and decreased chemical use, and would not interfere with groundwater basin management. Operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	Implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-4, HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5 are required.	Construction impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.
Cumulative Impacts. The proposed project's contribution to cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts would not be considerable with implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-4, HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5.	None required beyond project-level mitigation measures.	Cumulative impacts would be potentially significant. The project's contribution would not be considerable.
Land Use and Planning		
Impact LU-1. The proposed project would consist of renovation of the Sandpiper Golf Club and would not include new components, such as roads, that could physically divide an established community. The proposed project would improve local connectivity through the construction of sidewalks and trails along Hollister Avenue. There would be no impact.	None required.	No impact.
Impact LU-2. The proposed project would be consistent with the Goleta Municipal Code and the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan. The proposed project would conflict with the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan but such conflict would not result in a significant environmental impact. With implementation of mitigation, the project would be consistent with applicable Goleta General Plan policies. This impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation.	Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-11, CUL-1 through CUL-4, HYD-1, NOI-1, TCR-1, TCR-2, and UTIL-1 are required.	Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative land use and planning impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
Noise		
Impact NOI-1. Short-term construction of the project would temporarily increase local noise levels that may exceed Goleta's construction noise standard of 65 dBA. Through implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.	**NOI-1: Construction Noise Reduction** The construction contractor shall prepare and submit a Construction Noise Control Plan to the City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee for review and approval prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for a grading permit/demolition permit. The Construction Noise Control Plan shall specify the noise reduction measures to be implemented during project construction that uses heavy-duty equipment within 400 feet of residences, which may include improvements to the golf course (e.g., grading of the course), maintenance yard, Barnsdall area, and Hollister Avenue to ensure noise levels do not exceed 65 dBA at nearby sensitive receptors at the nearest residences. The measures specified in the Construction Noise Control Plan shall be included on the building and grading plans and shall be implemented by the construction contractor during construction. Measures in the Construction Noise Control Plan may include, but would not be limited to, the following: ▪ Prior to the start of and for the duration of construction, the contractor shall properly maintain and tune all construction equipment in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations to minimize noise emissions. ▪ Prior to use of any construction equipment, the contractor shall fit all equipment with properly operating mufflers, air intake silencers, and engine shrouds no less effective than as originally equipped by the manufacturer. ▪ Staging and delivery areas shall be located as far as feasible from existing residences. ▪ Installation of temporary sound barriers/blankets to break the line of sight between construction equipment and residences within 400 feet of heavy-duty equipment operation. The barriers shall be constructed with a solid material that has a density of at least 1.5 pounds per square foot with no gaps from the ground to the top of the barrier. ▪ To the extent consistent with applicable safety regulations, trucks operating with reverse motions alarms shall be outfitted with SAE J994 Class D or equivalent alarms (ambient-adjusting, or "smart alarms" that automatically adjust the alarm to 5 dBA above the ambient near the operating equipment), or switch off back-up alarms and replace with human spotters in compliance with all safety requirements and laws. ▪ A construction notification sign shall be posted at the job site, clearly visible to the public, that includes permitted construction days and hours, as well as the telephone numbers of the City of Goleta's and the contractor's authorized representatives that are assigned to respond in the event of a noise complaint. ▪ If the authorized contractor's representative receives a complaint, either City code enforcement or a contractor-retained and Goleta-approved noise consultant shall conduct noise measurements at the properties that registered the complaint. The noise measurements shall be conducted for a minimum of one hour to determine if noise levels are compliant with City's 65 dBA standard. The consultant shall prepare a letter report for code enforcement summarizing the measurements, calculation data used in determining impacts, and potential measures to reduce noise levels to the maximum extent feasible. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall approve the Construction Noise Control Plan prior to issuance of the zoning clearance for the grading permit/demolition permit. The measures specified in the Construction Noise Control Plan shall be included on the building and grading plans. Monitoring: The City shall monitor compliance with the requirements of the Construction Noise Control Plan periodically during construction and shall promptly investigate and respond to all noise complaints.	Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
Impact NOI-2. The project would include mechanical equipment that would increase noise levels during project operation. However, noise levels generated during project operation would not exceed the City's noise thresholds at the nearest properties. Impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact NOI-3. Project construction and operation would generate new vehicle trips that would increase noise levels on nearby roadways. Project construction and operation would not result in a traffic noise increase of 3 dBA or more. Impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact NOI-4. Project construction would result in groundborne vibration in the project site vicinity and potentially cause damage to the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. This impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. The proposed project would not involve substantial vibration sources associated with operation, and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	**NOI-2: Construction Vibration Reduction Measures** Prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for grading and building permit, the City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall verify that the construction plans include the following requirements: ▪ For paving activities within 42 feet of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, a static roller shall be used in lieu of a vibratory roller. ▪ For grading and earthwork activities within 20 feet of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, off-road equipment shall be limited to 100 horsepower or less. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee shall confirm the requirements are included on the grading and building permits prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance for grading and building permits. **Monitoring:** The City shall monitor compliance with the requirements of the vibration reduction measure periodically during grading and construction activities within 50 feet of Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station.	Construction impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
Impact NOI-5. The project site is located outside of the noise contours for the Santa Barbara Airport. The project would not result in exposure of people working in the area to excessive airport noise levels. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative impacts related to construction noise and vibration and stationary operational noise would be Class III, less than significant. Cumulative traffic noise impacts would be potentially significant, but the proposed project's contribution would not be considerable.	None required beyond project-level mitigation measures.	Cumulative impacts related to construction noise, vibration, and stationary operational noise would be less than significant. Cumulative impacts related to traffic noise would be potentially significant. The project's contribution would not be considerable.
Parks and Recreation		
Impact REC-1. The proposed project could indirectly induce population growth, but the resulting growth would not generate a substantial increase in the use of existing parks and recreational facilities or the substantial physical deterioration or need for the construction of park and recreation facilities. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact REC-2. The project includes the construction of recreational facilities, the potential environmental impacts of which are identified and evaluated throughout this Environmental Impact Report. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative impacts related to parks and recreation would be potentially significant, but the proposed project's contribution would not be considerable.	None required.	Cumulative impacts would be potentially significant. The project's contribution would not be considerable.
Public Services		
Impact PS-1. The project would not increase the demand for fire protection services such that new or physically altered fire protection facilities would be needed to adequately maintain service ratios. The project site's proximity to existing facilities would not necessitate the provisions of new or physically altered fire protection facilities. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact PS-2. The project would not increase the demand for police protection services such that new or physically altered police protection facilities would be needed. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact PS-3. The project would not substantially increase the amount of students in GUSD or SBUSD such that new or physically altered school facilities would be needed. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact PS-4. The project would not substantially increase demand for libraries such that new or physically altered library facilities would be needed. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative impacts related to public services would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Cumulative impacts would be less than significant.
Transportation and Circulation		
Impact TRA-1. The proposed project would be consistent with the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. The proposed project would conflict with the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan but such conflict would not result in a significant environmental impact. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
Impact TRA-2. The proposed project would reduce vehicle miles traveled associated with use of the golf course, and the proposed project's clubhouse restaurant and Rio Grande Coffee Shop are presumed by the City to have a less than significant impact on vehicle miles traveled. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b), and construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact TRA-3. The proposed project would not substantially increase hazards in accordance with local regulations and review from the City and Santa Barbara County Fire Department Standards. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact TRA-4. The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access in accordance with local regulations and review from the City and Santa Barbara County Fire Department Standards. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative impacts related to conflicts with circulation-related policies, emergency access, and vehicle miles traveled are potentially significant, but the proposed project's contribution would not be considerable.	None required.	Cumulative impacts would be potentially significant. The project's contribution would not be considerable.
Tribal Cultural Resources		
Impact TCR-1. The project may result in a potentially significant impact to tribal cultural resources through ground disturbance during project construction. Following implementation of Mitigation Measures TCR-1, TCR-2, and CUL-2 through CUL-4, construction impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operation of the proposed project would be similar to existing conditions and impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	Mitigation Measures CUL-2, CUL-3, and CUL-4 are required. **TCR-1: Native American Monitoring** At least 30 days prior to the commencement of project-related ground-disturbing activities, including, but not limited to, site clearing, grubbing, trenching, and excavation, the project applicant shall secure a tribal monitoring agreement with Native American Tribes. Should more than one of the Tribes wish to provide monitoring for the project, they may do so on a rotating basis to provide equal representation onsite during ground-disturbing activities. The tribal monitoring agreement shall be consistent with the processes and procedures outlined in the Cultural Resource Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan (Plan) prepared under Mitigation Measure CUL-1, and the project applicant shall submit the tribal monitoring agreement to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to the commencement of project-related ground-disturbing activities. The Native American monitor(s) shall have the authority to temporarily divert, redirect, or halt ground-disturbing activities to allow recovery of cultural resources, in coordination with the qualified archaeologist retained under Mitigation Measure CUL-2. The project applicant shall notify the retained Native American monitor(s) of scheduled ground disturbance at least five business days in advance. Work may proceed if the retained Native American monitor(s) are unavailable at the time of ground disturbance. Native American monitoring may be reduced or terminated in consultation with the project applicant and the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, as warranted by conditions such as encountering bedrock, the presence of fill soil, or negative findings during initial ground disturbance. The Native American monitor(s) shall maintain monitoring logs throughout project-related ground-disturbing activities and submit the monitoring logs to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director after each phase of construction (e.g., site clearing, grubbing, trenching) has concluded. **Plan Requirements and Timing.** At least 30 days before ground-disturbing activities begin, the project applicant shall secure a tribal monitoring agreement with the Native American Tribes. The agreement shall align with the Cultural Resource Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan from Mitigation Measure CUL-2 and shall be provided to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director prior to the commencement of project-related ground-disturbing activities. The project applicant shall notify the Native American monitor(s) at least five business days before ground disturbance. Work can proceed if the Native American monitor(s) are unavailable. **Monitoring**. The Native American monitor(s) shall maintain monitoring logs throughout project-related ground-disturbing activities and submit the monitoring logs to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director after each phase of construction has concluded. Monitoring logs shall be kept on file with the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director for the duration of construction. **TCR-2: Final Disposition of Unanticipated Tribal Cultural Resources** Inadvertent discoveries of archaeological resources found during construction shall be immediately evaluated by the qualified archaeologist (retained under Mitigation Measure CUL-2) for their potential to qualify as tribal cultural resources, and shall be treated in accordance with the Cultural Resource Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan (Plan) prepared under Mitigation Measure CUL-2. The appropriate treatment method, which may include one or more of the following treatments, shall be determined by the qualified archaeologist in consultation with the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, and the Native American monitor(s). The qualified archaeologist shall provide the data recovery plan prepared pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-4 to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to initiation of the appropriate treatment. ▪ Preservation-in-place of the cultural resources, if feasible. Preservation in place means avoiding the resources, leaving them in the place where they were found with no development affecting the integrity of the resources.	Construction impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	▪ Reburial of the resources in the immediate vicinity of the project site. The measures for reburial may include the following in accordance with the Plan: a) measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts in perpetuity; b) reburial shall not occur until all legally required cataloging and basic recordation have been completed, with an exception that sacred items, burial goods, and Native American human remains are excluded; c) any reburial process shall be culturally appropriate; and d) listing of contents and location of the reburial shall be included in the data recovery plan prepared pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-4. ▪ If preservation in place or reburial is not feasible, then the resource(s) may be curated in a culturally appropriate manner as described in the Plan prepared pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-2 at a Santa Barbara County curation facility that meets the California Office of Historic Preservation Guidelines for the Curation of Archaeological Resources, ensuring access and use pursuant to these guidelines. The collection and associated records shall be transferred, including title, and are to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence of curation in the form of a letter from the curation facility stating that subject archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid, shall be provided to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director by the project applicant. No destructive or invasive testing on sacred items, burial goods, and Native American human remains shall be permitted. Results concerning finds of any inadvertent discoveries shall be included in the data recovery plan prepared pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-4. **Plan Requirements and Timing.** Inadvertent discoveries of archaeological resources during construction shall be immediately evaluated by the qualified archaeologist for their potential to qualify as tribal cultural resources and treated according to the Cultural Resource Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan from Mitigation Measure CUL-2. The qualified archaeologist shall provide the data recovery plan prepared pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-4 to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, for review and approval prior to initiation of the appropriate treatment. **Monitoring.** The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall consult with the qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor(s) to determine the appropriate treatment process. The City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, shall also review and approve the data recovery plan prior to initiation of the appropriate treatment. The qualified archaeologist shall submit evidence of completion of the appropriate treatment method, to the City of Goleta's Planning and Environmental Review Director within 30 days of completion.	
Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative impacts related to tribal cultural resources would be Class III, less than significant.	None required beyond project-level mitigation measures.	Cumulative impacts would be less than significant.
Utilities and Service Systems		
Impact UTIL-1. The proposed project would require the installation and relocation of utility infrastructure, the environmental effects of which are analyzed throughout this Environmental Impact Report. The proposed project would not require or necessitate the construction of additional water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities beyond those evaluated throughout this Environmental Impact Report. Construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact UTIL-2. The proposed project would reduce the project site's existing water demand by approximately 150.7 acre-feet per year. The Goleta Water District has determined it has sufficient water supplies to serve the proposed project's anticipated water demand, and the proposed project's anticipated demand would not cause a reduction in water supplies such that a water deficit would occur. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact.	None required.	No impact.
Impact UTIL-3. The proposed project's anticipated wastewater generation would be adequately accommodated by the existing capacity of the Goleta Sanitary District Wastewater Treatment Plant. Therefore, construction and operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required.	Class III, less than significant.
Impact UTIl-4. During operation, the proposed project would generate 105.5 tons annually of solid waste, which would not exceed the operational solid waste threshold of 196 tons per year. The proposed project would generate an estimated 1,380 tons of nonrecyclable solid waste during demolition and construction. The estimated nonrecyclable solid waste generated during demolition and construction activities would exceed the construction and demolition solid waste threshold of 350 tons. With implementation of mitigation requiring additional material recycling of concrete construction materials, construction impacts would be reduced to Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	**UTIL-1: Additional Diversion Requirements** Demolition debris generated by removal of the existing concrete golf cart paths shall be recycled at a minimum 98 percent diversion rate. All other materials (non-concrete materials) shall be recycled at a minimum 65 percent diversion rate. The project applicant's Waste Management Plan, required in accordance with Chapter 8.10, Article IV of the City's Municipal Code, shall include a measure that requires the construction contractor to recycle all concrete debris from the existing concrete golf cart path removal. The Waste Management Plan shall be submitted to the City Director of Public Works or designee for review and approval prior to the start of construction. During construction, the City Director of Public Works or designee shall assign a monitor to inspect the project site on a quarterly basis to ensure the requirements of the Waste Management Plan are being implemented. In addition, the project applicant shall retain proof of 98 percent diversion rate of the demolition waste generated from the concrete golf cart paths via waste tonnage data, supported by original or certified photocopies of receipts and weight	Construction impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.

Impact	Mitigation Measure (s)	Residual Impact
	tickets on other records of measurement from recycling companies, deconstruction contractors, and/or landfill and disposal companies, and submit these to the City Director of Public Works or designee for review and approval prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. **Plan Requirements and Timing**. The project applicant shall prepare and submit the Waste Management Plan to the City Director of Public Works or designee prior to the start of construction. The project applicant shall submit proof of achieving a 98 percent diversion rate of the demolition waste generated from the concrete golf cart paths to the City Director of Public Works or designee following the completion of construction. The City Director of Public Works or designee shall review and approve the applicant-provided proof prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. **Monitoring**: A monitor chosen by the Director of Public Works Department, or designee, shall inspect the project site on a quarterly basis from the start of construction activities.	
Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative impacts related to solid waste generation would be potentially significant, and the proposed project's contribution would be adverse, but not considerable, with implementation of Mitigation Measure UTIL-1.	None required beyond project-level mitigation measures.	Cumulative impacts would be potentially significant. The project's contribution would not be considerable.

This page intentionally left blank.