

Table of Contents

6	Alternatives.....	6-1
6.1	Introduction	6-1
6.2	Project Alternatives.....	6-1
6.2.1	Alternatives Considered but Rejected from Further Evaluation	6-2
6.2.2	Description of Alternatives Evaluated	6-3
6.3	Alternatives Impact Analysis.....	6-7
6.3.1	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	6-7
6.3.2	Alternative 2: Clubhouse Renovation.....	6-16
6.3.3	Alternative 3: Revised Site Plan	6-33
6.3.4	Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path.....	6-49
6.4	Environmentally Superior Alternative	6-66

Tables

Table 6-1	Comparison of Project Alternatives’ Buildout Characteristics.....	6-4
Table 6-2	Impact Comparison of Alternatives	6-69

Figures

No table of contents entries found.

6 Alternatives

6.1 Introduction

Section 15126.6 of the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines* provides guidance for the identification and evaluation of project alternatives in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The *CEQA Guidelines* state that an “EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.”

As required by Section 15126.6 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, this EIR examines a range of reasonable alternatives to the project that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant but mitigable impacts of the project, as no significant and unavoidable impacts were identified, and would attain most of the following project objectives:

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 agricultural 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 sandcapping 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.

6.2 Project Alternatives

This discussion focuses on alternatives to the project, including alternatives which were considered but ultimately rejected from further evaluation. These alternatives have been selected for their ability to substantially reduce or eliminate one or more of the significant but mitigable adverse impacts associated with the project, as no significant and unavoidable impacts were identified, while still meeting most of the basic project objectives. This EIR also evaluates a No Project Alternative, consistent with the *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e).

6.2.1 Alternatives Considered but Rejected from Further Evaluation

Section 15126.6(c) of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires that an EIR identify alternatives that were considered but rejected as infeasible and provide a brief explanation as to why such alternatives were not fully considered in the EIR. As required by the *CEQA Guidelines*, the selection of alternatives for this EIR included a screening process to determine a reasonable range of alternatives, which could reduce significant effects but also feasibly meet project objectives. Alternatives that do not clearly provide any environmental advantages compared to the project, do not meet basic project objectives, or do not achieve overall lead agency policy goals, have been eliminated from further consideration. The factors that may be considered when addressing the feasibility of alternatives include site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (*State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6[f][1]).

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a) also states that “an EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation.” The alternatives shall be limited to those that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. Other alternatives may be considered but are not required to satisfy the requirements of CEQA.

For the project, characteristics used to reject alternatives from further consideration include:

- Failure to meet basic project objectives;
- Limited effectiveness in reducing project environmental impacts;
- Inconsistency with City policies; and
- Potential for inconsistency with adopted agency plans and policies.

The following alternatives were considered but eliminated from further analysis by the City due to one or more of these factors.

Alternative Location

The first step in considering an off-site alternative is identifying whether any of the significant impacts of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by the relocation. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6[f][2][A]). If it is determined that no feasible alternative locations exist, the EIR must disclose the reasons for this conclusion (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6[f][2][B]).

No alternative properties to undertake the proposed project are analyzed in this EIR. The project involves renovation of the Sandpiper Golf Club. Based on a review of golf course properties in the City, there are no other properties in the City or surrounding area that could support renovation similar to the proposed project, and the project applicant does not own or control any other property within the City that would be suitable for renovation. The Glen Annie Golf Course, located at 405 Glen Annie Road in Santa Barbara County adjacent to Goleta, was rezoned for housing in the County of Santa Barbara 2023-2031 Housing Element Update, which would preclude renovation of the golf course for non-residential uses (County of Santa Barbara 2023). The Hidden Oaks Golf Course, located

at 4760 Calle Camarada in the City of Santa Barbara, is closed, but not within the City of Goleta and is approximately 12 acres and would not allow for the implementation of a project with similar uses and square footage as the proposed project (which is located on a 193-acre project site). As of April 2025, there are currently no vacant golf course properties of similar size for sale and that could be redeveloped (LoopNet 2025). Furthermore, several of the project objectives are specific to renovation of the Sandpiper Golf Club and could not occur at an alternative location, including providing improved facilities for golfers, diners and special event attendees at the Sandpiper Golf Club, providing enhanced maintenance facilities to support Sandpiper Golf Club operations, and rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. As a result of these considerations, alternative project site locations were considered and rejected, consistent with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(c).

Alternative Use

The proposed project would involve renovation of the Sandpiper Golf Club. The City considered an alternative that would repurpose the project site for uses other than golf facilities. The project site is zoned as Open Space/Active Recreation, which allows for active and passive recreation, open space, golf courses, and nature preserves. Alternative uses such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses would not comply with this zoning designation, leading to potential conflicts with local regulations and policies. The proposed renovation of the Sandpiper Golf Club is designed to minimize environmental impacts, such as reducing impervious hardscape, reducing water use, and reducing pesticide use, whereas alternative, developed uses could cause greater environmental impacts through site-wide development. Development of the site with more intensive recreational uses could generate greater environmental impacts than the proposed project, including those related to an increase in population, vehicle trips and associated emissions, or impervious surface areas. Additionally, several of the project objectives are specific to renovation of the existing Sandpiper Golf Club, and an alternative land use would not meet these objectives. As a result of these considerations, an alternative use of the project site was considered and rejected, consistent with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(c).

6.2.2 Description of Alternatives Evaluated

This analysis considers the following four alternatives to the proposed project:

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

Table 6-1 provides a summary comparison of the development characteristics of the proposed project and each of the alternatives considered. Each of these alternatives is described below. The potential environmental effects of each of these alternatives in comparison to the proposed project is described in Section 6.3.

Table 6-1 Comparison of Project Alternatives' Buildout Characteristics

Feature	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	Alternative 2: Clubhouse Renovation	Alternative 3: Revised Site Plan	Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path
Proposed Project Components	New clubhouse, comfort station, Rio Grande Coffee Shop (including adaptive reuse of the Barnsdall-Rio Grande gas station building), maintenance yard, and golf course; dedication of lateral access easements; dedication of open space easement in Bell Canyon; coastal access improvements, including a Type 4 trail; Hollister Avenue improvements; and undergrounding of power lines.	No change to the existing clubhouse, comfort station, vacant Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, maintenance yard, and golf course.	New clubhouse and no other improvements.	Shifted placement of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop building and no construction of the Hollister Avenue Road improvements, including the Type 4 trail and lateral access easement along Hollister Avenue. New clubhouse, comfort station, maintenance yard, and golf course; dedication of lateral access easements along the beach frontage; dedication of open space easement in Bell Canyon; undergrounding of power lines, and adaptive reuse of the Barnsdall-Rio Grande gas station building, would remain the same as the proposed project.	Includes a bicycle path along Hollister Avenue instead of a Type 4 trail. New clubhouse, comfort station, Rio Grande Coffee Shop (including adaptive reuse of the Barnsdall-Rio Grande gas station building), maintenance yard, and golf course; dedication of lateral access easements; dedication of open space easement in Bell Canyon; Hollister Avenue improvements; and undergrounding of power lines
Sphere of Influence Request ¹	Included	Not included	Included	Included	Included
Lot Area	193 acres	193 acres	193 acres	193 acres	193 acres
Floor Area	46,028 sf	16,969 sf	37,179 sf	44,257 sf	46,028 sf
Maximum Height	33 feet (clubhouse)	28 feet and 6 inches (clubhouse)	33 feet (clubhouse)	33 feet (clubhouse)	33 feet (clubhouse)
Provided Parking	162 spaces	139 spaces	138 spaces	148 spaces	162 spaces
Disturbed Soil Area	>193 acres ²	0 acres	0.45 acre	193 acres	>193 acres ²

¹ The Sphere of Influence request would incorporate the new clubhouse and comfort station into Goleta West Sanitary District's Sphere of Influence.

² The proposed Hollister Avenue improvements would involve grading and soil-disturbing activities within Hollister Avenue and its right of way, which are not considered part of the Sandpiper Golf Club lot.

sf = square feet

6.2.2.1 *Alternative 1: No Project Alternative*

The purpose of describing and analyzing a no project alternative is to allow decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project. According to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e)(3)(C), the lead agency should analyze the impacts of the no project alternative by projecting what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved. The No Project Alternative assumes that the proposed project is not approved and the Sandpiper Golf Club and course 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 irrigated turf area of the golf course; would not provide lateral access or open space easements; and would not eliminate septic system use. Under the No Project Alternative, the Sphere of Influence request would not be included.

6.2.2.2 *Alternative 2: Clubhouse Renovation*

Alternative 2 would consist of just demolition of the existing clubhouse facility and reconstructing a new clubhouse building. This alternative 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, and the Sphere of Influence request would remain.

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.

6.2.2.3 *Alternative 3: Revised Site Plan*

Alternative 3 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, which could occur under the proposed project (prior to mitigation). 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 system under Alternative 3 would be

Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project

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 following Hollister Avenue roadway improvements:

- Improvements to the Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oaks Road intersection, including:
 - Installation of pedestrian ramps and striping to create crosswalks on all three legs of the intersection
 - Construction of a pedestrian refuge on the northeastern corner
 - Extension of an access ramp on the northwestern corner
 - Relandscaping at the northwestern corner
- Reconfiguration of the striped median of Hollister Avenue and addition of a left-hand turn lane for the clubhouse parking lot;
- Construction of a Type 4¹ trail and landscaping trail along the south side of Hollister Avenue;
- Dedication of a lateral access easement along Hollister Avenue;
- Construction of a curb and gutter along the south side of Hollister Avenue;
- Relocation of the existing bus stop and pocket² approximately 200 feet east, across from a planned fire station;
- Improvements to Hollister Avenue at the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, including:
 - Construction of a 10-foot-wide bicycle entrance with a bollard
 - Construction of a new meandering concrete sidewalk, which would extend from the Rio Grande Coffee Shop to the eastern project site boundary
 - Construction of a new 24-foot-wide two-way driveway entrance for access to the parking lot
- 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.

Additionally, Alternative 3 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, 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, and the Sphere of Influence request would remain. 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.

¹ A Type 4 trail provides a 6-foot-wide path for pedestrian bike and equestrian use.

² On October 31, 2022, the Metropolitan Transportation District approved the proposed layout of the relocated bus station and pocket.

6.2.2.4 *Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path*

Alternative 4 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 a 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 4³ trail along the south side of Hollister Avenue that would extend from the eastern project site boundary to the proposed clubhouse parking lot, Alternative 4 would include a 10- to 14-foot Class I bicycle path⁴ 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, approximately 0.3 mile beyond the project site's eastern boundary. The 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 to allow eight (8) proposed parking spaces to encroach into the 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.

6.3 Alternatives Impact Analysis

6.3.1 Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

a. Aesthetics

Under the No Project Alternative, the Sandpiper Golf Club would be operated and maintained in the existing condition and would not be renovated. The No Project Alternative would not involve new construction or the addition of structures on the project site that could impact scenic vistas, which would reduce construction impacts when compared to the proposed project. However, the No Project Alternative would not include undergrounding of the existing power lines or restoration of the existing Barnsdall Rio Gas Station and therefore would not result in the aesthetic improvements to the project site that would occur as part of the proposed project. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no construction impacts on scenic vistas, but would not improve the visual quality of the site or community. Overall, the No Project Alternative would have no impact when compared to existing conditions, but a greater visual impact when compared to the proposed project, because it would not include the site renovation and undergrounding on utilities lines along Hollister Avenue that would be implemented as part of the proposed project.

³ A Type 4 trail provides a 6-foot-wide path for pedestrian bike and equestrian use.

⁴ A Class I bicycle path is a paved right-of-way that is completely separated from vehicular traffic and is designated for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians.

The project site is not visible from a scenic highway. Like the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on scenic resources within a State scenic highway.

The No Project Alternative would not result in renovation that would conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations that govern scenic quality. However, the No Project Alternative would not support the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan's policies governing scenic resources, because it would not include site renovation that would be implemented as part of the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would not result in new sources of light and glare, as no renovation would occur. Sources of light and glare on the project site, under the No Project Alternative, would remain the same as existing conditions. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving the creation of new sources of light and glare, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on aesthetics. The No Project Alternative's aesthetics impacts resulting from construction and light and glare would be reduced when compared to the proposed project, due to the lack of renovation on the site. However, the No Project Alternative would not include visual enhancements provided by the proposed project, such as the undergrounding of existing power lines or restoration of the existing Barnsdall Rio Gas Station.

b. Air Quality

The No Project Alternative would not result in renovation that could lead to indirect population growth and therefore would not conflict with the land use assumptions and population projections used to forecast emissions in the 2022 Ozone Plan. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving conflict with an applicable air quality management plan, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would not include construction or demolition activities, including construction vehicle trips, that could emit criteria air pollutants. Operation and maintenance of the Sandpiper Golf Club under the No Project Alternative would maintain existing conditions, similar to the proposed project. Overall, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving generation of criteria pollutant emissions, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no construction or demolition activities or construction vehicle trips to the project site that could expose sensitive receptors to pollutants. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would maintain existing conditions on the project site and would not involve demolition or construction activities. The No Project Alternative would not have the potential to generate odors beyond those already occurring. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no change involving odor emissions, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on air quality. The No Project Alternative's air quality emissions would remain the same and would be less compared to the proposed project due to the lack of construction emissions from renovation of the site.

c. Biological Resources

The No Project Alternative would not include any renovation activities on the project site and therefore would have no potential to impact special-status plant and wildlife species, riparian habitat or Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA), wetlands, or wildlife migration based on renovation on the project site. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on these biological resources from renovation. Because the No Project Alternative would not include any renovation activities on the project site, the No Project Alternative has no potential to conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, and no impact would occur as a result of renovation. As with the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would not be located in an area subject to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, and no impact would occur. Overall, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on biological resources from renovation activities, which is a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

d. Cultural Resources

The No Project Alternative would not involve new construction near the historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station and would not have the potential to damage Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station due to vibration from construction equipment. While the No Project Alternative would have no impact on historic resources when compared to existing conditions, the No Project Alternative would not restore the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, as would occur under the proposed project. The Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station has been unused and largely abandoned since the 1950s. This long period of inactivity has left it vulnerable to deterioration from weather, vandalism, and lack of upkeep. Under the No Project Alternative, the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station would remain at risk of further deteriorating and losing its historic integrity.

The No Project Alternative would not involve ground-disturbing activities (other than normal routine maintenance activities) that could potentially damage or disturb subsurface archaeological resources. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on archaeological resources, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

Under the No Project Alternative, no ground-disturbing activities on the project site would occur that could potentially damage or disturb human remains. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on human remains, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on cultural resources. The No Project Alternative's cultural resources impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the lack of renovation of the site. However, the No Project Alternative would not restore the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, putting this building at further risk due to the lack of use.

e. Energy

Under the No Project Alternative, no construction activities would occur that would result in the consumption of energy. However, the No Project Alternative would not replace aging on-site structures with energy efficient features that could reduce energy use on-site, including the installation of a new irrigation system and construction of buildings compliant with current energy efficiency standards. Overall, the No Project Alternative would not change the current consumption of energy at the site. When compared to existing conditions, the No Project Alternative would have no impact related to energy. When compared to the proposed project, however, the No Project

Alternative would have a greater impact, as it would result in less overall operational energy efficiency than the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would not include construction activities that would result in increased energy use on the project site. However, the No Project Alternative would not renovate existing structures to be compliant with current energy efficiency standards, would not include a new maintenance building that allows for the installation of solar panels on the roof, would not increase the number of electric vehicle charging stations on the project site, and would not improve pedestrian and bicycle transportation along Hollister Avenue; all of which are aligned with Senate Bill 100, the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP), Strategic Energy Plan, or Municipal Code requirements. While the No Project Alternative would not conflict with renewable energy or energy efficiency plans, the No Project Alternative would result in less overall operational energy efficiency than the proposed project.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have no impact related to energy. The No Project Alternative's energy impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the lack of construction during construction of the site. However, the No Project Alternative would result in less overall operational energy efficiency than the proposed project.

f. Geology and Soils

The No Project Alternative would be located on the same project site as the proposed project and would be subject to the same seismic hazards, including fault rupture. The No Project Alternative would not involve ground-disturbing activities, and would not introduce new structures, residents, or employees to the project site. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving risk of loss, injury, or death due to fault rupture when compared to existing conditions, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would not involve renovation on the project site that could increase the risk of loss, injury, or death due to seismic ground shaking when compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no additional impact involving risk of loss, injury, or death due to strong seismic ground shaking. However, the No Project Alternative would not include the renovation/reconstruction of existing buildings with buildings that meet current, more stringent seismic design requirements than were in place at the time of development of the existing buildings. Thus, the No Project Alternative would not result in seismic upgrades to buildings provided by the proposed project from construction of new buildings designed with current seismic standards and therefore the seismic safety the golf course facilities would remain unchanged from when they were constructed.

The No Project Alternative would not involve ground-disturbing activities or increase the potential for the risk of loss, injury, or death related to liquefaction to occur on the project site when compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving risk of loss, injury, or death due to seismic-related ground failure. Although the No Project Alternative would have no impact, the No Project Alternative would not include the renovation of the site with buildings constructed in accordance with modern seismic safety standards. The No Project Alternative would not involve renovation on the project site that could increase the risk of loss, injury, or death due to landslides when compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving risk of loss, injury, or death due to landslides, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would not involve construction activities, such as grading, that would increase the potential for erosion and sedimentation. Under the No Project Alternative, existing drainage patterns on the project site would be maintained, and the No Project Alternative would not result in new sources of runoff that could contribute to project site erosion. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would not increase the potential for unstable soils to occur on the project site when compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving unstable soils, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

Soils on the project site have very low potential for expansion. The No Project Alternative would not involve on-site renovation that could potentially increase the risks to life or property from expansive soils. The No Project Alternative would have no impact involving expansive soils because of no renovation, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

Although the No Project Alternative would not include the abandonment of on-site septic tanks, it also would not involve the installation of additional septic tanks on-site. As such, the No Project Alternative would not result in increased impacts related to the use of septic tanks, similar to the proposed project. However, the No Project Alternative's impact involving septic tanks would be greater than the proposed project, as the No Project Alternative would not discontinue use and abandon the on-site septic tanks and would perpetuate the risk of septic tank failure at the project site.

The No Project Alternative would not involve ground-disturbing activities that could potentially damage or disturb unanticipated paleontological resources would occur. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving paleontological resources, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have no impact related to fault rupture, liquefaction, landslides, erosion, unstable soils, and expansive soils, which is a lesser impact than the proposed project. However, the No Project Alternative would not include the demolition of existing buildings with the construction of new buildings that meet current, more stringent seismic design requirements than were in place at the time of development of the existing buildings. The No Project Alternative would result in a greater impact related to the use of septic systems when compared to the project. The No Project Alternative would have no impact related to paleontological resources, which is a lesser impact than the proposed project.

g. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The No Project Alternative would not result in construction activities or additional vehicle trips than what is already occurring that could emit greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Unlike the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would not increase operational GHG emissions. The No Project Alternative would have no impact involving GHG emissions, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative does not involve renovation activities that would increase GHG emissions and therefore would not have the potential to conflict with existing policies or regulations established to reduce GHG emissions. The No Project Alternative would not increase the total number of electric vehicle parking spaces at the project site, would not improve public transit along Hollister Avenue, would not improve the existing and aging irrigation system to maximum water use efficiency, and would not upgrade the existing buildings to be consistent with modern building electrification

requirements; all of which are aligned with existing policies or regulations established to reduce GHG emissions. Nevertheless, the No Project Alternative would not increase GHG emissions and would have no impact related to conflicts with existing policies or regulations established to reduce GHG emissions, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have no impact related to GHG emissions. The No Project Alternative's GHG emissions impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the lack of additional GHG emissions associated with renovation of the site.

h. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The No Project Alternative would not alter the existing use of the project site and would not introduce new construction-related activities that could increase the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. However, unlike the proposed project, operation of the No Project Alternative would not reduce fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course. As a result, the ongoing transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during operation would continue at current levels. While the No Project Alternative would not increase hazardous materials use beyond existing conditions, its impact would be greater than that of the proposed project, which includes operational reductions. Nonetheless, this impact would remain less than significant.

The No Project Alternative would not result in a change in the use of the project site and consequently would not have the potential to disturb hazardous materials within the existing clubhouse, comfort station, or Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, or within project site soils or groundwater. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no additional impact involving the accidental release of hazardous materials, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would not involve any handling of hazardous materials for construction and would not result in the increased handling of hazardous materials within the vicinity of Ellwood School. Unlike the proposed project, operation of the No Project Alternative would not result in reduced fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course and therefore would not decrease the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during operation compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not change the existing condition involving the handling of hazardous materials within 0.25-mile of a school, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would not result in a change of use of the project site and consequently would not have the potential to disturb existing hazardous materials within project site soils or groundwater. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving the creation of a significant hazard to the public or environment, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project, which would involve soil disturbance and potentially disturb hazardous materials within project site soils.

As with the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would continue to be located outside of the safety and noise contours of the Santa Barbara Airport. The No Project Alternative would not change the use of the property and would not introduce additional employees or visitors to the project site. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no change to the condition involving safety hazards or excessive noise related to airport operations, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would maintain existing roadway conditions at the project site and would not involve construction vehicles or operational traffic that could potentially interfere with an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, the No Project Alternative

would have no change to the site's condition that would interfere with an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would maintain existing conditions at the project site and would not involve renovation activities which could increase the risk of wildland fire beyond existing conditions. As discussed in Section 4.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, the project site is partially located within a fire hazard severity zone. As the No Project Alternative would maintain existing conditions, the existing on-site buildings would not be renovated in accordance with the most recent building code standards for wildfire protection. Nonetheless, as the No Project Alternative would not involve construction activities with the potential to result in wildfire ignition, the No Project Alternative's impacts related to wildfire would be decreased when compared to the proposed project and would be less than significant.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have a less than significant impact related to hazards and hazardous materials. However, unlike the proposed project, operation of the No Project Alternative would not result in a reduction in fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course and therefore would not decrease the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during operation that are currently occurring. Additionally, the No Project Alternative would not renovate existing buildings to meet current building code standards for wildfire protection. However, the No Project Alternative's impact related to wildfire would be decreased when compared to the proposed project, as the No Project Alternative would not include construction activities that would increase the risk of wildfire ignition.

i. Hydrology and Water Quality

The No Project Alternative would not result in demolition or new construction that could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. No new sources of pollutants would be introduced to the project site, and existing drainage patterns would be maintained. The No Project Alternative would have no impact involving water quality degradation during construction, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project. However, unlike the proposed project, operation of the No Project Alternative would not result in a reduction in fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course, would not include a new water-efficient irrigation system, and would not include new on-site bioretention basins. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not decrease the potential to impair water quality due to pesticides, reduced irrigation, and additional stormwater treatment infrastructure on-site.

Unlike the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would not involve construction and consequently would not require groundwater dewatering. The No Project Alternative would not introduce new impervious surfaces that could affect groundwater recharge. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would not involve renovation and would maintain existing conditions at the project site. The No Project Alternative would not include construction activities that could alter the drainage pattern of the project site, including through the alteration of a course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces in a manner that could result in substantial erosion or siltation and introduction of polluted runoff, which is a lesser level of impact compared to the proposed project. However, unlike the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would not remove the existing culvert and restore Devereaux Creek to its natural condition and flow.

The No Project Alternative would be subject to the same on-site inundation hazards as the proposed project. Like the proposed project, hazardous materials stored on-site would be located outside the inundation areas and stored in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. The No Project Alternative would not change the risk of release of stormwater pollutants during inundation compared to existing conditions.

The No Project Alternative would not result in water quality impacts related to erosion, groundwater dewatering, construction of new structures, or addition of new uses to the site. Consequently, the No Project Alternative would not conflict with the goals of the Basin Plan. The No Project Alternative would have no impact on on-site water use and therefore would not interfere with the management of the Basin in accordance with the Wright Judgment or implementation of Goleta Water District's Groundwater Management Plan Goleta Groundwater Basin. However, the No Project Alternative would not decrease the potential to impair water quality or reduce water use on-site. Nevertheless, the No Project Alternative would have no change/impact involving obstruction of a water quality control plan or groundwater management plan, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have no impact related to hydrology and water quality. However, unlike the proposed project, operation of the No Project Alternative would not decrease the potential to impair water quality due to pesticides, reduced potential for overwatering, and additional stormwater treatment infrastructure on-site. Nevertheless, the No Project Alternative's hydrology and water quality impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the lack of construction activities during renovation of the site.

j. Land Use and Planning

The No Project Alternative would not include construction that could physically divide an established community. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving the physical division of an established community, which would be the same level of impact as the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would not include renovation or other additional on-site activities beyond existing conditions. The No Project Alternative would not support Policies VH 2.3, VH 4.14, and PF 6.2 related to the undergrounding of existing utility lines, as the No Project Alternative would not underground the existing utility lines. Additionally, the No Project Alternative would not support Policy VH 5.4 related to preservation of historic structures, as the No Project Alternative would not adaptively reuse the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not directly conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Impacts would be less than significant, which is a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

k. Noise

The No Project Alternative would not involve demolition or construction, including grading and excavation, that could result in the generation of construction noise levels that exceed City of Goleta standards. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving generation of a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would maintain existing on-site conditions and would not introduce new structures or land uses that could result in increases in operational noise. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving generation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would maintain existing on-site conditions and would not introduce new vehicle trips to and from the project site. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving generation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels due to vehicle trips, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would not involve new construction near the historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station and would not result in any potential to affect the building due to construction-related groundborne vibration. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving groundborne vibration, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would be located outside the noise contours from Santa Barbara Airport and, unlike the proposed project, would not result in increased employees or visitors on the project site. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact involving exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have no impact related to noise. The No Project Alternative's noise impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the lack of renovation of the site.

l. Parks and Recreation

The No Project Alternative would not result in new employees or visitors at the project site, and would consequently not increase demand for parks or recreational facilities. The No Project Alternative would not redevelop the Sandpiper Golf Club, an existing recreational facility, and would thus have no impact involving construction or expansion of a recreational facility that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Unlike the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would not expand recreational access at the project site through construction of a Type 4 trail or dedication of a lateral access easement along the beach frontage on the sand and along Hollister Avenue. Nevertheless, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on parks or recreational facilities, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

m. Public Services

The No Project Alternative would not result in new employees or visitors at the project site and would not increase demand for public services, including fire protection, police protection, schools, or other public facilities. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on public services, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

n. Transportation and Circulation

Unlike the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would not include any improvements to Hollister Avenue or the Class IV trail. The No Project Alternative would not change vehicle miles traveled (VMT) generated from the site, which is a lesser level of impact compared to the proposed project. The No Project Alternative would not involve any changes to the existing circulation network at or surrounding the project site and would not include any construction activities at the project site that could result in delays to emergency access. Overall, the No Project Alternative would have no

impact on transportation and circulation, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

o. Tribal Cultural Resources

The No Project Alternative would involve no ground-disturbing activities and would have no potential to adversely impact tribal cultural resources. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact on tribal cultural resources, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

p. Utilities and Service Systems

The No Project Alternative would not include any installation of utility infrastructure or necessitate additional utility infrastructure to the project site. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact related to the relocation or construction of new or expanded utility infrastructure, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would not change the existing water use on the site. Unlike the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would not reduce irrigated turf and corresponding reductions in water use for golf course irrigation.

The No Project Alternative would not include any renovation or increase in employees or visitors and would not increase existing wastewater generation on the project site. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have no impact related to wastewater generation, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would not require construction activities or include additional operations at the Sandpiper Golf Club and therefore would not increase solid waste generation compared to existing conditions. Accordingly, the No Project Alternative would have no impact related to solid waste generation, which would be a lesser level of impact than the proposed project.

Based on the above, the No Project Alternative would have no impact related to utilities and service systems. The No Project Alternative's impacts related to the installation of utility infrastructure, wastewater, and solid waste would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the lack of renovation of the site. The No Project Alternative would result in no impact on water supply but would not include reductions in water use for golf course irrigation.

6.3.2 Alternative 2: Clubhouse Renovation

a. Aesthetics

Under this alternative, potential impacts related to aesthetics would be limited to those involving the demolition, construction, and operation of the proposed clubhouse. As with the proposed project, construction of the clubhouse in accordance with Alternative 2 would be visible from the Hollister Avenue scenic corridor and related scenic viewpoints, but such visual impacts would be temporary and construction areas would be screened with fencing during construction to obstruct views of equipment and the construction sites from public viewing areas. Due to this alternative's reduced construction activities, Alternative 2 would result in fewer temporary visual impediments from the Hollister Avenue scenic corridor and related scenic viewpoints during construction compared to the proposed project. Alternative 2's tree removal would be limited to the clubhouse site and would include tree plantings at the clubhouse to maintain the existing, vegetated conditions that surround the clubhouse, and would screen views of the new, paved parking areas from Hollister Avenue. Similar to the proposed project, the addition of new trees at the clubhouse would not interfere with previous,

unobstructed, scenic views from public locations. However, Alternative 2 would not include undergrounding of the existing power lines or restoration of the existing Barnsdall Rio Gas Station, and therefore would not result in the same aesthetic improvements to the project site that would occur as part of the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative 2 would have lesser construction impacts, but would include fewer visual enhancements than the proposed project. Like the proposed project, impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant.

Alternative 2 would not place infrastructure in an area visible from an officially designated State scenic highway. As with the proposed project, existing buildings topography, and vegetation obscure views of the project site and existing on-site development from vehicles travelling along United States Route 101 (U.S. 101). Alternative 2's clubhouse would be the same height as the proposed project's clubhouse, and thus obscured from views from U.S. 101, similar to the proposed project. No impact to scenic highways would occur, the same as the proposed project.

Alternative 2's clubhouse would not differ from the proposed project's clubhouse and therefore would be consistent with the same policies and regulations governing visual quality as those applicable to the proposed project's clubhouse. Alternative 2's clubhouse would meet the same development standard as the proposed project, including maximum lot coverage, maximum building height,⁵ minimum setbacks, and parking, of the Open Space/Active Recreation zone. In addition, Alternative 2's clubhouse would not exceed Federal Air Regulations (FAR) Part 77 building height restrictions and would not obstruct views of the Pacific Ocean in compliance with Section 30251 of the California Coastal Act. Like the proposed project, impacts to scenic quality would be less than significant.

Alternative 2 would reduce the amount of lighting from on-site structures compared to the proposed project because it would not include lighting associated with the Rio Grande Coffee Shop and parking lot. Light sources associated with Alternative 2's clubhouse would be the same as the proposed project's clubhouse and be designed in accordance with City standards, including City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy 4.12, Lighting, which requires outdoor lighting fixtures to be designed, located, aimed downward or toward structures (if properly shielded), retrofitted if feasible, and maintained in order to prevent over-lighting, energy waste, glare, light trespass, and sky glow. Because of a decrease in employees and associated vehicle trips compared to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would result in less vehicle-related lighting than the proposed project. Lighting would be similar to the surrounding area due to frequent residential and commercial vehicles near the U.S. 101 and Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oaks Road interchange. Alternative 2 would introduce the same glare from sunlight reflecting on the clubhouse's glass surfaces but would reduce the overall glare compared to the proposed project due to Alternative 2's reduction in renovation activities. Like the proposed project, impacts related to light and glare would be less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's aesthetics impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the reduction in construction and lack of renovation of the site. However, Alternative 2 would include fewer visual enhancements than the proposed project because it would not include the undergrounding of utilities or restoration of the existing Barnsdall Rio Gas Station. Alternative 2 would have no impact on scenic highways and less than significant impacts on scenic vistas, scenic quality, and light and glare, similar to the proposed project.

⁵ Following approval of the requested adjustment to allow the abovementioned portions of the clubhouse to exceed the 25-foot height limit, the proposed project would be consistent with the maximum building height requirement.

b. Air Quality

As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not change the project site's existing land use and therefore would not conflict with the land use assumptions that inform the 2022 Ozone Plan's emissions forecasts. Alternative 2 would require nine fewer employees than the proposed project and therefore would result in less indirect population growth compared to the proposed project. Given that the proposed project's indirect population growth is within Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) growth projections utilized within the 2022 Ozone Plan, Alternative 2 would also be within SBCAG growth projections and therefore would not conflict with the 2022 Ozone Plan. Alternative 2's impacts related to conflicts with an air quality management plan would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2 would reduce the scope of the proposed project's construction activities by limiting demolition and construction to the clubhouse and therefore would reduce criteria air pollutant emissions during construction compared to the proposed project. Given that construction of the proposed project would not exceed Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) emissions thresholds, Alternative 2's reduced construction would also not exceed SBCAPCD thresholds. Similarly, given Alternative 2's reduced scale compared to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would generate less criteria air pollutant emissions during operation compared to the proposed project, which would not exceed SBCAPCD thresholds. Alternative 2's impacts related to release of criteria air pollutants would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Because Alternative 2 would limit construction to the clubhouse, Alternative 2's construction would result in less toxic air contaminant emissions on the project site compared to the proposed project and would limit toxic air contaminant emissions to the clubhouse area, farther from single-family residences to the east of the project site. As with the proposed project, operation of Alternative 2 would not involve the use of equipment that would increase toxic air contaminant emission on the project site. Alternative 2's impacts related to the release of toxic air contaminants would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Because Alternative 2 would limit construction to the clubhouse, Alternative 2's construction would result in less odors from construction equipment compared to the proposed project, which would be intermittent, temporary, and dissipate rapidly with distance from in-use construction equipment. As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would include food preparation at the clubhouse restaurant; however, odors associated with food preparation would primarily be confined to the indoor dining areas. Food-related odors would also dissipate rapidly, and given the northeast to southwest wind patterns, would not be carried to nearby development north and east of the project site. Alternative 2's odor impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's air quality impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the reduction in construction and less renovation of the site. Like the proposed project, Alternative 2's impacts to air quality would be less than significant.

c. Biological Resources

Alternative 2 would limit construction to the clubhouse area and therefore would avoid impacts to red sand verbena and southern California black walnut in Bell Canyon and woolly seablite along the coastal bluff, similar to the proposed project. Unlike the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not include landscaping within coyote brush scrub occupied by cliff malacothrix along the coastal bluff

and would not involve planting of milkweed where Santa Barbara honeysuckle is located. In addition, Alternative 2 would not include trenching for a water main from the comfort station and does not have the potential to result in direct impacts to special-status plant species that have expanded into proposed disturbance areas at this portion of the project site. Accordingly, Alternative 2 would avoid potentially significant direct impacts to special-status plant species, and would not require implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, or BIO-3 for special-status plant species. As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 could result in indirect impacts to special-status plant species due to water quality effects and chemical spills or vehicle leaks; therefore, Alternative 2 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4, which includes best management practices (BMP) to reduce potential indirect impacts to special-status plant species. Alternative 2's impacts related to special-status plant species would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Alternative 2 would limit construction to the clubhouse area and therefore would avoid direct impacts to Crotch's bumble bee, monarch butterfly and monarch ESHA, California red-legged frog, and southwestern pond turtle, and tidewater goby. Accordingly, Alternative 2 would not require implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, or BIO-9 for special-status wildlife species. However, Alternative 2 could result in similar indirect impacts to special-status wildlife species habitat due to water quality effects, chemical spills, or vehicle leaks. In addition, if nests are present, Alternative 2 could result in impacts to special-status bird species due to the potential to disturb nests during tree removal or in proximity to the clubhouse during construction. Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and BIO-10 calling for construction BMPS and nesting bird surveys and avoidance would therefore continue to be required. Alternative 2's impacts related to special-status wildlife species would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Alternative 2 would limit project activities to the clubhouse area and therefore would avoid direct impacts to riparian habitat and ESHA. As such, Mitigation Measure BIO-11 would no longer be required. Alternative 2 could result in similar indirect impacts to ESHA habitat due to water quality effects, chemical spills, or vehicle leaks; therefore, Alternative 2 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4, which includes BMPs to reduce potential indirect impacts to ESHA. Alternative 2's impacts related to riparian habitat and ESHA would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Alternative 2 would limit project activities to the clubhouse area and therefore would avoid direct impacts to state or federally protected wetlands and would not require implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, or BIO-11. Alternative 2 could result in indirect impacts to wetlands due to water quality effects chemical spills, or vehicle leaks; therefore, Alternative 2 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4 which includes BMPs to reduce potential indirect impacts to state or federally protected wetlands. Alternative 2's impacts related to federally protected wetlands would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

As Alternative 2 would limit project activities to the clubhouse area, it would avoid substantial noise exceeding Goleta's noise standards, which would avoid impediments to wildlife migration or the use of wildlife nursery sites that could occur with the proposed project. Accordingly, Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would not be required to reduce construction noise levels that could affect essential behavioral activities of wildlife. Given that Alternative 2 would not require mitigation for construction noise, Alternative 2 would result in less than significant impacts related to wildlife movement, which is reduced compared to the proposed project.

Alternative 2 would limit project activities to the clubhouse area and therefore would avoid potential conflicts with Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 1.6 and Policy CE 9.5 which would result from the proposed project's activities in areas other than the clubhouse. As a result, Alternative 2 would not require implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, or BIO-11 to reduce impacts related to conflicts with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Accordingly, Alternative 2 would result in a less than significant impact related to conflict with policies protecting biological resources, which is reduced compared to the proposed project.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not be located in an area subject to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Alternative 2 would have no impact related to conflicts with these plans, which would be the same level of impact compared to the proposed project.

Based on the above, Alternative 2 would have a reduced level of impact compared to the proposed project due to Alternative 2's reduced construction activities and lack of renovation of the site. Alternative 2's impact related to special-status plant and wildlife species, riparian habitat and ESHA, and state and federally protected wetlands would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated, similar to the proposed project. Like the proposed project, Alternative 2 would have no impact related to conflicts with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. For impacts to wildlife movement and conflicts with local policies or ordinances, Alternative 2 would reduce the proposed project's less than significant with mitigation impact to a less than significant level.

d. Cultural Resources

Alternative 2 would not involve the restoration and adaptive reuse of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, a historical resource, and would concentrate construction at the clubhouse. Therefore, Alternative 2 would not have the potential to result in damage to the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station from vibration caused by construction equipment proximate to the station. Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and NOI-2 would not be required for Alternative 2. Alternative 2 would result in no construction impacts to historic resources, which is reduced compared to the proposed project. However, Alternative 2 would not include the restoration of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, such that the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station would remain at risk of further deteriorating and losing its historic integrity.

Construction of Alternative 2 would reduce the amount of ground disturbance compared to the proposed project, which would reduce the potential to encounter unknown archaeological resources. Because some ground disturbance would still occur, Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4 would continue to be required. These measures would minimize potential impacts to unanticipated discoveries of archaeological resources by requiring archaeological monitoring, a cultural resources sensitivity meeting for construction personnel, and implementation of appropriate procedures for evaluation and treatment of any discoveries made during construction. Alternative 2's impacts related to archaeological resources would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Construction of Alternative 2 would reduce the amount of ground disturbance compared to the proposed project, which would reduce the potential to encounter unknown human remains. As with the proposed project, in the event of unanticipated discovery of human remains, the construction contractor would comply with State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and human remains would be preserved in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section

5097.98. Alternative 2's impacts related to human remains would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's cultural resources impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the reduction in ground disturbing activities and avoidance of construction equipment use near the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. Alternative 2 would result in no impact to historical resources, compared to the proposed project's less than significant with mitigation impact; however, Alternative 2 would not restore and adaptively reuse the Barnsdall Rio Gas Station putting this building at further risk due to the lack of use. Alternative 2's impact to archaeological resources would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 2's impact to human remains would remain less than significant.

e. Energy

Alternative 2 would reduce the scope of the proposed project's construction activities by limiting demolition and construction to the clubhouse which would reduce the amount of petroleum-based fuels used for construction equipment compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, energy use during construction would be temporary and minimized in compliance with existing regulations such as California Code of Regulations Title 13 Sections 2449 and 2485, which prohibit diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles and off-road diesel vehicles from idling for more than five minutes. Due to Alternative 2's reduced renovation activities, including the omission of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, Alternative 2 would use less energy during operation than the proposed project. Operation of Alternative 2 would require the same energy consumption for the clubhouse as the proposed project's clubhouse and would adhere to the same energy efficiency standards as the proposed project, such as the California Green Building Standards Code and the 2025 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Furthermore, Alternative 2 would be designed in accordance with the City's Energy Performance Reach Code which would provide electric-ready facilities for the use of electric infrastructure. In addition, Alternative 2 would continue to utilize the existing on-site electric golf carts for golfers. Alternative 2's impact related to the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy resources would be reduced compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would adhere to the California Green Building Standards Code and the 2025 Building Energy Efficiency Standards to minimize unnecessary energy use in the clubhouse. The clubhouse would be supplied power from Southern California Edison (SCE) in accordance with Senate Bill 100, which requires SCE to increase renewable energy procurement to 60 percent by 2030, and 100 percent by 2045. As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would provide 15 electric vehicle (EV) charging spaces at the clubhouse, which would make up 88 percent of the 17 total parking spaces proposed in accordance with Alternative 2. This amount of electric vehicle parking would be consistent with the requirements of the CALGreen intervening code update and the City's Municipal Code, which requires new non-residential construction to construct at least 30 percent of new parking spaces to be EV capable or include EV charging infrastructure. Alternative 2 would include 12 bicycle spaces at the clubhouse to encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation, consistent with the City's Climate Action Plan, Strategic Energy Plan, General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, or Municipal Code. Alternative 2's impact related to conflicts with state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency be less than significant, the same as the proposed project.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's overall energy impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the reduction in construction and lack of renovation of the site, but would remain less than significant.

f. Geology and Soils

As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not locate structures within 50 feet of the More Ranch Fault and would not directly or indirectly cause the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault. This impact would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2 would include renovation in an area with the same risks of seismic activity as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 requiring recommendations from the project-specific geotechnical reports to be put into grading and building plans; however, only the recommendations of the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed Club House would apply for Alternative 2 as no other renovation would be included. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce potential impacts due to groundshaking to a less than significant level through incorporation of structural integrity recommendations. Unlike the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not include seismic upgrades associated with renovation of existing maintenance buildings with buildings that meet current, more stringent seismic design requirements. Therefore, Alternative 2's impacts related to groundshaking would be greater compared to the proposed project, but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Alternative 2 would be subject to the same liquefaction risks as the proposed project's clubhouse, which are very low. As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 design would incorporate design measures required by the California Building Code (CBC) which reduce the potential for substantial adverse effects due to liquefaction. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to liquefaction would be similar to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2 would be subject to the same landslide risks as the proposed project's clubhouse, which is not located in an area with landslide potential. Alternative 2's clubhouse would require the same cut and fill slopes as the proposed project, which would not result in substantially steep slopes or other conditions that could induce a landslide. However, Alternative 2 would not include recontouring of the golf course within high landslide potential areas. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to landslides would be less than the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Construction of Alternative 2 would reduce the amount of ground disturbance compared to the proposed project, which would reduce the potential for erosion. Alternative 2's clubhouse would be 37,179 square feet, or 0.85-acre, which would exempt Alternative 2's construction from obtaining coverage under the Construction Stormwater General Permit. However, Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code requires preparation of an erosion and sediment control plan in order to obtain a grading permit. Thus, Alternative 2 would still include implementation of an erosion control plan to minimize erosion during construction activities. Alternative 2 would include implementation of bioretention basins at the clubhouse to treat and discharge stormwater onto the golf course consistent with the requirements of the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), including erosion control, during operation. As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not substantially increase the rate of runoff on the site compared to existing conditions, as the impervious surfaces added to the project site from the clubhouse would represent an increase of less than 0.2 percent compared to existing conditions. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to erosion would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not locate structures in an area subject to substantial liquefaction potential, landslide hazards, or potential for soil collapse. Potential impacts associated with geotechnical hazards would be minimized with adherence to the CBC. As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 may require groundwater dewatering during construction, but groundwater dewatering would be limited to the localized perched water on the project site and would be temporary, only occurring if perched groundwater is encountered. Therefore, construction of Alternative 2 would not result in substantial groundwater withdrawals that could result in subsidence on-site. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to the risk of landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would locate renovation on soils with very low potential for expansion. The construction contractor would be required to comply with the CBC, including the use of non-expansive fill material, to minimize the potential for structural hazards associated with soil expansion. Alternative 2's impact related to creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property related to expansive soil would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would involve connecting the clubhouse to the Goleta West Sanitary District sewer system and the abandonment of the private septic systems serving the clubhouse, but would retain the existing septic tank serving the comfort station. Alternative 2 would not involve the installation of additional septic tanks on-site and therefore would not result in impacts related to the use of septic tanks. The No Project Alternative would have no impact, which would be the same level of impact compared to the proposed project.

Alternative 2 would reduce the amount of ground disturbance compared to the proposed project, which would reduce the potential to encounter paleontological resources or unique geologic features compared to the proposed project. However, Alternative 2 could result in the disturbance of unknown paleontological resources at the clubhouse area; therefore, Alternative 2 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-2 to reduce potential construction impacts to paleontological resources and unique geologic features to a less than significant level by requiring a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training, monitoring, and setting forth procedures for the recovery, identification, and curation of fossils discovered during construction. Alternative 2's impacts related to paleontological resources and unique geologic features would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's impacts related to fault rupture, liquefaction, landslides, unstable soils, and expansive soils, would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant. Alternative 2's impacts related to erosion would be reduced compared to the proposed project, but would remain less than significant. Alternative 2 would result in no impact related to septic systems, which is the same as the proposed project. Alternative 2's impacts related to groundshaking and paleontological resources would be reduced compared to the proposed project, but remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 2 would not include seismic upgrades associated with renovation of existing maintenance buildings with buildings that meet current, more stringent seismic design requirements.

g. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Alternative 2 would reduce the scope of the proposed project's construction activities by limiting demolition and construction to the clubhouse. Therefore, this alternative would result in reduced GHG emissions during construction compared to the proposed project. In addition, Alternative 2's

reduced scope would reduce GHG emissions during operation compared to the proposed project because Alternative 2 does not include construction of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop. Given the reduction in GHG emissions compared to the proposed project, Alternative 2's impacts related to GHG emissions would be reduced compared to the proposed project. Impacts would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would include design features to promote renewable energy use, energy efficiency, water efficiency, and reductions in vehicle travel, all of which contribute to the creation of minimal GHG emissions. Alternative 2 would include EV charging infrastructure that exceeds California Green Building Standards and City requirements for EV charging infrastructure. Alternative 2's clubhouse would be the same as the proposed project and therefore be designed in accordance with the same energy efficiency standards. Alternative 2 would incorporate water efficient fixtures to reduce water consumption for landscaping, plumbing, and irrigation consistent with the latest Title 24 Green Building Code and Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Alternative 2 would not reduce the maximum rounds of golf per year and therefore would result in increased vehicle miles traveled (VMT) compared to the proposed project. Alternative 2 would not include installation of a new water-efficient irrigation system and would not result in minimal GHG emissions related to reduced water use like the proposed project. Alternative 2 would introduce less bicycle parking than the proposed project, would not include construction of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop (which is designed as a bicycle way station and would encourage bicycling in the area), would not include the Type 4 trail extension, and would therefore not promote minimal GHG emissions from vehicles like the proposed project. Accordingly, while Alternative 2 would not implement components included in the proposed project to reduce GHG emissions, Alternative 2 would still be consistent with applicable GHG reduction plans. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to consistency with applicable GHG reduction plans would be increased compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's GHG emissions impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to decreased construction activity. As Alternative 2 would include less infrastructure that would minimize on-site GHG emissions, impact related to consistency with applicable GHG reduction plans would increase compared to the proposed project. Alternative 2's impacts related to GHG emissions would remain less than significant.

h. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Alternative 2 would reduce the scope of the proposed project's construction activities by limiting demolition and construction to the clubhouse and therefore would result in less hazardous material usage compared to the proposed project. Hazardous materials used during construction of Alternative 2 would be handled in accordance with the same regulations as the proposed project, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Waste Control Law, and California Code of Regulations Title 22. Alternative 2 would not be required to implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan but would be required to implement construction site BMPs to reduce potential spills in accordance with Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code. All hazardous material transport, use, or disposal associated with Alternative 2's operation would comply with existing hazardous materials regulations established by United States Environmental Protection Agency, the State of California, the County of Santa Barbara, and the City of Goleta. These regulations prescribe measures for the safe transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials to reduce risk of spills. However, unlike the proposed project, operation of the Alternative 2 would not reduce fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course and

therefore would not decrease the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during operation. Alternative 2's construction-related impact would be reduced compared to the proposed project, but Alternative 2's operational impact would be increased. Alternative 2's overall impact would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would include demolition of the existing clubhouse which has the potential to contain asbestos-containing materials (ACM), lead-based paint (LBP), mercury, and polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB). Alternative 2 would require less ground disturbance than the proposed project and therefore would have less potential to result in release of hazardous soils; however, grading at the clubhouse could potentially disturb hazardous materials in soil, leading to an accidental release of hazardous materials. As with the proposed project, construction of Alternative 2 could also encounter perched groundwater which, if contaminated, could result in the accidental release of hazardous materials. In addition, operation of Alternative 2 could result in exposure to volatile organic compounds in the soil, similar to the proposed project. Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6 would continue to be required, which would reduce potential hazardous material impacts associated with accidental releases of hazardous materials during demolition of the existing clubhouse, and grading of potentially contaminated soil, soil vapor, or groundwater to a less than significant level. However, unlike the proposed project, operation of Alternative 2 would not reduce fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course and therefore would not decrease the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during operation. Alternative 2's construction-related impact would be reduced compared to the proposed project, but Alternative 2's operational impact would be increased. Alternative 2's overall impact would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Alternative 2 would limit construction activities to the clubhouse area, which is located approximately 0.6-mile southwest of the Ellwood School. Accordingly, construction of Alternative 2 would not involve handling hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of a school. As with the proposed project, Alternative 2's construction activities would have the potential to create a significant hazard involving the release of ACMs, LBP, mercury, or PCBs into the environment, or through exposure and transport of on-site contaminated soil or groundwater, which would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6. However, unlike the proposed project, operation of the Alternative 2 would not result in a reduction in fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course and therefore would require increased handling of hazardous materials associated with landscaping compared to the proposed project. Alternative 2's construction-related impact would be reduced compared to the proposed project, but Alternative 2's operational impact would be increased. Alternative 2's overall impact would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Alternative 2 would have less potential to result in hazardous material release due to the presence of on-site hazardous materials compared to the proposed project due to the reduction in ground disturbing activities; however, Alternative 2's ground disturbing activities could still potentially result in hazardous material release. Mitigation Measures HAZ-3 through HAZ-6 and HAZ-7 would be required, which mandate oversight from Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Services and Central Coast RWQCB. Alternative 2's impact related to the presence of on-site hazardous materials would be reduced compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would be located outside of the safety and noise contours of the Santa Barbara Airport. Alternative 2's clubhouse would be the same as the proposed project and therefore would not conflict with the standards of Review Area 2 of the Santa Barbara Airport's Airport Influence Area or FAR Part 77. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to safety hazards and

excessive noise due to proximity to an airport would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2 would not include construction on Hollister Avenue and therefore would result in less potential to interfere with emergency response or evacuation of Hollister Avenue compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 2's operations would not introduce activities that could impede or interfere with the Santa Barbara County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan or emergency evacuations on Hollister Avenue. Alternative 2's impact related to impaired implementation or physical interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2 would be located on the same site as the proposed project and therefore be exposed to the same fire risks as the proposed project. Alternative 2 would reduce the amount of construction compared to the proposed project and therefore reduce the potential for construction equipment to result in a fire. As with the proposed project, construction of Alternative 2 would comply with California Public Resources Code Sections 4442, 4427, 4428, and 4431 to minimize the potential for wildland fire. Alternative 2's clubhouse would result in the same fire risk as the proposed project's clubhouse. However, under Alternative 2, the proposed clubhouse would be constructed with adherence to the standards of the California Fire Code, CBC, and California Code of Regulations Title 14, all of which would improve the structure's resilience and safety during a wildfire event. The other on-site structures would not be renovated to the same fire code standards. Nonetheless, as Alternative 2 would involve less construction than the proposed project, Alternative 2's impact related to wildland fire would be lesser when compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's hazardous materials impacts from construction would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the reduction in construction activities, lack of encroachment onto Hollister Avenue, and lack of renovation of the site. Alternative 2's operational impacts related to hazardous materials would be increased compared to the proposed project due to the increased use of hazardous materials for landscaping. Alternative 2's impacts related to upset or accident of hazardous materials, emissions of hazardous materials near schools, and hazardous materials sites would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Impacts related to transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, airport hazards, emergency response plans, and wildland fires would remain less than significant.

i. Hydrology and Water Quality

Given the reduction in construction activities, Alternative 2 would have a reduced potential to degrade water quality compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would include demolition of the existing clubhouse, which could discharge ACB and LBP to on-site soils where they could then be transported off-site in stormwater runoff. Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 would continue to be required, and would minimize the potential for the accidental release of ACB and LBP.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 could require groundwater dewatering of perched groundwater during construction which, if contaminated, could result in releases of hazardous materials into stormwater. Mitigation Measure HAZ-5 would continue to reduce the potential for the accidental discharge of contaminated groundwater. Construction of Alternative 2 would not be required to comply with the Construction Stormwater General Permit, but would be required to

implement construction site BMPs to minimize the creation of stormwater pollutants during construction activities in accordance with Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code.

Alternative 2 would not include work at Devereaux Creek and therefore would not result in the potential to degrade water quality in Devereaux Creek due to increased temporary erosion and would not require implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1 or BIO-4. In addition, adherence to the City's Municipal Code would ensure construction activities would not result in substantial runoff water which would exceed the capacities of Devereaux Creek or Bell Canyon Creek. Alternative 2's construction impacts related to water quality degradation, erosion, and the introduction of substantial polluted runoff and exceedances of stormwater capacity would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Alternative 2 would include implementation of bioretention basins at the clubhouse to treat and discharge stormwater onto the golf course consistent with the requirements of the Central Coast RWQCB but would not include the proposed project's other bioretention basins outside of the clubhouse area and therefore would not result in the same long-term stormwater quality improvements as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, treated water and high-flow bypass from the basins would be discharged to the golf course rather than the storm drain system in Hollister Avenue that outlets to Bell Canyon Creek which would minimize the amount of stormwater and potential stormwater pollutants entering Bell Canyon Creek. Alternative 2 would also abandon the existing clubhouse septic system which, upon completion, would reduce the potential for groundwater quality to be affected by sewage. Unlike the proposed project, operation of Alternative 2 would not result in a reduction in fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course. Alternative 2 would not install a new efficient irrigation system included in the proposed project and therefore would increase the potential for golf course operation to discharge stormwater pollutants compared to the proposed project. Alternative 2 would not include changes to the maintenance facility and therefore the potential to introduce stormwater pollutants from the maintenance facility would be the same as under existing conditions. Alternative 2's operational impacts related to water quality degradation, erosion, and the introduction of substantial polluted runoff and exceedances of stormwater capacity would be increased compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, construction of Alternative 2 has the potential to require groundwater dewatering of perched groundwater. Groundwater dewatering activities would be localized and temporary, lasting only during excavation activities, if groundwater is encountered. The anticipated duration and minimal amount of groundwater dewatering that would be required for excavation would not result in substantial groundwater losses in the Goleta Groundwater Basin (Basin). Similar to the proposed project, given the limited infiltration potential of on-site soils and the minimal amount of impervious surface increase generated by Alternative 2, Alternative 2 would not substantially change groundwater infiltration rates on-site or result in substantial interference to groundwater recharge. Alternative 2's impact related to substantially decreasing groundwater supplies or interfering with groundwater recharge would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Unlike the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not result in long-term improvements associated with culvert removal and the restoration of Devereaux Creek to its natural flow. Alternative 2's impact related to on- or off-site flooding would be increased compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2 would be subject to the same on-site inundation hazards as the proposed project. The new clubhouse would be located outside of a flood hazard zone, tsunami zone, seiche hazard zone, and dam inundation zone. Like the proposed project, hazardous materials stored on-site would

located be outside the inundation areas and stored in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. Impacts related to risk of release of stormwater pollutants during inundation would be similar to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Given the reduction in construction activities, Alternative 2 would have a reduced potential to degrade water quality in conflict with the Basin Plan compared to the proposed project during construction but would not result in the same long-term stormwater quality improvements as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would adhere to Chapter 13.04 and Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code to minimize water quality impacts, and would require Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5 to reduce potential water quality impacts to a less than significant level. Accordingly, Alternative 2's impacts related to conflicts with the Basin Plan would be greater than the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As described above, Alternative 2 would not adversely impact groundwater supplies, but would result in greater water use during operation than the proposed project because Alternative 2 would not reduce the amount of irrigated golf course turf from 125 acres to 62 acres. Alternative 2 would not interfere with the management of the Basin in accordance with the Wright Judgement. Accordingly, Alternative 2's impact related to conflicts with the Wright Judgement or Goleta Water District's Groundwater Management Plan Goleta Groundwater Basin would be greater than the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's hydrology and water quality impacts during construction would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the reduction in construction activities and lack of renovation of the site. Alternative 2's operational impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be increased compared to the proposed project due to the increased use of pesticides and fertilizers for landscaping and less infrastructure to improve stormwater quality. Alternative 2's impacts related to water quality, polluted runoff, and conflict with water quality plans or groundwater management plans would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Impacts related to groundwater, erosion and siltation, flooding, and release of pollutants from inundation would remain less than significant.

j. Land Use and Planning

As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would be located on the existing Sandpiper Golf Club and would not include any components that could divide an established community. Alternative 2 would have no impact related to the physical division of an established community, which would be the same level of impact compared to the proposed project.

Alternative 2's clubhouse would be the same as the proposed project's clubhouse and would therefore be consistent with all applicable Goleta Municipal Code zoning standards and FAR Part 77 standards. As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would be consistent with most policies of the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan through implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-4, BIO-10, CUL-2 through CUL-4, TCR-1, and TCR-2 to minimize potential impacts related to cultural resources, tribal cultural resources, and biological resources. However, Alternative 2 would not support Policies VH 2.3, VH 4.14, and PF 6.2 related to the undergrounding of existing utility lines, as Alternative 2 would not underground the existing utility lines. Additionally, Alternative 2 would not support Policy VH 5.4 related to preservation of historic structures, as Alternative 2 would not adaptively reuse the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. As Alternative 2 would not include the Type 4 trail, Alternative 2 would be inconsistent with the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, as well as Policies OS 4.4, VH 2.5, VH 3.3, VH 3.5, and VH 4.10. This impact would remain less than significant

with mitigation incorporated, which would be a similar level of impact compared to the proposed project. However, given Alternative 2's reduced renovation, Alternative 2 would not require implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, BIO-9, BIO-11, HYD-1, NOI-1, or UTIL-1 to reduce impacts related to conflict with the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan.

k. Noise

Due to Alternative 2's reduction in construction activities compared to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would result in less construction noise compared to the proposed project. Construction of the clubhouse in accordance with Alternative 2 would require the use of the same construction equipment the same distance from sensitive receptors as the proposed project's clubhouse. As with the construction of the proposed project's clubhouse, construction of Alternative 2 would not exceed 65 A-weighted decibels (dBA) at the nearest sensitive receptors, and no noise control is needed. Alternative 2 would not include construction activities for golf course improvements, maintenance yard, the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, restoration and adaptive reuse of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, or Hollister Avenue improvements, and therefore would not include the construction of project components which could exceed 65 dBA at the residential receptors to the east of the project site. Therefore, construction of Alternative 2 would not require implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 to reduce construction noise levels, unlike the proposed project. Alternative 2's noise impact would be less than significant, which is reduced compared to the proposed project.

Due to Alternative 2's reduction in construction activities, Alternative 2 would result in less construction traffic noise than the proposed project. Because the proposed project's construction traffic would not result in an increase of 3 dBA or more, the reduced construction in accordance with Alternative 2 would not result in an increase of 3 dBA or more of traffic noise. Alternative 2's construction traffic noise impact would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2's clubhouse would be the same as the proposed project. Therefore, operational noise in the clubhouse due to the use of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning units, and conversational noise would not exceed City noise thresholds. In addition, Alternative 2 would not include the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, which would decrease operational noise at the residential receptors to the east of the project site compared to the proposed project. Alternative 2's impact related to operational noise would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Due to the absence of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, Alternative 2 would result in fewer new vehicle trips than the proposed project. Alternative 2's operational traffic noise impact would be reduced compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Unlike the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not include the use of a vibratory roller or large bulldozer in proximity to the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station and therefore would not result in potential damage to the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station due to vibration from construction equipment. As a result, Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would not be required. Therefore, Alternative 2's vibration impacts would be less than significant, which is reduced compared to the proposed project.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would be located outside of the noise contours from Santa Barbara Airport. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to excessive airport noise would remain less than significant, which is the same as the proposed project.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's noise impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the reduction in construction activities and distance from existing noise- and vibration-sensitive receptors. Alternative 2 would reduce the proposed project's less than significant noise and vibration impacts to less than significant. Airport noise impacts would be less than significant and the same as the proposed project.

I. Parks and Recreation

Alternative 2 would require less construction activities and therefore would result in less potential to degrade existing park facilities due to construction worker use. Alternative 2 would require nine fewer employees than the proposed project and therefore would result in less indirect population growth compared to the proposed project, which would reduce alteration in ratio of parkland per 1,000 residents compared to the proposed project. Given that the proposed project would not substantially reduce this ratio, Alternative 2 would also not substantially reduce the amount of parkland available to the residents of Goleta. As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 could increase the amount of visitors at the clubhouse restaurant which may increase the use of nearby parks and trails. However, given the minimal additional anticipated non-golfer visitors, it is unlikely that these visitors would substantially degrade existing park facilities. In addition, Alternative 2 would result in fewer non-golfer visitors to the project site because Alternative 2 does not include the Rio Grande Coffee Shop. Therefore, although Alternative 2 does not include the recreational facilities included in the proposed project (i.e., sidewalks to provide access to Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve, construction of a Type 4 trail as a continuation of De Anza Trail, and dedication of lateral access along beach frontage on the sand and along Hollister Avenue to enhance coastal access to Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve and Haskell's Beach), Alternative 2 would also not substantially increase the use of existing park and recreational facilities such as Sperling Preserve, Santa Barbara Shores Park, or Haskell's Beach such that a need for new or physically altered park facilities would occur or physical deterioration of existing facilities would occur or be accelerated. Alternative 2's impact to park facilities would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Unlike the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not renovate the existing golf course. However, as described above, Alternative 2 would not result in substantial deterioration of recreational facilities and furthermore would not necessitate new or expanded recreational facilities. Therefore, Alternative 2 would not result in adverse physical effects on the environment due to new or expanded recreational facilities. Alternative 2's impact related to recreational facilities would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's construction impacts to parks and recreation would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the reduction in construction activities. Alternative 2's operational impacts related to parks and recreation would be similar to the proposed project. Alternative 2's impacts related to parks and recreation would remain less than significant.

m. Public Services

Alternative 2 would require nine fewer employees than the proposed project and therefore would result in less indirect population growth compared to the proposed project. Given that the proposed project's indirect population growth would not result in substantially diminished fire protection services, police protection services, school capacities, or library services, Alternative 2's reduced indirect population growth would also not result in substantially diminished public services. As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would be located in proximity to existing fire stations and police

stations and would be adequately served by existing fire protection and police protection services in Goleta. In addition, as with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would also include the required payment of development impact fees which would provide funding for expanded public services in accordance with Chapter 17.70 of the Municipal Code and Goleta Union School District and Santa Barbara Unified School District fees. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to public services would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

n. Transportation and Circulation

As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not include elements that would conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Alternative 2 would add bicycle parking spaces to the project site, providing facilities for bicycle travel. Alternative 2 would not result in any temporary lane, bicycle route, or sidewalk closures on Hollister Avenue. However, unlike the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not include any improvements to Hollister Avenue or installation of the Type 4 trail to continue the Juan Bautista De Anza Trail. Alternative 2 would require nine fewer employees than the proposed project which, as with the proposed project, would not substantially interfere with Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District operations. Alternative 2's impact related to conflicts with transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities during construction would be reduced compared to the proposed project. However, unlike the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not include infrastructure along Hollister Avenue to promote bicycle and pedestrian transportation, and would not further support the City's policies related to bicycle and pedestrian facilities. However, impacts would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2 would require less construction activities than the proposed project and therefore would generate less short-term VMT increases than the proposed project. This construction-related VMT increase would be temporary and would not have a lasting effect on the overall transportation network or long-term VMT patterns in the area. Alternative 2's proposed clubhouse would be the same as the proposed project and therefore the clubhouse restaurant would be exempt from quantitative VMT analysis and presumed to have a less than significant impact on VMT pursuant to the City's VMT Guidelines. As with the proposed project, Alternative 2's non-restaurant portion of the clubhouse would serve golfers. Alternative 2 would not increase the time between tee-offs and correspondingly reduce the annual rounds of golf per year, and therefore would result in additional VMT from golfers compared to the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to conflicts with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) would be greater than the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, during construction of Alternative 2, equipment staging would occur on-site and construction personnel would park on-site, which would minimize the potential for construction related vehicles and equipment to disrupt circulation in the immediate area. Alternative 2 would not include construction in the right-of-way of Hollister Avenue and therefore would not result in any roadway impediments on Hollister Avenue. Alternative 2 would include the same new driveway for entrance to the clubhouse parking lot and would include the same reconfigurations to the existing clubhouse driveway. As with the proposed project, these driveways would be designed in accordance with City and Santa Barbara County Fire Department (SBCFD) driveway access control and vision clearance standards which would ensure Alternative 2's design would not result in the potential to result in line-of-sight disruptions and increase hazards between vehicles and pedestrians and vehicles and cyclists, similar to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not introduce new incompatible uses, such as farm equipment, to roadways, and Alternative

2's uses would be the same as existing on-site uses. Accordingly, Alternative 2's impacts to increased hazards would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

As stated above, during construction of Alternative 2, equipment staging would occur on-site and construction personnel would park on-site, which would minimize the potential for construction related vehicles and equipment to result in inadequate emergency access. Alternative 2 would not result in inadequate emergency access on Hollister Avenue because Alternative 2 does not include construction in the Hollister Avenue right-of-way. As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would be designed in accordance with all applicable SBCFD standards to maintain adequate emergency access. As with the proposed project, SBCFD and the City would review and approve Alternative 2's design, which would ensure Alternative 2 would provide adequate egress for emergency access. Therefore, Alternative 2's impacts to emergency access would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's transportation and circulation impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the lack of construction in the Hollister Avenue right-of-way. Alternative 2's impacts related to transportation and circulation would remain less than significant.

o. Tribal Cultural Resources

As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would be located in an area with high sensitivity for cultural resources, including tribal cultural resources. Alternative 2 would require less ground disturbance, which would reduce the potential to encounter tribal cultural resources compared to the proposed project. Although impacts would be reduced, potential to unearth previously unidentified resources would remain. As such, Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4, TCR-1, and TCR-2 would be required, including implementation of a tribal monitoring agreement and appropriate disposition of any unanticipated tribal cultural resources discovered during construction. Alternative 2's impact related to tribal cultural resources would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

p. Utilities and Service Systems

Alternative 2 would require the installation and relocation of the same utility infrastructure as required for the proposed project's clubhouse, but unlike the proposed project would not include utilities associated with the maintenance facility, comfort station, or Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station and Rio Grande Coffee Shop. Accordingly, Alternative 2's impact related to the relocation or construction of utility infrastructure would be reduced compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2 would not include reductions in irrigated turf and, unlike the proposed project, would not result in a reduction in water use for golf course irrigation. Alternative 2's water demand from the clubhouse would be the same water demand as the proposed project's clubhouse. Unlike the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not reduce on-site water use associated with reductions in irrigated turf. As with the proposed project, the project applicant would ensure Alternative 2 would adhere to the water shortage restrictions during stages of drought, as set forth in Goleta Water District Code Chapter 6.21. Accordingly, although Alternative 2 would have greater impacts on water supply than the proposed project, impacts would remain less than significant.

Based on a 100 gallons per day per 1,000 square feet wastewater generation factor, Alternative 2 would result in 0.003 million gallons per day (MGD) of wastewater, which is 0.002 MGD less than the amount of wastewater that would be generated by proposed project. A 0.002 MGD increase in wastewater flows represents approximately 0.2 percent of the 0.93 MGD capacity available for Goleta West Sanitary District customers. Accordingly, existing wastewater treatment plant capacity would be sufficient to accept wastewater generated by Alternative 2. Therefore, Alternative 2's impact related to wastewater treatment capacity would be reduced compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 2 would result in less solid waste generation during construction and operation than the proposed project due to reduced construction activities and reduced renovation of the golf course. Alternative 2 would involve the demolition of the existing clubhouse (9,305 square feet). Based on a solid waste generation factor of 100 pounds per square foot for demolition, the demolition of the existing clubhouse would result in approximately 465⁶ tons of debris, approximately 884 tons less than the proposed project⁷. Based on a solid waste generation factor of 3.89 pounds per square foot for construction, the construction of Alternative 2 would generate approximately 72 tons of debris⁸, approximately 17 tons less than the proposed project.⁹ In total, Alternative 2's demolition and construction activities would generate approximately 537 tons of solid waste. With the required 65 percent diversion rate for demolition and construction debris, construction of Alternative 2 would generate approximately 188 tons of solid waste¹⁰, which would not exceed the City's construction and demolition waste threshold of 350 tons. Accordingly, Alternative 2 would not require Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 due to solid waste generation during construction. Once operational, Alternative 2 would result in less solid waste generation than the proposed project due to the absence of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, which would not exceed the City's project-specific threshold of 196 tons per year. Therefore, Alternative 2 would reduce the proposed project's operational solid waste impacts to a less than significant level.

Based on the above, Alternative 2's impacts related to water supply would increase to a less than significant level, compared to no impact under the proposed project, because Alternative 2 does not include a reduction in irrigated turf. Alternative 2's impacts related to solid waste would decrease to a less than significant level as demolition and construction of Alternative 2 would not exceed City solid waste thresholds and implementation of Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 would not be required. Alternative 2's impact related to the construction of utility infrastructure and wastewater treatment capacity would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

6.3.3 Alternative 3: Revised Site Plan

a. Aesthetics

Alternative 3 would include the same facilities as the proposed project, excluding the Hollister Avenue improvements and free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek, and therefore would result in similar effects on scenic vistas compared to the project. Construction of Alternative 3 would occur over a similar timeframe as construction of the proposed project and therefore would result in similar temporary visual impediments. As with the proposed project, construction activities associated with Alternative 3 would be visible from the Hollister Avenue scenic corridor and related scenic viewpoints,

⁶ 9,305 square feet * 100 pounds per square foot = 930,500 pounds / 2,000 pounds per ton = 465.25 tons

⁷ 1,349 tons - 465 tons = 884 tons

⁸ 37,179 square feet * 3.89 pounds per square foot = 144,626 pounds / 2,000 pounds per ton = 72.3 tons

⁹ 89 tons - 72 tons = 17 tons

¹⁰ 465 tons + 72 tons = 537 tons * 35 percent solid waste requiring a landfill = 187.95 tons

Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project

but such visual impacts would be temporary and construction areas would be screened with fencing during construction to obstruct views of equipment and the construction sites from public viewing areas. Alternative 3 would include the same tree removal and replacement as the proposed project which would not interfere with previous, unobstructed, scenic views from public locations. The minimal movement of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop 75 feet southwest would not result in additional impediments of scenic vistas beyond the proposed project's Rio Grande Coffee Shop because the Rio Grande Coffee Shop would continue to be obscured by trees and would not result in additional substantial changes to the landscape. Because Alternative 3 would include the same project facilities as the proposed project, excluding the Hollister Avenue improvements and free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek, Alternative 3 would not result in substantial adverse effects on key viewpoints surrounding the project site. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to scenic vistas would be similar to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would not place infrastructure in an area visible from an officially-designated State scenic highway. As with the proposed project, existing buildings, topography, and vegetation obscure views of the project site and existing on-site development from vehicles travelling along U.S. 101. Alternative 3 would not increase the height of the proposed project's facilities, and therefore Alternative 3's facilities would be obscured from views from U.S. 101. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would result in no impact related to scenic resources within a State scenic highway.

Alternative 3's proposed facilities would not differ from the same facilities evaluated in the proposed project, aside from the shift in the location of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop and omission of the Hollister Avenue improvements and free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek. This minor shift in location would not result in any inconsistencies with the policies and regulations governing visual quality applicable to the proposed project. Alternative 3's facilities would meet the same development standards as the proposed project, including maximum lot coverage, maximum building height, minimum setbacks, and parking, of the Open Space/Active Recreation zone. In addition, Alternative 3's facilities would not exceed FAR Part 77 building height restrictions and would not obstruct views of the Pacific Ocean in compliance with Section 30251 of the California Coastal Act. Alternative 3's impact related to conflicts with zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality would be similar to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would result in the same amount of lighting compared to the proposed project as the Alternative 3 would include the same facilities with lighting as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, light sources associated with Alternative 3 would be similar to existing conditions and be designed in accordance with City standards, including City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy 4.12, Lighting, which requires outdoor lighting fixtures to be designed, located, aimed downward or toward structures (if properly shielded), retrofitted if feasible, and maintained in order to prevent over-lighting, energy waste, glare, light trespass, and sky glow. Alternative 3 would result in the same lighting sources from vehicles as the proposed project. Lighting would be similar to the surrounding area due to frequent residential and commercial vehicles near the U.S. 101 and Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oaks Road interchange. Alternative 3 would introduce the same sources of glare from the sunlight reflecting on the glass surfaces of proposed facilities as the proposed project. Vegetative screening around the clubhouse and maintenance yard would reduce off-site impacts of glare from the clubhouse and cars, and the comfort station would be located in the southeastern portion of the project site and would have limited potential to produce off-site glare impacts. Like the proposed project,, Alternative 3's impact related to light and glare would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's aesthetics impacts would be the same compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic quality, and light and glare, and no impacts related to scenic highways.

b. Air Quality

As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 does not propose any change to the project site's existing land use and therefore would not conflict with the land use assumptions that inform the 2022 Ozone Plan's emissions forecasts. Alternative 3 would require the same number of employees compared to the proposed project and therefore would result in the same indirect population growth. Given that the proposed project's indirect population growth is within SBCAG growth projections utilized within the 2022 Ozone Plan, Alternative 3 would also be within SBCAG growth projections and therefore would not conflict with the 2022 Ozone Plan, which would be the same level of impact compared to the proposed project.

Alternative 3 would reduce the scope of the proposed project's construction activities by excluding the Hollister Avenue improvements and free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek and therefore would result in reduced criteria air pollutant emissions during construction compared to the proposed project. Given that construction of the proposed project would not exceed SBCAPCD emissions thresholds, Alternative 3's construction would also not exceed SBCAPCD thresholds. Alternative 3 would include the same operational activities as the proposed project and therefore would generate the same criteria air pollutant emissions as operation of the proposed project, which would not exceed SBCAPCD thresholds. This impact would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

As described above, Alternative 3 would reduce the scope of the proposed project's construction activities which would result in less toxic air contaminant emissions on the project site compared to the proposed project. Based on existing northeast to southwest wind patterns on the project site, these emissions would be carried away from the single-family residential receptors. As with the proposed project, operation of Alternative 3 would not involve the use of equipment that would increase toxic air contaminant emission on the project site. Alternative 3's impact related to toxic air contaminants would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3's construction would result in the same odors as the proposed project which would be intermittent, temporary, and dissipate rapidly with distance from in-use construction equipment. Alternative 3 would shift the location of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop further from residential receptors than the proposed project which would result in the creation of odors further from residential receptors. Food-related odors associated with food preparation would primarily be confined to the indoor dining areas of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop. Food-related odors would also dissipate rapidly, and given the northeast to southwest wind patterns, would not be carried to nearby development north and east of the project site. Therefore, Alternative 3's odor impact would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's air quality impacts would be reduced to the proposed project due to the reduction in construction activities compared to the proposed project. Like the proposed project, Alternative 3's impacts to air quality would be less than significant.

c. Biological Resources

Alternative 3 would not include construction of the free-standing bridge within Devereaux Creek and therefore would avoid impacts to monarch butterfly associated with degradation of Monarch Butterfly Roosting ESHA at Devereaux Creek due to bridge installation. Alternative 3 would result in similar direct and indirect impacts to special-status species related to habitat removal and degradation and would require Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-10 to reduce potential impacts to special-status plant and wildlife species to a less than significant level. Alternative 3's impacts to special-status species would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Alternative 3 would not include construction of the free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek and therefore would avoid Devereux Creek riparian ESHA and Monarch Butterfly Roosting ESHA along the eastern boundary of the project site. However, similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would include direct impacts to riparian habitat ESHA, and aquatic resources through storm drain installation and grading activities and indirect impacts associated with construction activities such as the use of construction equipment. Therefore, Alternative 3 would require Mitigation Measures BIO-2 through BIO-4 and BIO-11 to reduce potential impacts related to riparian habitat, ESHA, and wetlands to a less than significant level. Alternative 3's impact related to riparian habitat, ESHA, and aquatic resources would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 3's construction activities could exceed City noise thresholds and result in potential disruption of wildlife movement in the short term. Accordingly, Alternative 3 would require Mitigation Measure NOI-1 to reduce potential impacts to wildlife movement related to construction noise to a less than significant level. Alternative 3 would include the same lighting as the proposed project which would not result in substantial impediments to wildlife movement. Alternative 3 would result in the same human presence on the project site as the proposed project. Like the proposed project, Alternative 3's impact related to wildlife movement would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would include installation of a storm drain and associated outlet within arroyo willow thickets ESHA along Devereux Creek, sand capping and grading within the 100-foot Streamside Protection Area, and trenching for underground utilities within riparian ESHA along Devereux Creek and along the eastern project site boundary within riparian and monarch butterfly roosting habitat ESHA. As with the proposed project, these activities could potentially be inconsistent with General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 1.6 and Policy CE.9.5. Therefore, Alternative 3 would require implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, and BIO-11 to reduce this impact to a less than significant level, which would be the same as the proposed project.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would not be located in an area subject to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Alternative 3 would have no impact related to conflicts with these plans, which would be the same level of impact compared to the proposed project.

Overall, Alternative 3 would reduce the proposed project's impacts to riparian habitat and ESHA by excluding construction of the free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek. Alternative 3's impacts related to special-status plant and wildlife species, riparian and ESHA habitat, wetlands, wildlife migration, and conflicts with local policies protecting biological resources would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Like the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have no

impact related to conflicts with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

d. Cultural Resources

As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would include the restoration and adaptive reuse of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, a historical resource. Restoration and adaptive reuse activities would be carried out in accordance with Mitigation Measure CUL-1 to ensure the historical integrity of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station is preserved. Alternative 3 would shift the Rio Grande Coffee Shop approximately 50 feet from the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station which would ensure construction activities, including the use of a vibratory roller or large bulldozer, would not result in substantial vibration which could damage Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. Therefore, Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would not be required for Alternative 3. Alternative 3 would result in less than significant impacts to historic resources, which is reduced compared to the proposed project.

Construction of Alternative 3 would reduce the amount of ground disturbance compared to the proposed project as Alternative 3 would not include the Hollister Avenue improvements or construction of the free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek. Therefore, Alternative 3 would reduce the potential to encounter unknown archaeological resources compared to the proposed project. Because ground disturbance would still occur, Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4 would continue to be required. These measures would minimize potential impacts to unanticipated discoveries of archaeological resources by requiring archaeological monitoring, a cultural resources sensitivity meeting for construction personnel, and implementation of appropriate procedures for evaluation and treatment of any discoveries made during construction. Accordingly, Alternative 3's impact to archaeological resources would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Construction of Alternative 3 would reduce the amount of ground disturbance compared to the proposed project which would reduce the potential to encounter unknown human remains. As with the proposed project, in the event of unanticipated discovery of human remains, the construction contractor would comply with State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and human remains would be preserved in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. With regulatory compliance, Alternative 3's impact to human remains would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 3 would reduce the proposed project's impact to historical resources to less than significant and would not require the implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2. Alternative 3's impact to archaeological resources would be reduced but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 3's impact to human remains would be reduced but would remain less than significant.

e. Energy

Alternative 3 would reduce the scope of the proposed project's construction activities by excluding the Hollister Avenue improvements and free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek and therefore would result in reduced fuel used for construction equipment compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, energy use during construction would be temporary and minimized in compliance with existing regulations such as California Code of Regulations Title 13 Sections 2449 and 2485, which prohibit diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles and off-road diesel vehicles from idling for more than five minutes. Operation of Alternative 3 would require the same energy consumption as the proposed project, which would occur in compliance with the energy efficiency standards such

as the California Green Building Standards Code and the 2025 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Alternative 3's impact related to the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy resources would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would adhere to the California Green Building Standards Code and the 2025 Building Energy Efficiency Standards to minimize unnecessary energy use in the proposed facilities. Alternative 3's facilities would be supplied power from SCE in accordance with Senate Bill 100, which requires SCE to increase renewable energy procurement to 60 percent by 2030, and 100 percent by 2045. Alternative 3 would provide the same amount of electric vehicle parking as the proposed project which would be consistent with the requirements of the CALGreen intervening code update and the City's Municipal Code, which requires new non-residential construction to construct at least 30 percent of new parking spaces to be EV capable or include EV charging infrastructure. Alternative 3 would include the same amount of bicycle spaces as the proposed project to encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation, consistent with the City's CAP, Strategic Energy Plan, General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, and Municipal Code. Furthermore, Alternative 3 would be designed in accordance with the City's Energy Performance Reach Code which would provide electric-ready facilities for the use of electric infrastructure. In addition, Alternative 3 would continue to utilize the existing on-site electric golf carts for golfers. Alternative 3's impact related to conflicts with state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's energy impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the reduction in construction activities. Alternative 3's impacts to energy would remain less than significant.

f. Geology and Soils

As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would not locate structures within 50 feet of the More Ranch Fault and would not directly or indirectly cause the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault. This impact would be the same as the proposed project, and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would include renovation in an area with the same risks of seismic activity as the proposed project and therefore could result in potential risks associated with seismic ground shaking. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 requiring recommendations from the project-specific geotechnical reports to be put into grading and building plans. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce potential impacts due to groundshaking on the project site to a less than significant level through incorporation of structural integrity recommendations. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to seismic ground shaking would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Alternative 3 would be subject to the same liquefaction risks as the proposed project's structures, which are very low. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3's design would incorporate design measures required by the CBC which reduce the potential for substantial adverse effects due to liquefaction. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to liquefaction would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would be subject to the same landslide risks as the proposed project and would not place structures in areas of high landslide potential. Only activities related to the proposed golf course improvements would occur in areas with high landslide potential. Alternative 3 would require the same maximum cut and fill slopes as the proposed project, which would not result in substantially steep slopes or other conditions that could induce a landslide. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to landslides would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Construction of Alternative 3 would reduce the amount of ground disturbance compared to the proposed project which would reduce the potential for erosion compared to the proposed project. Construction of Alternative 3 would occur in compliance with the same requirements for erosion control as the proposed project, including the Construction Stormwater General Permit and Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code. Accordingly, construction of Alternative 3 would minimize the potential to cause substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Alternative 3 would include implementation of the same stormwater control infrastructure and site design BMPs as the proposed project to minimize erosion during operation. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would not substantially increase the rate of runoff on the site compared to existing conditions, as the impervious surfaces added to the project site would represent an increase of less than 0.2 percent compared to existing conditions. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to erosion would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would be subject to the same risks related to unstable geologic units and soil as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would not locate structures in an area subject to substantial liquefaction potential, landslide hazards, or potential for soil collapse. Potential impacts associated with geotechnical hazards would be minimized with adherence to the CBC. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 may require groundwater dewatering during construction, but groundwater dewatering would be limited to the localized perched water on the project site and would be temporary, only occurring if perched groundwater is encountered. Therefore, construction of Alternative 3 would not result in substantial groundwater withdrawals that could result in subsidence on-site. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to the risk of landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would locate structures on soils with very low potential for expansion. The construction contractor would be required to comply with the requirements of the CBC, including the use of non-expansive fill material, to minimize the potential for structural hazards associated with soil expansion. Alternative 3's impact related to creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property related to expansive soil would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would involve connecting the clubhouse, comfort station, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop to the Goleta West Sanitary District sewer system and the abandonment of the private septic systems serving the existing clubhouse and comfort station. Alternative 3 would not involve the installation of additional septic tanks on-site and therefore would not result in impacts related to the use of septic tanks. Therefore, Alternative 3 would have no impact related to soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks, which would be the same level of impact compared to the proposed project.

Alternative 3 would reduce the amount of ground disturbance compared to the proposed project which would reduce the potential to encounter paleontological resources or unique geologic features compared to the proposed project. However, Alternative 3 could result in the disturbance of unknown

paleontological resources. Therefore, Alternative 3 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-2 to reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources and unique geologic features to a less than significant level by requiring WEAP training, monitoring, and setting forth procedures for the recovery, identification, and curation of fossils discovered during construction. Alternative 3's impacts related to paleontological resources or unique geologic features would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's erosion impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant. Alternative 3's paleontological resources impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 3's impacts related to groundshaking would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 3's impacts related to fault rupture, liquefaction, landslides, unstable soils, and expansive soils, would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant. As with the proposed project, there would be no impact related potential for on-site soils to be capable to support the existing on-site septic systems.

g. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Alternative 3 would reduce the scope of the proposed project's construction activities by excluding Hollister Avenue improvements and the freestanding bridge over Devereaux Creek. Therefore, this alternative would result in reduced GHG emissions during construction compared to the proposed project. Alternative 3's operation would include the same components as the proposed project and therefore generate the same GHG emissions as operation of the proposed project. Accordingly, the combined construction and operation emissions of Alternative 3 would be reduced compared to the proposed project, which would not result in substantial GHG emissions. Therefore, Alternative 3's impacts related to GHG emissions would be reduced compared to the proposed project. Impacts would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would include design features to promote renewable energy use, energy efficiency, water efficiency, and reductions in vehicle travel, all of which contribute to the creation of minimal GHG emissions. Alternative 3 would not include additional renovation compared to the proposed project which could have the potential to conflict with applicable GHG reduction plans. Alternative 3 would include EV charging infrastructure that exceeds California Green Building Standards and City requirements for EV charging infrastructure. Alternative 3's proposed facilities would be the same as the proposed project and be designed in accordance with the same energy efficiency standards. Alternative 3 would incorporate water efficient fixtures to reduce water consumption for landscaping, plumbing, and irrigation consistent with the latest Title 24 Green Building Code and Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Alternative 3 would also include the same new water-efficient irrigation system as the proposed project which would reduce GHG emissions associated with water use. Alternative 3 would include active transportation facilities (i.e., bicycle parking) and therefore would encourage active transportation and the reduction of GHG emission from vehicles. However, Alternative 3 would not include implementation of the continuation of the Type 4 trail and therefore would not promote minimal GHG emissions from vehicles like the proposed project. Nevertheless, Alternative 3 would be consistent with applicable GHG reduction plans. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact would be greater compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's GHG emissions would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to decreased construction activity. As Alternative 3 would include less infrastructure that would minimize on-site GHG emissions, impacts related to consistency with applicable GHG reduction plans would be increased compared to the proposed project. Impacts related to GHG emissions would remain less than significant.

h. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Alternative 3 would reduce the scope of the proposed project's construction activities by excluding Hollister Avenue improvements and the freestanding bridge over Devereaux Creek and therefore would result in less hazardous material usage compared to the proposed project. Hazardous materials used during construction of Alternative 3 would be handled in accordance with the same regulations as the proposed project, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Waste Control Law, and California Code of Regulations Title 22. Construction of Alternative 3 would occur in compliance with a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan to reduce potential spills. All hazardous material transport, use, or disposal associated with Alternative 3's operation would comply with existing hazardous materials regulations established by United States Environmental Protection Agency, the State of California, the County of Santa Barbara, and the City of Goleta. These regulations prescribe measures for the safe transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials to reduce risk of spills. Accordingly, Alternative 3's impact related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would include demolition of the existing clubhouse portions of the existing maintenance facility, and comfort station, and restoration of the Barnsdall Rio Gas Station which have the potential to contain ACM, LBP, mercury, and PCB. Alternative 3 would require less ground disturbance than the proposed project and therefore would have less potential to result in release of hazardous soils; however, grading could potentially disturb hazardous materials in soil, leading to an accidental release of hazardous materials. As with the proposed project, construction of Alternative 3 could also encounter perched groundwater which, if contaminated, could result in the accidental release of hazardous materials. In addition, operation of Alternative 3 could result in exposure to volatile organic compounds in the soil similar to the proposed project. Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6 would continue to be required, which would reduce potential hazardous material impacts associated with accidental releases of hazardous materials during demolition of the existing clubhouse, and grading of potentially contaminated soil, soil vapor, or groundwater to a less than significant level. Operation of Alternative 3 would result in the same reduction in fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course as the proposed project due to the same reduction of irrigated turf. Accordingly, Alternative 3's impact related to the accidental release of hazardous materials would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As with the proposed project, construction of Alternative 3 could potentially occur within 0.25 mile of the Ellwood School. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3's construction activities would have the potential to create a significant hazard involving the release of ACMs, LBP, mercury, or PCBs into the environment, or through exposure and transport of on-site contaminated soil or groundwater, which would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to handling hazardous materials within 0.25-mile of a school would be reduced compared to the proposed project but remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have potential to result in hazardous material release due to the presence of on-site hazardous materials. Mitigation Measures HAZ-3 through HAZ-6 and HAZ-7 would be required which mandates oversight from Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Services and Central Coast RWQCB. Alternative 3's impact related to the presence of on-site hazardous materials would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would be located outside of the safety and noise contours of the Santa Barbara Airport. Alternative 3's facilities would be designed the same as the proposed project and therefore would not conflict with the standards of Review Area 2 of the Santa Barbara Airport's Airport Influence Area or FAR Part 77. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to safety hazards and excessive noise due to proximity to an airport would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would not include construction on Hollister Avenue and therefore would result in less potential to interfere with emergency response or evacuation of Hollister Avenue compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3's operations would not introduce activities that could impede or interfere with the Santa Barbara County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan or emergency evacuations on Hollister Avenue. Alternative 3's impact related to impaired implementation or physical interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would be located on the same site as the proposed project and therefore be exposed to the same fire risks as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, construction of Alternative 3 would comply with California Public Resources Code Sections 4442, 4427, 4428, and 4431 to minimize the potential for wildland fire. Alternative 3's structures would result in the same fire risks as the proposed project, which would be minimized with adherence to the standards of the California Fire Code, CBC, and California Code of Regulations Title 14. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to wildland fire would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's impacts related to hazardous materials would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 3's hazardous materials impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the reduction in construction activities and lack of encroachment onto Hollister Avenue. Alternative 3's impacts related to upset or accident of hazardous materials, emissions of hazardous materials near schools, and hazardous materials sites would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Impacts related to transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, airport hazards, emergency response plans, and wildland fires would remain less than significant.

i. Hydrology and Water Quality

Given the reduction in construction activities, Alternative 3 would have reduced potential to degrade water quality compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would include demolition of the existing clubhouse, portions of the existing maintenance facility, and comfort station, which could discharge ACB and LBP to on-site soils where they could then be transported off-site in stormwater runoff. Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 would be required and would minimize the potential for the accidental release of ACB and LBP. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 could require groundwater dewatering of perched groundwater during construction which, if contaminated, could result in releases of hazardous materials into stormwater. Mitigation Measure HAZ-5 would be required to reduce the potential for the accidental discharge of

contaminated groundwater. Construction of Alternative 3 would comply with the Construction Stormwater General Permit, including the implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and BMPs to minimize the introduction of pollutants during construction activities. Alternative 3 would not include the installation of bridge at Devereaux Creek or culvert removal and therefore would not require implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1 and BIO-4 to minimize the introduction of pollutants into Devereaux Creek. In addition, adherence to the City's Municipal Code would ensure construction activities would minimize substantial runoff water which would exceed the capacities of Devereaux Creek or Bell Canyon Creek. Alternative 3's construction impacts related to water quality degradation, erosion, and the introduction of substantial polluted runoff and exceedances of stormwater capacity would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Alternative 3 would include the same stormwater control infrastructure as the proposed project to treat and discharge stormwater onto the golf course consistent with the requirements of the Central Coast RWQCB. As with the proposed project, treated water and high-flow bypass from the basins would be discharged to the golf course rather than the storm drain system in Hollister Avenue that outlets to Bell Canyon Creek which would minimize the amount of stormwater and potential stormwater pollutants entering Bell Canyon Creek. Alternative 3 would also abandon the existing on-site septic systems which, upon completion, would reduce the potential for groundwater quality to be affected by sewage. Operation of Alternative 3 would result in the same reduction in fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course as the proposed project. Alternative 3 would include the same new irrigation system included in the proposed project which would reduce water use for landscaping compared to existing conditions and therefore would reduce the potential for operation of the golf course to discharge stormwater pollutants due to erosion compared to existing conditions. Alternative 3 would include the same maintenance facility as the proposed project, and potential stormwater pollutants from the maintenance facility would be minimized with storage of hazardous materials in accordance with the requirements of the Santa Barbara Public Health Department's Consolidated Unified Program Agency Hazardous Material Division and the Santa Barbara County Agriculture Commissioner. Alternative 3's operational impacts related to water quality degradation, erosion, and the introduction of substantial polluted runoff and exceedances of stormwater capacity would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, construction of Alternative 3 has the potential to require groundwater dewatering of perched groundwater. Groundwater dewatering activities would be localized and temporary, lasting only during excavation activities, if groundwater is encountered. The anticipated duration and minimal amount of groundwater dewatering that would be required for excavation would not result in substantial groundwater losses in the Basin. Similar to the proposed project, given the limited infiltration potential of on-site soils and the minimal amount of impervious surface increase generated by Alternative 3, Alternative 3 would not substantially decrease groundwater infiltration rates on-site or result in substantial interference to groundwater recharge, Alternative 3's impact related to substantially decreasing groundwater supplies or interfering with groundwater recharge would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 3's bioretention basins would be sized to collect and convey stormwater runoff on the project site to the golf course such that an increase in on-site flooding compared to existing conditions would not occur in accordance with Central Coast RWQCB requirements. Alternative 3 would not include work within Devereaux Creek and therefore has no potential to result in on- or off-site flooding in Devereaux Creek; however, Alternative 3 would not result in long-term improvements associated with culvert removal and the restoration of Devereaux

Creek to its natural flow. Alternative 3's impact related to on- or off-site flooding would be greater compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would be subject to the same on-site inundation hazards as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would locate structures outside of a flood hazard zone, tsunami zone, seiche hazard zone, and dam inundation zone. Like the proposed project, hazardous materials stored on-site would be located outside the inundation areas and stored in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. Impacts related to risk of release of stormwater pollutants during inundation would be similar to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Given the reduction in construction activities, Alternative 3 would have a reduced potential to degrade water quality in conflict with the Basin Plan compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would adhere to the requirements of the Construction Stormwater General Permit and Chapter 13.04 and Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code to minimize water quality impacts, and would require Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5 to reduce potential water quality impacts to a less than significant level. Accordingly, Alternative 3's impacts related to conflicts with the Basin Plan would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As described above, Alternative 3 would not adversely impact groundwater supplies. Accordingly, Alternative 3 would not interfere with the management of the Basin in accordance with the Wright Judgement. Accordingly, Alternative 3's impact related to conflicts with the Wright Judgement or Goleta Water District's Groundwater Management Plan Goleta Groundwater Basin would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's overall hydrology and water quality impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the reduction in construction activities. Alternative 3's impacts related to water quality, polluted runoff, and conflict with water quality plans or groundwater management plans would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Impacts related to groundwater, erosion and siltation, flooding, and release of pollutants from inundation would remain less than significant.

j. Land Use and Planning

As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would be located on the existing Sandpiper Golf Club and would not include any components that could divide an established community. Alternative 3's impact would be the same as the proposed project, and no impact related to the physical division of an established community would occur.

Alternative 3 would largely include the same renovation as the proposed project, excluding the Hollister Avenue improvements and would not include the construction of the free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek. Alternative 3's facilities would be the same as the proposed project and would therefore be consistent with all applicable Goleta Municipal Code zoning standards and FAR Part 77 standards. Alternative 3 would include installation of the same storm drain and outlet within arroyo willow thickets ESHA as the proposed project and therefore would have the same potential to conflict with Policy CE 1.6 of the City's General Plan/Local Coastal Plan. Alternative 3 would include trenching for underground utilities along Hollister Avenue right-of-way and would result in trenching within riparian and monarch butterfly roosting ESHA. Therefore, Alternative 3 would have a similar potential to conflict with Policy 9.5 of the City's General Plan/Local Coastal Plan compared to the proposed project. As Alternative 3 would not include the Type 4 trail, Alternative 3 would be inconsistent with the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, as well as Policies OS 4.4, VH 2.5, VH 3.3, VH 3.5, and

VH 4.10. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would be consistent with most policies of the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan through implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-11, CUL-1 through CUL-4, NOI-1, TCR-1, and TCR-2. Alternative 3's impact would be similar when compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation.

k. Noise

Alternative 3 would not include the Hollister Avenue improvements and would not include the construction of the free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek and therefore would result in less construction noise than the proposed project. In addition, Alternative 3 would shift the location of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop resulting in a reduction in construction noise associated with the Rio Grande Coffee Shop for single-family residences to the east. Alternative 3 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 to ensure construction noise levels do not exceed Goleta's 65 dBA construction noise standards. Accordingly, Alternative 3's construction noise impact remain less than significant with mitigation.

Alternative 3 would result in less construction traffic noise than the proposed project because Alternative 3 would not require construction worker trips for the Hollister Avenue improvements or free-standing bridge over Devereaux Creek. Because the proposed project's construction would not result in an increase of 3 dBA or more, the reduced construction in accordance with Alternative 3 would not result in an increase of 3 dBA or more of traffic noise. Alternative 3's construction traffic noise impact would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would include the same facilities as the proposed project which would generate the same noise levels at nearby sensitive receptors as the proposed project except for the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, which would generate decreased noise at single-family residences to the east due to its relocation. Operational noise associated with heating, ventilation, and air conditioning units, the pump station, and conversational noise would not exceed City noise thresholds. Accordingly, Alternative 3's stationary operational noise impact would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would result in the same new vehicle trips as the proposed project as Alternative 3 includes the same facilities as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would not result in operational traffic noise exceeding 3 dBA. Alternative 3's operational traffic noise impact would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would include the use of similar construction equipment as the proposed project, including the use of a vibratory roller and large bulldozer, which could generate substantial groundborne vibration. The equipment would exceed the Caltrans vibration damage potential threshold for historical structures of 0.12 PPV in/sec for transient sources within a distance of 42 feet and 20 feet, respectively. However, Alternative 3 includes the relocation of Rio Grande Coffee Shop 50 feet southwest of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. This relocation would ensure that construction equipment would be operated greater than 42 feet from Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station which would minimize the potential for construction to generate groundborne vibration that could damage the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station. Unlike the proposed project, Alternative 3 would not require implementation of mitigation to reduce potential groundborne vibration impacts. Alternative 3 would reduce the proposed project's vibration impact to a less than significant level.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would be located outside of the noise contours from Santa Barbara Airport. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to excessive airport noise would remain less than significant, which is the same as the proposed project.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's construction noise and construction vibration impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the reduction in construction activities and relocation of the Rio Grande Coffee Shop. Alternative 3's operational noise impacts would be the same as the proposed project. Alternative 3's would result in less than significant groundborne vibration impacts, compared to the proposed project's less than significant with mitigation impact. Alternative 3's impacts related to construction noise would remain less than significant with mitigation. Alternative 3's impacts related to operational noise and airport noise would remain less than significant.

I. Parks and Recreation

Alternative 3 would require less construction activities and therefore would result in less potential to degrade existing park facilities due to construction worker use as construction workers would not need to spend as much time at the project site and would have less opportunities to use surrounding recreational areas during break periods. Alternative 3 would include the same amount of employees as the proposed project which would not result in a substantial reduction in the amount of parkland available to the residents of Goleta. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 could increase the amount of visitors to the project site which may increase the use of nearby parks and trails; however, ultimately Alternative 3 would expand recreational opportunities in Goleta such that residents have additional options for recreation through the dedication of a lateral access easement for beach access. However, Alternative 3 would not include the Type 4 trail that would serve as a continuation of the Juan Bautista de Anza Trail and therefore would not provide the same amount of recreation infrastructure as the proposed project. Alternative 3's impact to park facilities would be greater than the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would include similar recreational facilities as the proposed project, excluding the Type 4 trail, which would not result in additional environmental impacts beyond what is evaluated in this EIR. As described above, Alternative 3 would not result in substantial deterioration of recreational facilities and furthermore would not necessitate new or expanded recreational facilities. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to recreational facilities would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's parks and recreation impacts would be reduced during construction compared to the proposed project due to the reduction in construction activities but would be increased during operation due to the lack of the Type 4 trail. Alternative 3's impacts related to parks and recreation would remain less than significant.

m. Public Services

Alternative 3 would require the same employees as the proposed project and therefore would result in the same indirect population growth compared to the proposed project. Given that the proposed project's indirect population growth would not result in substantially diminished fire protection services, police protection services, school capacities, or library services, Alternative 3's indirect population growth would also not result in substantially diminished public services. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would be located in proximity to existing fire stations and police stations and would be adequately served by existing fire protection and police protection services in Goleta. In addition, as with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would also include the required

payment of development impact fees which would provide funding for expanded public services in accordance with Chapter 17.70 of the Municipal Code and Goleta Union School District and Santa Barbara Unified School District fees. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to public services would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

n. Transportation and Circulation

As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would not include elements that would conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Alternative 3 would add the same bicycle parking spaces and bicycle entrance to the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, but would not include the continuation of the Juan Bautista De Anza Trail to the project site or dedication of a lateral access easement along Hollister Avenue, and would therefore provide less facilities for bicycle and pedestrian travel. Unlike the proposed project, Alternative 3 would not support the City of Goleta's General Plan/Local Coastal Plan Policy OS.4.4, which aims to facilitate improvements to the portion of the Juan Bautista De Anza Trail within Goleta. As with the proposed project, the design for Alternative 3's proposed driveways would be subject to review and approval by the City and SBCFD which would minimize the potential for vehicle to pedestrian and vehicle to cyclist conflicts. Unlike the proposed project, Alternative 3 would not result in any temporary lane, bicycle route, or sidewalk closures on Hollister Avenue and would not include roadway impediments on Hollister Avenue during construction. Alternative 3 would require the same amount of employees than the proposed project which, as with the proposed project, would not substantially interfere with Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District operations. Accordingly, Alternative 3's construction impact related to conflicts with transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities would be reduced compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant. However, unlike the proposed project, Alternative 3 would not include infrastructure along Hollister Avenue to promote bicycle and pedestrian transportation, and would not further support the City's policies related to bicycle and pedestrian facilities. However, impacts would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would require less construction activities than the proposed project and therefore would generate less short-term VMT increases than the proposed project. This construction-related VMT increase would be temporary and would not have a lasting effect on the overall transportation network or long-term VMT patterns in the area. Alternative 3 would include the same facilities as the proposed project which would be exempt from quantitative VMT analysis and presumed to have a less than significant impact on VMT pursuant to the City's VMT Guidelines. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would increase the time between tee-offs and correspondingly reduce the annual rounds of golf per year, which would reduce the amount of vehicle trips and associated VMT generated by golfers to get to and from the project site compared to existing conditions. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to conflicts with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, during construction of Alternative 3, equipment staging would occur on-site and construction personnel would park on-site, which would minimize the potential for construction related vehicles and equipment to disrupt in the immediate area. Unlike the proposed project, Alternative 3 would not include construction in the right-of-way of Hollister Avenue and therefore would not result in any roadway impediments on Hollister Avenue. Alternative 3 would include the same driveway configuration as the proposed project which would be designed accordance with all applicable SBCFD standards to minimize line-of-sight disruptions and hazards between vehicles and pedestrians and vehicles and cyclists. As with the proposed project, Alternative

3 would not introduce new incompatible uses, such as farm equipment, to roadways, and Alternative 3's uses would be the same as existing on-site uses. Accordingly, Alternative 3's impacts to increased hazards would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

As stated above, during construction of Alternative 3, equipment staging would occur on-site and construction personnel would park on-site, which would minimize the potential for construction related vehicles and equipment to result in inadequate emergency access. Unlike the proposed project, Alternative 3 would not result in any potential for inadequate emergency access in the short term on Hollister Avenue because Alternative 3 does not include construction in the Hollister Avenue right-of-way. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would be designed in accordance with all applicable SBCFD standards to maintain adequate emergency access. As with the proposed project, SBCFD and the City would review and approve Alternative 3's design, which would ensure Alternative 3 would provide adequate egress for emergency access. Therefore, Alternative 3's impacts to emergency access would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's transportation and circulation impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project due to the lack of construction in the Hollister Avenue right-of-way. Alternative 3's impacts related to transportation and circulation would remain less than significant.

o. Tribal Cultural Resources

As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would be located in an area with a high sensitivity for cultural resources, including tribal cultural resources. Alternative 3 would require less ground disturbance, which would reduce the potential to encounter tribal cultural resources compared to the proposed project. Although impacts would be reduced, potential to unearth previously unidentified resources would remain. As such, Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4, and TCR-1 and TCR-2 would be required, including implementation of a tribal monitoring agreement and appropriate disposition of any unanticipated tribal cultural resources discovered during construction. Alternative 3's impact related to tribal cultural resources would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation.

p. Utilities and Service Systems

Alternative 3 would require the installation and relocation of the same utility infrastructure as required for the proposed project. Accordingly, Alternative 3's impact related to the relocation or construction of utility infrastructure would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3's water demand would be the same as the proposed project which would reduce on-site water use compared to existing conditions. Accordingly, Alternative 3 would have no impact on water use, the same as the proposed project.

Alternative 3's wastewater generation would be the same as the proposed project which would be accommodated by existing wastewater treatment plant capacity available for Goleta West Sanitary District customers. Therefore, Alternative 3's impact related to wastewater treatment capacity would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 3 would result in less solid waste generation as the proposed project during construction due lack of Hollister Avenue improvements and free-standing bridge, but would still generate substantial solid waste during construction. As such, Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 would be required to

reduce solid waste generated during construction below the City's project specific threshold of 350 tons of nonrecyclable construction and demolition debris. Once operational, Alternative 3 would result in the same solid waste generation as the proposed project which does not exceed the City's project-specific threshold of 196 tons per year. Therefore, solid waste impacts related to the operation of Alternative 3 would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Based on the above, Alternative 3's impacts related to solid waste would be reduced compared to the proposed project but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 3's impacts related to the construction of utility infrastructure and wastewater treatment capacity would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant. Like the proposed project, no water supply impacts would occur.

6.3.4 Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path

a. Aesthetics

Alternative 4 would include the same facilities as the proposed project; however, rather than include a Type 4 trail along the south side of Hollister Avenue from the project site's eastern boundary to the proposed clubhouse parking lot, Alternative 4 would include a bicycle path along Hollister Avenue from Cathedral Oaks Road to Pebble Beach Drive. Thus, Alternative 4 would result in similar effects on scenic vistas compared to the project. Construction of Alternative 4 would occur over a similar timeframe as construction of the proposed project and therefore would result in similar temporary visual impairments. As with the proposed project, construction activities associated with Alternative 4 would be visible from the Hollister Avenue scenic corridor and related scenic viewpoints. Although Alternative 4 would result in additional construction along Hollister Avenue due to the extended bicycle path, visual impacts would be temporary and construction areas along the golf course would be screened with fencing during construction (as with the proposed project) to obstruct views of equipment and the construction sites from public viewing areas. Because Alternative 4 would include the same project facilities as the proposed project, and the proposed bicycle path would constitute a linear feature with minimal aboveground elements, Alternative 4 would not result in substantial adverse effects on key viewpoints surrounding the project site. Therefore, Alternative 4's impact related to scenic vistas would be similar to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 4 would not place infrastructure in an area visible from an officially-designated State scenic highway. As with the proposed project, existing buildings, topography, and vegetation obscure views of the project site and existing on-site development from vehicles travelling along U.S. 101. Alternative 4 would not increase the height of the proposed project's facilities, and therefore Alternative 4's facilities would be obscured from views from U.S. 101. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would result in no impact related to scenic resources within a State scenic highway.

Alternative 4's proposed facilities would not differ from the same facilities evaluated in the proposed project, aside from the extended bicycle path instead of the Type 4 trail. This substitution in linear features would not result in any inconsistencies with the policies and regulations governing visual quality applicable to the proposed project. Alternative 4's facilities would meet the same development standards as the proposed project, including maximum lot coverage, maximum building height, minimum setbacks, and parking, of the Open Space/Active Recreation zone. In addition, Alternative 4's facilities would not exceed FAR Part 77 building height restrictions and would not obstruct views of the Pacific Ocean in compliance with Section 30251 of the California Coastal Act.

Alternative 4's impact related to conflicts with zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality would be similar to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 4 would result in the same facilities and therefore the same amount of lighting compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, light sources associated with Alternative 4 would be similar to existing conditions and be designed in accordance with City standards, including City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy 4.12, Lighting, which requires outdoor lighting fixtures to be designed, located, aimed downward or toward structures (if properly shielded), retrofitted if feasible, and maintained in order to prevent over-lighting, energy waste, glare, light trespass, and sky glow. Alternative 4 would result in the same lighting sources from vehicles as the proposed project. Lighting would be similar to the surrounding area due to frequent residential and commercial vehicles near the U.S. 101 and Hollister Avenue/Cathedral Oaks Road interchange. Alternative 4 would introduce the same sources of glare from the sunlight reflecting on the glass surfaces of proposed facilities as the proposed project. Vegetative screening around the clubhouse and maintenance yard would reduce off-site impacts of glare from the clubhouse and cars, and the comfort station would be located in the southeastern portion of the project site and would have limited potential to produce off-site glare impacts. Like the proposed project, Alternative 4's impact related to light and glare would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 4's aesthetics impacts would be similar compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would have less than significant impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic quality, and light and glare, and no impacts related to scenic highways.

b. Air Quality

As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 does not entail any change to the project site's existing land use and therefore would not conflict with the land use assumptions that inform the 2022 Ozone Plan's emissions forecasts. Alternative 4 would require the same number of employees compared to the proposed project and therefore would result in the same indirect population growth. Given that the proposed project's indirect population growth is within SBCAG growth projections utilized within the 2022 Ozone Plan, Alternative 4 would also be within SBCAG growth projections and therefore would not conflict with the 2022 Ozone Plan, which would be the same level of impact compared to the proposed project.

Alternative 4 would slightly increase the scope of the proposed project's construction activities by extending the bicycle path from the project site's eastern boundary to Pebble Beach Drive, and therefore would result in a small increase in criteria air pollutant emissions during construction compared to the proposed project. Under Alternative 4, approximately 0.49 acre of additional ground disturbance would occur, which is approximately 0.28 percent of the total anticipated ground disturbance of 174.43 acres under the proposed project. The proposed project's maximum annual construction emissions are 1.03 tons per year of reactive organic compounds, and 3.36 tons per year of nitrogen oxides, which do not exceed the applicable SBCAPCD thresholds of 25 tons per year. While construction activities would be slightly greater than the proposed project, the increase would be nominal given the overall scale of construction activities. As such, Alternative 4 would similarly not exceed the applicable SBCAPCD thresholds.

Alternative 4 would include the same golf course operational activities as the proposed project and therefore would generate the same criteria air pollutant emissions as operation of the proposed project, which would not exceed SBCAPCD thresholds. However, Alternative 4 would reduce long-term criteria pollutant emissions by promoting alternative modes of transportation. Specifically, the inclusion of a 10- to 14-foot Class I bicycle path within Hollister Avenue's southern right-of-way would

facilitate increased use of bicycles and pedestrian travel. This enhanced connectivity to regional bike infrastructure and transit stops, including accommodation of an existing bus stop and a proposed bus stop near Cathedral Oaks Road, would reduce reliance on automobile travel and associated vehicle emissions. Therefore, operational impacts would be reduced when compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

As described above, Alternative 4 would slightly increase the scope of the proposed project's construction activities and would result in a small increase toxic air contaminant emissions on the project site compared to the proposed project. However, this increase would be nominal given the overall scale of the construction activities. Based on existing northeast to southwest wind patterns on the project site, these emissions would be carried away from the single-family residential receptors. As with the proposed project, operation of Alternative 4 would not involve the use of equipment that would increase toxic air contaminant emissions on the project site. Alternative 4's impact related to toxic air contaminants would be similar when compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 4's construction would result in the same odors as the proposed project which would be intermittent, temporary, and dissipate rapidly with distance from in-use construction equipment. Therefore, Alternative 4's odor impact would be similar when compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 4's air quality construction impacts would be similar when compared to the proposed project, and operational impacts would be reduced when compared to the proposed project. Like the proposed project, Alternative 4's impacts to air quality would be less than significant.

c. Biological Resources

No special-status plant species have been documented within or adjacent to the extended bicycle path area, and the potential for their occurrence is considered low due to the developed nature of the Hollister Avenue right-of-way and the dominance of ornamental and eucalyptus vegetation. However, there remains a limited possibility that previously undetected individuals could occur in small undeveloped patches at the southern edge of the roadway. If present, these could be subject to direct impacts from construction activities or indirect effects such as dust, chemical spills, or changes in water quality. Special-status wildlife species with potential to occur include monarch butterflies, California red-legged frogs, raptors such as Cooper's hawk and white-tailed kite, yellow warblers, and other nesting birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code. While no roosts or nests have been documented within the extended bicycle path area, suitable habitat exists to the south, particularly within eucalyptus groves designated as ESHA. Construction activities could result in temporary disturbances such as noise and human presence, but the alignment of Alternative 4 would avoid core habitat areas and would be confined to previously disturbed edges, reducing the likelihood of significant impacts. Alternative 4 would result in similar direct and indirect impacts to special-status species related to habitat removal and degradation, when compared to the proposed project, and would require Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-10 (as with the proposed project) to reduce potential impacts to special-status plant and wildlife species to a less than significant level.

Alternative 4 would include construction activities within and adjacent to monarch butterfly/raptor roosting habitat ESHA and riparian/marsh/vernal pool ESHA (as well as their associated 100-foot buffers) along the southern edge of Hollister Avenue. These activities would include grading, paving, and installation of landscaping adjacent to eucalyptus groves designated as ESHA. Although Alternative 4 would not introduce new development into undisturbed habitat, it would result in minor

Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project

encroachments into ESHA buffers and potential root zone disturbance. Alternative 4's impacts to ESHA are not anticipated to be greater than those of the proposed project, because the bike path alignment is confined to previously disturbed areas and involves a low-impact use. While minor encroachment and temporary construction-related effects may occur, they are limited in scale and duration and do not introduce substantial new development into undisturbed habitat. Additionally, Alternative 4 would avoid removal of protected trees and significant impacts to Monarch Butterfly Roosting ESHA where feasible through project design. Furthermore, as with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would require Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, and BIO-11 to reduce potential impacts related to riparian habitat, ESHA, and wetlands to a less than significant level. Alternative 4's impact related to riparian habitat, ESHA, and aquatic resources would be similar to the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 4's construction activities could exceed City noise thresholds and result in temporary disruption of wildlife movement. Accordingly, Alternative 4 would require Mitigation Measure NOI-1 to reduce potential impacts to wildlife movement related to construction noise to a less than significant level. Alternative 4 would not introduce new lighting or permanent barriers to wildlife movement, and the proposed bicycle path extension would be located adjacent to an existing roadway. Like the proposed project, Alternative 4's impact related to wildlife movement would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would include installation of a storm drain and associated outlet within arroyo willow thickets ESHA along Devereux Creek, sand capping and grading within the 100-foot Streamside Protection Area, and trenching for underground utilities within riparian ESHA along Devereux Creek and along the eastern project site boundary within riparian and monarch butterfly roosting habitat ESHA. Additionally, Alternative 4 would include construction activities within and adjacent to monarch butterfly/raptor roosting habitat ESHA and riparian/marsh/vernal pool ESHA (as well as their associated 100-foot buffers) along the southern edge of Hollister Avenue, due to the extension of the bicycle path. Similar to the proposed project, these activities could potentially be inconsistent with General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policies CE 1.6, CE 2.2, CE 4.4, and CE 9.5. Alternative 4 may result in direct impacts, such as root and/or canopy pruning or compaction or accidental damage during excavation and grading, to 27 trees due to the extension of the bicycle path. However, removal of and major impacts to protected trees are anticipated to be avoided (and reduced to less than significant) through implementation of project design measures such as root bridging or shaving, shifting the alignment, or eliminating sections of curb/gutter. The extended bicycle path under Alternative 4 is an allowed use (public accessway/trail) pursuant to General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policy CE 1.6. Alternative 4 would require implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, and BIO-11, which would result in consistency with General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Policies CE 1.6, CE 2.2, CE 4.4, and CE 9.5, and reduce this impact to a less than significant level, which would be the same as the proposed project.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would not be located in an area subject to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Alternative 4 would have no impact related to conflicts with these plans, which would be the same level of impact compared to the proposed project.

Overall, Alternative 4 would result in similar impacts to riparian habitat, ESHA, and special-status species compared to the proposed project. However, with implementation of mitigation measures, Alternative 4's impacts related to special-status plant and wildlife species, riparian and ESHA habitat, wetlands, wildlife movement, and conflicts with local policies protecting biological resources would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Like the proposed project, Alternative 4

would have no impact related to conflicts with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

d. Cultural Resources

As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would include the restoration and adaptive reuse of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station, a historical resource. Restoration and adaptive reuse activities would be carried out in accordance with Mitigation Measure CUL-1 to ensure the historical integrity of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station is preserved. Additionally, Alternative 4 would include Mitigation Measure NOI-2, to reduce potential vibration damage from construction activities. Alternative 4 would result in less than significant impacts to historic resources, and impacts would be the same as the proposed project.

Construction of Alternative 4 would slightly increase the amount of ground disturbance compared to the proposed project as Alternative 4 would extend the bicycle path to Pebble Beach Drive. However, this increase would be nominal given the overall scale of ground disturbance. Under Alternative 4, approximately 0.49 acre of additional ground disturbance would occur, which is approximately 0.28 percent of the total anticipated ground disturbance of 174.43 acres under the proposed project. As identified in the *Phase I and Extended Phase I Archaeological Resources Assessment Report*, no known archaeological resources are located within the extended bicycle path area. The increase in ground disturbance would be nominal given the overall scale of ground disturbance that would occur. In addition, the extended bicycle path area is located within the disturbed right-of-way of Hollister Avenue, which would have a reduced potential to contain unknown archaeological resources due to the amount of previous disturbance. However, because ground disturbance would occur, Alternative 4 has potential to encounter unknown cultural resources and Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4 would continue to be required. These measures would minimize potential impacts to unanticipated discoveries of archaeological resources if they were to be encountered by requiring archaeological monitoring, a cultural resources sensitivity meeting for construction personnel, and implementation of appropriate procedures for evaluation and treatment of any discoveries made during construction. Accordingly, Alternative 4's impact to archaeological resources would be similar when compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Construction of Alternative 4 would slightly increase (0.28 percent increase) the amount of ground disturbance compared to the proposed project; however, the extended bicycle path area is located within disturbed right-of-way of Hollister Avenue and with lower potential to contain unknown human remains. As with the proposed project, in the event of unanticipated discovery of human remains during ground disturbance, the construction contractor would comply with State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and human remains would be preserved in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. With regulatory compliance, Alternative 4's impact to human remains would be similar compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 4 would have the same impact to historical resources as the proposed project. Alternative 4's impact to archaeological resources would be similar and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 4's impacts to human remains would be similar and would remain less than significant.

e. Energy

Alternative 4 would slightly increase the scope of the proposed project's construction activities by extending the bicycle path to Pebble Beach Drive and therefore would slightly increase fuel used for

construction equipment compared to the proposed project. However, the increase in construction activities for the extended bike trail would be nominal given the overall scale of construction activities. As with the proposed project, energy use during construction would be temporary and minimized in compliance with existing regulations such as California Code of Regulations Title 13 Sections 2449 and 2485, which prohibit diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles and off-road diesel vehicles from idling for more than five minutes. Operation of Alternative 4 would require the same energy consumption as the proposed project, which would occur in compliance with the energy efficiency standards such as the California Green Building Standards Code and the 2025 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. However, Alternative 4 would reduce long-term energy demand associated with transportation by promoting alternative modes of travel. Specifically, the inclusion of a Class I bicycle path within Hollister Avenue's southern right-of-way would facilitate increased use of bicycles and pedestrian travel, reducing reliance on automobiles and associated fuel consumption. The extended bicycle path would connect to existing regional bike infrastructure and transit stops, including an existing bus stop near the Ellwood Mesa Open Space and a proposed bus stop near Cathedral Oaks Road, further supporting reduced automobile travel and fuel consumption and facilitating regional access to the proposed Rio Grande Coffee Shop, the Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve, commercial areas east of the project site, and the University of California-Santa Barbara. Therefore, Alternative 4's impact related to the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy resources would be reduced when compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would adhere to the California Green Building Standards Code and the 2025 Building Energy Efficiency Standards to minimize unnecessary energy use in the proposed facilities. Alternative 4's facilities would be supplied power from SCE in accordance with Senate Bill 100, which requires SCE to increase renewable energy procurement to 60 percent by 2030, and 100 percent by 2045. Alternative 4 would provide the same amount of electric vehicle parking as the proposed project which would be consistent with the requirements of the CALGreen intervening code update and the City's Municipal Code, which requires new non-residential construction to construct at least 30 percent of new parking spaces to be EV capable or include EV charging infrastructure. Alternative 4 would include the same amount of bicycle spaces as the proposed project to encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation, consistent with the City's CAP, Strategic Energy Plan, General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan, and Municipal Code. Furthermore, Alternative 4 would be designed in accordance with the City's Energy Performance Reach Code which would provide electric-ready facilities for the use of electric infrastructure. In addition, Alternative 4 would continue to utilize the existing on-site electric golf carts for golfers. Alternative 4's impact related to conflicts with state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 4's energy impacts would be reduced when compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

f. Geology and Soils

As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would not locate structures within 50 feet of the More Ranch Fault and would not directly or indirectly cause the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault. This impact would be the same as the proposed project, and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 4 would include renovation in an area with the same risks of seismic activity as the proposed project and therefore could result in potential risks associated with seismic ground shaking. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure

GEO-1 requiring recommendations from the project-specific geotechnical reports to be put into grading and building plans. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce potential impacts due to groundshaking on the project site to a less than significant level through incorporation of structural integrity recommendations. Therefore, Alternative 4's impact related to seismic ground shaking would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Alternative 4 would be subject to the same liquefaction risks as the proposed project's structures, which are very low. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4's design would incorporate design measures required by the CBC which reduce the potential for substantial adverse effects due to liquefaction. Therefore, Alternative 4's impact related to liquefaction would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 4 would be subject to the same landslide risks as the proposed project and would not place structures in areas of high landslide potential. Only activities related to the proposed golf course improvements would occur in areas with high landslide potential. Alternative 4 would require the same maximum cut and fill slopes as the proposed project, which would not result in substantially steep slopes or other conditions that could induce a landslide. Therefore, Alternative 4's impact related to landslides would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Construction of Alternative 4 would slightly increase the amount of ground disturbance by 0.49 acre, for a total of 174.92 acre (compared to the proposed project's total ground disturbance of 174.43 acre), and would result in a minor increase in the potential for erosion compared to the proposed project. However, this increase would be nominal (0.28 percent) given the overall scale of ground disturbance. Construction of Alternative 4 would occur in compliance with the same requirements for erosion control as the proposed project, including the Construction Stormwater General Permit and Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code. Accordingly, construction of Alternative 4 would minimize the potential to cause substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Alternative 4 would include implementation of the same stormwater control infrastructure and site design BMPs as the proposed project to minimize erosion during operation. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would not substantially increase the rate of runoff on the site compared to existing conditions, as the impervious surfaces added to the project site would represent an increase of less than 0.2 percent compared to existing conditions. Alternative 4's impact related to erosion would be similar compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 4 would be subject to the same risks related to unstable geologic units and soil as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would not locate structures in an area subject to substantial liquefaction potential, landslide hazards, or potential for soil collapse. Potential impacts associated with geotechnical hazards would be minimized with adherence to the CBC. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 may require groundwater dewatering during construction, but groundwater dewatering would be limited to the localized perched water on the project site and would be temporary, only occurring if perched groundwater is encountered. Therefore, construction of Alternative 4 would not result in substantial groundwater withdrawals that could result in subsidence on-site. Therefore, Alternative 4's impact related to the risk of landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would locate structures on soils with very low potential for expansion. The construction contractor would be required to comply with the requirements of the CBC, including the use of non-expansive fill material, to minimize the potential for structural hazards

associated with soil expansion. Alternative 4's impact related to creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property related to expansive soil would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would involve connecting the clubhouse, comfort station, and Rio Grande Coffee Shop to the Goleta West Sanitary District sewer system and the abandonment of the private septic systems serving the existing clubhouse and comfort station. Alternative 4 would not involve the installation of additional septic tanks on-site and therefore would not result in impacts related to the use of septic tanks. Therefore, Alternative 4 would have no impact related to soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks, which would be the same level of impact compared to the proposed project.

Alternative 4 would slightly increase (increase of 0.28 percent) the amount of ground disturbance compared to the proposed project which would slightly increase the potential to encounter paleontological resources or unique geologic features compared to the proposed project. In addition, the extended bicycle path area is located within disturbed right-of-way of Hollister Avenue with lower potential to contain paleontological resources. However, during grading and ground disturbance, Alternative 4 could result in the disturbance of unknown paleontological resources, similar to the proposed project. Alternative 4 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-2 to reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources and unique geologic features to a less than significant level by requiring WEAP training, monitoring, and setting forth procedures for the recovery, identification, and curation of fossils discovered during construction. Alternative 4's impacts related to paleontological resources or unique geologic features would be similar compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Based on the above, Alternative 4's erosion impacts would be similar compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant. Alternative 4's paleontological resources impacts would be similar compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 4's impacts related to groundshaking would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 4's impacts related to fault rupture, liquefaction, landslides, unstable soils, and expansive soils, would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant. As with the proposed project, there would be no impact related potential for on-site soils to be capable to support the existing on-site septic systems.

g. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Alternative 4 would slightly increase the scope of the proposed project's construction activities. However, the increase in GHG emissions would be nominal given the small areas of additional construction activities (approximately 0.28 percent of the total project area) when amortized over 30 years. Alternative 4's operation would include the same components as the proposed project and therefore generate the same GHG emissions as operation of the proposed project. Accordingly, the combined construction and operation emissions of Alternative 4 would be slightly increased when compared to the proposed project, and would not result in substantial GHG emissions. Therefore, Alternative 4's impacts related to GHG emissions would be similar compared to the proposed project. Impacts would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would include design features to promote renewable energy use, energy efficiency, water efficiency, and reductions in vehicle travel, all of which contribute to the creation of minimal GHG emissions. Alternative 4 would include EV charging infrastructure that exceeds California Green Building Standards and City requirements for EV charging infrastructure.

Alternative 4's proposed facilities would be the same as the proposed project, other than the bicycle path instead of the Type 4 trail, and would be designed in accordance with the same energy efficiency standards. Alternative 4 would incorporate water efficient fixtures to reduce water consumption for landscaping, plumbing, and irrigation consistent with the latest Title 24 Green Building Code and Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Alternative 4 would also include the same new water-efficient irrigation system as the proposed project which would reduce GHG emissions associated with water use.

Alternative 4 would reduce long-term GHG emissions by promoting alternative modes of transportation. The inclusion of a Class I bicycle path within Hollister Avenue's southern right-of-way would facilitate increased use of bicycles and pedestrian travel, reducing reliance on personal vehicles and associated transportation emissions. Alternative 4 would include additional active transportation facilities when compared to the proposed project and therefore would encourage active transportation and the reduction of GHG emissions from vehicles to a greater extent than the proposed project. Thus, Alternative 4 would be consistent with applicable GHG reduction plans; impacts would be reduced when compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 4's GHG emissions would be reduced when compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

h. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Alternative 4 would slightly increase the scope of the proposed project's construction activities and therefore would result in a minor increase in hazardous material usage compared to the proposed project. However, this increase would be nominal when compared to the overall scale of construction activities. Hazardous materials used during construction of Alternative 4 would be handled in accordance with the same regulations as the proposed project, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Waste Control Law, and California Code of Regulations Title 22. Construction of Alternative 4 would occur in compliance with a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan to reduce potential spills. All hazardous material transport, use, or disposal associated with Alternative 4's operation would comply with existing hazardous materials regulations established by United States Environmental Protection Agency, the State of California, the County of Santa Barbara, and the City of Goleta. These regulations prescribe measures for the safe transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials to reduce risk of spills. Accordingly, Alternative 4's impact related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials would be similar compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would include demolition of the existing clubhouse, portions of the existing maintenance facility, and comfort station, and restoration of the Barnsdall Rio Gas Station, which have the potential to contain ACM, LBP, mercury, and PCB. Alternative 4 would result in the same potential impact regarding the release of ACM, LBP, mercury, and PCB from demolition of existing buildings. Alternative 4 would require slightly more ground disturbance than the proposed project and therefore would a small increase in potential to result in release of hazardous materials. However, the increase would be nominal given the overall scale of construction activities. Grading could potentially disturb hazardous materials in soil, leading to an accidental release of hazardous materials. As with the proposed project, construction of Alternative 4 could also encounter perched groundwater which, if contaminated, could result in the accidental release of hazardous materials. In addition, operation of Alternative 4 could result in exposure to volatile organic

Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project

compounds in the soil similar to the proposed project. Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6 would continue to be required, which would reduce potential hazardous material impacts associated with accidental releases of hazardous materials during demolition of the existing clubhouse, and grading of potentially contaminated soil, soil vapor, or groundwater to a less than significant level. Operation of Alternative 4 would result in the same reduction in fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course as the proposed project due to the same reduction of irrigated turf. Accordingly, Alternative 4's impact related to the accidental release of hazardous materials would be similar compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Construction of Alternative 4 would occur approximately 80 feet from the Ellwood School due to the extension of the bicycle path beyond the project site's eastern boundary, which is closer to the school than the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4's construction activities would have the potential to create a significant hazard involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, or through exposure and transport of on-site contaminated soil or groundwater, which would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6. Therefore, although Alternative 4 would be located closer to the Ellwood School, Alternative 4's impact related to handling hazardous materials within 0.25-mile of a school would be similar to the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would have potential to result in a hazardous materials release due to the presence of on-site hazardous materials. Mitigation Measures HAZ-3 through HAZ-6 and HAZ-7 would be required which mandates oversight from Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Services and Central Coast RWQCB. Alternative 4's impact related to the presence of on-site hazardous materials would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would be located outside of the safety and noise contours of the Santa Barbara Airport. Alternative 4's facilities would be designed the same as the proposed project and therefore would not conflict with the standards of Review Area 2 of the Santa Barbara Airport's Airport Influence Area or FAR Part 77. Therefore, Alternative 4's impact related to safety hazards and excessive noise due to proximity to an airport would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 4 would include construction on Hollister Avenue and therefore would have a similar potential to interfere with emergency response or evacuation of Hollister Avenue compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4's operations would not introduce activities that could impede or interfere with the Santa Barbara County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan or emergency evacuations on Hollister Avenue. Alternative 4's impact related to impaired implementation or physical interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would be similar to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 4 would primarily be in the same location and Fire Hazard Severity Zones as the proposed project and therefore be exposed to the same fire risks as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, construction of Alternative 4 would comply with California Public Resources Code Sections 4442, 4427, 4428, and 4431 to minimize the potential for wildland fire. Alternative 4's structures would result in the same fire risks as the proposed project, which would be minimized with adherence to the standards of the California Fire Code, CBC, and California Code of Regulations Title 14. Therefore, Alternative 4's impact related to wildland fire would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 4's impacts related to hazardous materials would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 4's hazardous materials impacts would be similar compared to the proposed project. Alternative 4's impacts related to upset or accident of hazardous materials, emissions of hazardous materials near schools, and hazardous materials sites would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Impacts related to transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, airport hazards, emergency response plans, and wildland fires would remain less than significant.

i. Hydrology and Water Quality

Given the slight increase in construction activities due to the extension of the bicycle path, Alternative 4 would have a minor increase in potential to degrade water quality compared to the proposed project. However, the increase would be nominal given the increase in ground disturbance is a 0.28 percent increase compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would include demolition of the existing clubhouse, portions of the existing maintenance facility, and comfort station, which could discharge ACB and LBP to on-site soils where they could then be transported off-site in stormwater runoff. Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 would be required and would minimize the potential for the accidental release of ACB and LBP. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 could require groundwater dewatering of perched groundwater during construction at the Sandpiper Golf Club or within the extended bicycle path area, which, if contaminated, could result in releases of hazardous materials into stormwater. Mitigation Measure HAZ-5 would be required to reduce the potential for the accidental discharge of contaminated groundwater. Construction of Alternative 4 would comply with the Construction Stormwater General Permit, including the implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and BMPs to minimize the introduction of pollutants during construction activities. Alternative 4 would include the installation of a bridge at Devereaux Creek and culvert removal and therefore would require implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1 and BIO-4 to minimize the introduction of pollutants into Devereaux Creek. In addition, adherence to the City's Municipal Code would ensure construction activities would minimize substantial runoff water which would exceed the capacities of Devereaux Creek, Bell Canyon Creek, or the City's storm drain system within Hollister Avenue. Alternative 4's construction impacts related to water quality degradation, erosion, and the introduction of substantial polluted runoff and exceedances of stormwater capacity would be similar compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Alternative 4 would include the same stormwater control infrastructure as the proposed project to treat and discharge stormwater onto the golf course consistent with the requirements of the Central Coast RWQCB. As with the proposed project, treated water and high-flow bypass from the basins would be discharged to the golf course rather than the storm drain system in Hollister Avenue that outlets to Bell Canyon Creek which would minimize the amount of stormwater and potential stormwater pollutants entering Bell Canyon Creek. Stormwater within the extended bicycle path area would flow to the City's storm drain system within Hollister Avenue. Alternative 4 would also abandon the existing on-site septic systems which, upon completion, would reduce the potential for groundwater quality to be affected by sewage. Operation of Alternative 4 would result in the same reduction in fertilizer and pesticide use on the golf course as the proposed project. Alternative 4 would include the same new irrigation system included in the proposed project which would reduce water use for landscaping compared to existing conditions and therefore would reduce the potential for operation of the golf course to discharge stormwater pollutants due to erosion compared to existing conditions. Alternative 4 would include the same maintenance facility as the proposed project, and potential stormwater pollutants from the maintenance facility would be minimized with

Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project

storage of hazardous materials in accordance with the requirements of the Santa Barbara Public Health Department's Consolidated Unified Program Agency Hazardous Material Division and the Santa Barbara County Agriculture Commissioner. Alternative 4's operational impacts related to water quality degradation, erosion, and the introduction of substantial polluted runoff and exceedances of stormwater capacity would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, construction of Alternative 4 has the potential to require groundwater dewatering of perched groundwater. Groundwater dewatering activities would be localized and temporary, lasting only during excavation activities, if groundwater is encountered. The anticipated duration and minimal amount of groundwater dewatering that would be required for excavation would not result in substantial groundwater losses in the Basin. Similar to the proposed project, given the limited infiltration potential of on-site soils and the minimal amount of impervious surface increase generated by Alternative 4 due to the extension of the bicycle path, Alternative 4 would not substantially decrease groundwater infiltration rates on-site or result in substantial interference to groundwater recharge, Alternative 4's impact related to substantially decreasing groundwater supplies or interfering with groundwater recharge would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 4's bioretention basins would be sized to collect and convey stormwater runoff on the project site to the golf course such that an increase in on-site flooding compared to existing conditions would not occur in accordance with Central Coast RWQCB requirements. Alternative 4 would include work within Devereaux Creek and would result in long-term improvements associated with culvert removal and the restoration of Devereaux Creek to its natural flow. Alternative 4's impact related to on- or off-site flooding would be the same compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 4 would be subject to the same on-site inundation hazards as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would locate structures outside of a flood hazard zone, tsunami zone, seiche hazard zone, and dam inundation zone. Like the proposed project, hazardous materials stored on-site would be located outside the inundation areas and stored in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. Impacts related to risk of release of stormwater pollutants during inundation would be similar to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Given the minor increase in construction activities, Alternative 4 would have a slightly increased potential to degrade water quality and conflict with the Basin Plan compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would adhere to the requirements of the Construction Stormwater General Permit and Chapter 13.04 and Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code to minimize water quality impacts, and would require Mitigation Measures BIO-4, HAZ-1, HAZ-2, HAZ-5, and HYD-1 to reduce potential water quality impacts to a less than significant level. Accordingly, Alternative 4's impacts related to conflicts with the Basin Plan would be similar compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As described above, Alternative 4 would not adversely impact groundwater supplies. Accordingly, Alternative 4 would not interfere with the management of the Basin in accordance with the Wright Judgement. Alternative 4's impact related to conflicts with the Wright Judgement or Goleta Water District's Groundwater Management Plan Goleta Groundwater Basin would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 4's hydrology and water quality impacts would be similar compared to the proposed project. Alternative 4's impacts related to water quality, polluted runoff, and conflict

with water quality plans or groundwater management plans would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Impacts related to groundwater, erosion and siltation, flooding, and release of pollutants from inundation would remain less than significant.

j. Land Use and Planning

As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would be primarily located on the existing Sandpiper Golf Club, with the exception of the extended bicycle path, and would not include any components that could divide an established community. Alternative 4's impact would be the same as the proposed project, and no impact related to the physical division of an established community would occur.

Alternative 4 would largely include the same renovation as the proposed project, with the substitution of the Type 4 trail with a bicycle path. Alternative 4's structural facilities would be the same as the proposed project and would therefore be consistent with all applicable Goleta Municipal Code zoning standards and FAR Part 77 standards. Alternative 4 would include installation of the same storm drain and outlet within arroyo willow thickets ESHA as the proposed project and therefore would have the same potential to conflict with Policy CE 1.6 of the City's General Plan/Local Coastal Plan. Alternative 4 would include trenching for underground utilities and would have a similar potential to conflict with Policy 9.5 of the City's General Plan/Local Coastal Plan compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would be consistent with most policies of the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan through implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-11, CUL-1 through CUL-4, HYD-1, NOI-1, TCR-1, and TCR-2.

When compared to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would further Policies OS 2.2 (Planned Vertical Accessways) and OS 2.4 (Mitigation of Impacts to Vertical Coastal Access) to a greater extent by facilitating lateral pedestrian connectivity along Hollister Avenue that improves public access for all Goleta residents to vertical access points toward the shoreline. The proposed project would not provide bluff top lateral access or vertical access onsite. The extent of the Class I bike path proposed under Alternative 4 would compensate for the proposed project's lack of a bluff top lateral access and vertical access by (1) increasing the lateral access along Hollister Avenue that would connect to multiple vertical access points that allow visitors of the Ellwood Mesa to access the beach and lateral bluff access points located offsite and (2) providing a safe and smooth surface that is wide enough to accommodate two directional flow of walking and alternative modes of transportation to multiple lateral and vertical access points off the project site.

Additionally, Alternative 4 would further Policies VH 3.5 (Pedestrian-Oriented Design), TE 1.1 (Alternative Modes), TE 2.3 (Diversion of Automobile Trips to Alternative Modes), and TE 10.4 (Pedestrian Facilities in New Development) to a greater extent than the proposed project by providing an extended bike path that connects existing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure instead of a Type 4 path that would only occur along the project site's northern boundary and would not accommodate alternative modes of transportation, including bicycles. The Type 4 path would only accommodate pedestrian walking. By encouraging greater alternative modes of transportation, Alternative 4 would better reduce consumption of non-renewable energy sources. Alternative 4 would directly further the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, which implements the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Transportation Element Policies. One of the goals and objectives of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan is to provide more active means of transportation (bicycle and walking) in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through less vehicle miles traveled as alternative methods are used. In order to meet this objective, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan identifies a need for a Class I multi-use pathway along Hollister Avenue from Cathedral Oaks Road to Elderberry Drive, which would directly support Policies TE 10 and TE 11 from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan,

which require pedestrian or bicycle linkages that are safe and convenient for all Goleta residents. Alternative 4 would complete this multi-use pathway and would thus result in consistency with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan's goals and policies, whereas the Type 4 path under the proposed project does not meet the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. Overall, Alternative 4's impact would be reduced when compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation, but would better support the City's policies for active transportation as well as comply with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

k. Noise

Alternative 4 would include additional construction on Hollister Avenue that would place construction equipment at a closer distance to residences than the proposed project. Specifically, the extended bike path's approximate center of each construction area would be within 50 feet of residences on Elderberry Drive and Pebble Beach Drive, compared to 100 feet with the proposed project for Elderberry Drive and 1,600 feet for Pebble Beach Drive. Additionally, the extended bike path would be within 80 feet of the Ellwood School, compared to 1,100 feet for the proposed project.

Because construction would occur closer to sensitive receptors than the proposed project, short-term noise impacts associated with construction activities for Alternative 4 were analyzed based on typical construction equipment noise levels derived from the Federal Highway Administration's Roadway Construction Noise Model, and predicted average-daily construction noise levels (in dBA [A-weighted decibel] L_{eq}) were calculated assuming three louder pieces of equipment operating simultaneously¹¹ with the equipment operating in approximately the center of each construction area to the nearest sensitive receptors (a distance of 50 feet). Heavy-duty construction equipment used for construction of the bike path may require excavators, concrete trucks, dump trucks, pavers, loaders, and rollers. The three loudest pieces of equipment from this list would be an excavator, loader, and roller. At a distance of 50 feet, these pieces of equipment would generate a noise level of 80 dBA. This would be slightly higher than the highest construction noise level analyzed for the proposed project of 78 dBA. Similar to the proposed project, construction for Alternative 4 would exceed Goleta's 65 dBA construction noise standards. Alternative 4 would require implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 to ensure construction noise levels do not exceed Goleta's 65 dBA construction noise standards. With similar assumptions to the proposed project, the use of a temporary noise barrier would reduce construction noise levels by 15 dBA to 65 dBA, which would not exceed Goleta's 65 dBA standard. Accordingly, Alternative 4's construction noise impact would remain less than significant with mitigation, similar to the proposed project.

Alternative 4 would result in similar construction traffic noise compared to the proposed project because the overall construction intensity would be similar. The extended bike path may require more construction days than the proposed project; however, the construction trips per day would be similar, and any increase in construction traffic from the proposed project would be minor compared to existing traffic. Because the proposed project's construction would not result in an increase of 3 dBA or more, the reduced construction in accordance with Alternative 4 would not result in an increase of 3 dBA or more of traffic noise. Alternative 4's construction traffic noise impact would be similar to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 4 would include the same facilities as the proposed project that would generate the same noise levels at nearby sensitive receptors as the proposed project. Operational noise associated with heating, ventilation, and air conditioning units, the pump station, and conversational noise would not

¹¹ On most typical construction sites, up to three pieces of heavy-duty equipment would be operating in a work area simultaneously.

exceed City noise thresholds. Accordingly, Alternative 4's stationary operational noise impact would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 4 would result in the same new vehicle trips as the proposed project as Alternative 4 includes the same facilities as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would not result in operational traffic noise exceeding 3 dBA. Alternative 4's operational traffic noise impact would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 4 would include the use of similar construction equipment as the proposed project, including the use of a vibratory roller and excavator (similar to a large bulldozer analyzed for the proposed project), which could generate substantial groundborne vibration. The equipment would exceed the Caltrans vibration damage potential threshold for historical structures of 0.12 PPV in/sec for transient sources within a distance of 42 feet and 20 feet, respectively. Construction of the extended bike path under Alternative 4 would move construction equipment closer to residences than analyzed in the proposed project, with a vibratory roller being potentially used within 30 feet of the residential structures on Elderberry Drive and Pebble Beach Drive, compared to 75 feet for the proposed project. This would equal a vibration level of approximately 0.17 PPV in/sec. at a distance of 30 feet. This vibration level would be well below the Caltrans vibration damage potential threshold for older structures of 0.5 PPV in/sec for transient sources. Therefore, temporary impacts associated with the vibratory roller (and other potential equipment) to off-site residential structures would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would be located outside of the noise contours from Santa Barbara Airport. Therefore, Alternative 4's impact related to excessive airport noise would remain less than significant, which is the same as the proposed project.

Based on the above, Alternative 4's construction noise and construction vibration impacts would be similar compared to the proposed project and less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 4's operational noise and airport noise impacts would be the same as the proposed project.

I. Parks and Recreation

Alternative 4 would involve the same construction schedule as the proposed project due to the nominal increase in ground disturbance, and therefore would result in the same potential to degrade existing park facilities due to construction worker use. Alternative 4 would include the same amount of employees as the proposed project which would not result in a substantial reduction in the amount of parkland available to the residents of Goleta. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 could increase the amount of visitors to the project site which may increase the use of nearby parks and trails; however, ultimately Alternative 4 would expand recreational opportunities in Goleta such that residents have additional options for recreation. Additionally, Alternative 4 would include a bicycle path along Hollister Avenue and would provide similar recreation infrastructure as the proposed project. Alternative 4's impact to park facilities would be similar to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 4 would facilitate greater access to the Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve and the Pacific Ocean by allowing for a safe and wide path that connects users of the path to multiple vertical and lateral beach access points offsite that are not available under the proposed project. Alternative 4 would increase access to recreational facilities more than the proposed project. Alternative 4 would not result in additional environmental impacts beyond what is evaluated in this EIR. As described above, Alternative 4 would not result in substantial deterioration of recreational

facilities but more importantly, increase access to the Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve and the Pacific Ocean. Therefore, Alternative 4's impact related to recreational facilities would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 4 impacts to parks and recreation would be reduced compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

m. Public Services

Alternative 4 would require the same employees as the proposed project and therefore would result in the same indirect population growth compared to the proposed project. Given that the proposed project's indirect population growth would not result in substantially diminished fire protection services, police protection services, school capacities, or library services, Alternative 4's indirect population growth would also not result in substantially diminished public services. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would be located in proximity to existing fire stations and police stations and would be adequately served by existing fire protection and police protection services in Goleta. In addition, as with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would also include the required payment of development impact fees which would provide funding for expanded public services in accordance with Chapter 17.70 of the Municipal Code and Goleta Union School District and Santa Barbara Unified School District fees. Therefore, Alternative 4's impact related to public services would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

n. Transportation and Circulation

As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would not include elements that would conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Alternative 4 would add the same bicycle parking spaces and bicycle entrance to the Rio Grande Coffee Shop, and would include an extended bicycle path from Cathedral Oaks Road to Pebble Beach Drive, and would therefore provide additional facilities for bicycle and pedestrian travel. Alternative 4 would directly further the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, which identifies a need for the proposed multi-use pathway (City of Goleta 2018), and would thus result in full consistency with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan's goals and policies when compared to the proposed project. Furthermore, through the extension of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, Alternative 4 would further Policies VH 3.5 (Pedestrian-Oriented Design), TE 1.1 (Alternative Modes), TE 2.3 (Diversion of Automobile Trips to Alternative Modes), and TE 10.4 (Pedestrian Facilities in New Development) to a greater extent than the proposed project because Alternative 4 would encourage more alternative modes of transportation that is not just limited to pedestrian walking. As with the proposed project, the design for Alternative 4's proposed driveways would be subject to review and approval by the City and SBCFD which would minimize the potential for vehicle to pedestrian and vehicle to cyclist conflicts. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would result in temporary lane, bicycle route, or sidewalk closures on Hollister Avenue and would include roadway impediments on Hollister Avenue during construction. Alternative 4 would require the same amount of employees than the proposed project which, as with the proposed project, would not substantially interfere with Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District operations. Accordingly, Alternative 4's construction impact related to conflicts with transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities would be similar compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 4 would include the same facilities as the proposed project which would be exempt from quantitative VMT analysis and presumed to have a less than significant impact on VMT pursuant to the City's VMT Guidelines. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would increase the time

between tee-offs and correspondingly reduce the annual rounds of golf per year, which would reduce the amount of vehicle trips and associated VMT generated by golfers to get to and from the project site compared to existing conditions. Additionally, Alternative 4's enhanced bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure would further reduce VMT by encouraging active transportation and transit use and reducing automobile use. Therefore, Alternative 4's impact related to conflicts with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) would be reduced when compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

As with the proposed project, during construction of Alternative 4, equipment staging would occur on-site and construction personnel would park on-site, which would minimize the potential for construction related vehicles and equipment to disrupt the immediate area. Alternative 4 would include construction in the right-of-way of Hollister Avenue and therefore would result in roadway impediments on Hollister Avenue, as with the proposed project. Alternative 4 would include the same driveway configuration as the proposed project which would be designed in accordance with all applicable SBCFD standards to minimize line-of-sight disruptions and hazards between vehicles and pedestrians and vehicles and cyclists. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would not introduce new incompatible uses, such as farm equipment, to roadways, and Alternative 4's uses would be the same as existing on-site uses. Accordingly, Alternative 4's impacts to increased hazards would be similar compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

As stated above, during construction of Alternative 4, equipment staging would occur on-site and construction personnel would park on-site, which would minimize the potential for construction related vehicles and equipment to result in inadequate emergency access. Alternative 4 would result in the potential for inadequate emergency access in the short term on Hollister Avenue as Alternative 4 would include construction in Hollister Avenue right-of-way. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would be designed in accordance with all applicable SBCFD standards to maintain adequate emergency access. As with the proposed project, SBCFD and the City would review and approve Alternative 4's design, which would ensure Alternative 4 would provide adequate egress for emergency access. Therefore, Alternative 4's impacts to emergency access would be similar compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Based on the above, Alternative 4's transportation and circulation impacts would be reduced when compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant. Furthermore, Alternative 4 would better support the City's policies for active transportation and meets the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, whereas the proposed project does not.

o. Tribal Cultural Resources

As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would be located in an area with a high sensitivity for cultural resources, including tribal cultural resources. Alternative 4 would require slightly more ground disturbance (0.28 percent greater); however, the extended bicycle path area is located within disturbed right-of-way of Hollister Avenue with limited potential to contain undisturbed tribal cultural resources. As with the proposed project, because ground disturbance would occur, Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4, and TCR-1 and TCR-2 would be required, including implementation of a tribal monitoring agreement and appropriate disposition of any unanticipated tribal cultural resources discovered during construction. Alternative 4's impact related to tribal cultural resources would be similar compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation.

p. Utilities and Service Systems

Alternative 4 would require the installation and relocation of the same utility infrastructure as required for the proposed project. Accordingly, Alternative 4's impact related to the relocation or construction of utility infrastructure would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 4's water demand would be the same as the proposed project which would reduce on-site water use compared to existing conditions. Accordingly, Alternative 4 would have no impact on water use, the same as the proposed project.

Alternative 4's wastewater generation would be the same as the proposed project which would be accommodated by existing wastewater treatment plant capacity available for Goleta West Sanitary District customers. Therefore, Alternative 4's impact related to wastewater treatment capacity would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Alternative 4 would result in slightly more solid waste generation than the proposed project due to increased construction activities. However, the increase would be nominal given the overall demolition and construction activities. As with the proposed project, Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 would be required to reduce solid waste generated during construction below the City's project specific threshold of 350 tons of nonrecyclable construction and demolition debris. Once operational, Alternative 4 would result in the same solid waste generation as the proposed project which does not exceed the City's project-specific threshold of 196 tons per year. Therefore, solid waste impacts related to the operation of Alternative 4 would be similar compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Based on the above, Alternative 4's impacts related to solid waste would be similar compared to the proposed project and would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Alternative 4's impacts related to the construction of utility infrastructure and wastewater treatment capacity would be the same as the proposed project and would remain less than significant. Like the proposed project, no water supply impacts would occur.

6.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA requires the identification of an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR. *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e)(2) provides that, if the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, then the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

This discussion identifies the environmentally superior alternative by assessing the degree to which each alternative avoids or minimizes environmental impacts. In some cases, an alternative will avoid or minimize one or more impacts identified for the proposed project but then introduce one or more new impacts. Therefore, selection of the environmentally superior alternative requires an overall assessment of the changes in the number and type of significant impacts.

The *CEQA Guidelines* do not define a specific methodology for determining the environmentally superior alternative. For the purposes of this analysis, the project alternatives have been compared within each issue area to the proposed project, and a determination has been made as to whether the potential environmental effects of each alternative would be reduced, increased, or is similar in comparison to the proposed project (refer to Table 6-2). For the purpose of this EIR, each impact is

equally weighted. Decision makers and the community in general may choose to emphasize one issue or another, which could lead to differing conclusions regarding environmental superiority.

The No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) would result in the fewest adverse environmental effects when compared to existing conditions because no renovation activities would occur; therefore, the No Project Alternative would be considered environmentally superior. However, the No Project Alternative would not result in the benefits achieved by the proposed project to scenic quality (through undergrounding of the existing utility lines), historic resources (through renovation of the Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station), fire and seismic safety (through renovations to existing buildings), water and energy efficiency (through site-wide renovations), and wastewater leakage (through elimination of the existing septic systems). Additionally, the No Project Alternative would not fulfill any project objectives.

As stated above, *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e)(2) provides that, if the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, then the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. The environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives would be Alternative 2 (Clubhouse Renovation). Due to Alternative 2's reduced construction footprint and schedule, Alternative 2 would have less potential than the proposed project, Alternative 3 (Revised Site Plan), and Alternative 4 (Extended Bicycle Path) to result in impacts related to aesthetics (light and glare), air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils (landslides, erosion, and paleontological resources), greenhouse gas emissions, noise, parks and recreation, public services, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities (wastewater and solid waste). However, as Alternative 2 would exclude project features other than the new clubhouse, it would fail to meet the following project objectives:

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 agricultural application.
4. Provide enhanced maintenance facilities to support Sandpiper Golf Club operations.
5. Rehabilitate, preserve, and adaptively reuse the historic Barnsdall Rio Grande Gas Station.
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.

In addition, Alternative 2 would only partially meet the following project objectives as Alternative 2 would not include recreational improvements or the Rio Grande Coffee Shop and would only include removal of the septic system serving the existing clubhouse:

1. Provide improved recreational and dining facilities for golfers, diners, and special event attendees at the Sandpiper Golf Club.
2. Protect water quality and bluff stability by converting existing private septic systems to public sewers and utilizing sand capping to filter stormwater.

Alternative 3 would result in slightly increased impacts to greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality (runoff and flooding), parks and recreation, and transportation (conflict with plans that encourage provision of alternative transportation), although impacts would remain less than

Sandpiper Golf Course Renovation and New Clubhouse Project

significant. Alternative 3 would result in similar, or slightly reduced, impacts to all other issue areas. Additionally, Alternative 3 would fail to meet the following project objectives:

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.
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.

Alternative 4 would result in slightly increased impacts to noise, as Alternative 4 would be closer to sensitive receptors and result in a nominal increase in construction noise in the vicinity of these receptors. Alternative 4 would result in reduced impacts to air quality, energy, greenhouse gases, land use, parks and recreation, and transportation through the encouragement of alternative transportation and corresponding reduction in automobile travel, which would in turn reduce the amount of greenhouse gas emissions being emitted. It would also result in reduced impacts to parks and recreation by facilitating greater access to the Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve and the Pacific Ocean by allowing for a safe and wide path that connects users of the path to multiple vertical and lateral beach access points offsite, and increase access to recreational facilities. Alternative 4 would result in similar, or slightly reduced, impacts to all other issue areas. Additionally, Alternative 4 would better support the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies related to vertical access and the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies related to active transportation. Alternative 4 complies with the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan whereas the proposed project does not. Alternative 4 would meet all project objectives. It would also further the following project objective to a greater extent than the proposed project by providing lateral access along Hollister Avenue that would connect to multiple vertical access points that allow Ellwood Mesa Open Space and Sperling Preserve visitors access to the beach and lateral bluff access points located offsite, and provide a safe and smooth surface wide enough to accommodate two directional flow of walking and alternative modes of transportation to multiple lateral and vertical access points off the project site:

1. Improve coastal access for the public in the vicinity of the project site.

Table 6-2 Impact Comparison of Alternatives

Issue	Proposed Project Impact Classification	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	Alternative 2: Clubhouse Renovation	Alternative 3: Revised Site Plan	Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path
Aesthetics					
Scenic vistas	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (-)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)
Scenic highways	No Impact	No Impact (=)	No Impact (=)	No Impact (=)	No Impact (=)
Scenic quality	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)
Light and glare	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)
Air Quality					
Conflicts with an Air Quality Plan	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)
Cumulatively considerable increases of criteria pollutants	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (+)
Sensitive receptor exposure to pollutant concentrations	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (=)
Odors	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (=)
Biological Resources					
Effects on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, BIO-9, and BIO-10	No Impact (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and BIO-10 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, BIO-9, and BIO-10 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, BIO-9, and BIO-10 (=)
Effects on riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, AND BIO-11	No Impact (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, and BIO-11 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, AND BIO-11 (=)
Effects on state- or federally-protected wetlands	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, and BIO-11	No Impact (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, and BIO-11 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, and BIO-11 (=)
Wildlife movement	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 (=)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 (=)
Conflicts with local polices protecting biological resources	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, AND BIO-11	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, AND BIO-11 (=)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, AND BIO-11 (=)
Conflicts with Habitat Conservation Plans	No Impact	No Impact (=)	No Impact (=)	No Impact (=)	No Impact (=)

Issue	Proposed Project Impact Classification	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	Alternative 2: Clubhouse Renovation	Alternative 3: Revised Site Plan	Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path
Cultural Resources					
Effects on historical resources	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and NOI-2	No Impact (+)	No Impact (-)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and NOI-2 (=)
Effects on archaeological resources	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4	No Impact (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4 (=)
Disturbance of human remains	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (=)
Energy					
Wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (+)
Conflicts with a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (+)
Geology and Soils					
Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zones	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)
Seismic ground shaking	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1	No Impact (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 (-)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 (=)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 (=)
Liquefaction and Unstable soils	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)
Landslides	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)
Substantial erosion and loss of topsoil	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (=)
Expansive soils	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)
Use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems	No impact	No Impact (-)	No Impact (=)	No Impact (=)	No Impact (=)
Destruction of paleontological resources or unique geologic features	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-2	No Impact (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-2 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-2 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-2 (=)
Greenhouse Gas Emissions					
Generation of GHG emissions	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (+)
Conflicts with plans, policies, or regulations adopted to reduce GHG emission	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (-)	Less than significant (-)	Less than significant (+)
Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
Transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials	Less than significant	No Impact (-)	Less than significant (-)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (=)
Upset and accident conditions involving hazardous material release	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6	No Impact (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6 (-)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6 (=)

Issue	Proposed Project Impact Classification	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	Alternative 2: Clubhouse Renovation	Alternative 3: Revised Site Plan	Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path
Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials within 0.25-mile of a school	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6	No Impact (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6 (-)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6 (=)
Hazardous materials sites	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-3 through HAZ-7	No Impact (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-3 through HAZ-7 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-3 through HAZ-7 (=)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-3 through HAZ-7 (=)
Airport hazards	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)
Impairment of or interference with emergency response plans and emergency evacuation plans	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (=)
Exposure of people or structures to risk involving wildland fires	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (-)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)
Hydrology and Water Quality					
Violate water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, or degrade surface or groundwater quality	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-4, HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5	No Impact (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-4, HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5 (=)
Decrease groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)
Result in substantial erosion or siltation	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)
Result in on-or off-site flooding	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (-)	Less than significant (-)	Less than significant (=)
Exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional polluted runoff	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-4, HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5	No Impact (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5 (-)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-4, HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5 (=)
Impede or redirect flood flows	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (-)	Less than significant (-)	Less than significant (=)
Risk release of pollutants due to project inundation	Less than significant	No Impact (=)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)
Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-4, HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5	No Impact (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5 (-)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, BIO-4, HAZ-1, HAZ-2, and HAZ-5 (=)
Land Use					
Physically divide an established community	No impact	No Impact (=)	No Impact (=)	No Impact (=)	No impact (=)
Conflict with land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, BIO-9, BIO-10, BIO-11, CUL-1, CUL-2, CUL-3, CUL-4, HYD-1, NOI-1, TCR-1, TCR-2, and UTIL-1.	No Impact (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-4, BIO-10, CUL-2 through CUL-4, TCR-1, and TCR-2 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, BIO-9, BIO-10, BIO-11, CUL-1, CUL-2, CUL-3, CUL-4, NOI-1, TCR-1, TCR-2, and UTIL-1. (=)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-7, BIO-8, BIO-9, BIO-10, BIO-11, CUL-1, CUL-2, CUL-3, CUL-4, HYD-1, NOI-1, TCR-1, TCR-2, and UTIL-1. (+)

Issue	Proposed Project Impact Classification	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	Alternative 2: Clubhouse Renovation	Alternative 3: Revised Site Plan	Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path
Noise					
Result in substantial temporary or permanent ambient noise increases	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 (-)
Generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2 (-)
Expose residents or employees to excessive airport noise	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)
Parks and Recreation					
Substantially increase the use of or result in the degradation of existing parks and recreational facilities	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (-)	Less than significant (+)
Include recreational facilities	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (+)
Public Services					
Result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)
Result in the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)
Result in the need for new or physically altered school facilities	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)
Result in the need for new or physically altered other public facilities	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)
Transportation and Circulation					
Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (-)	Less than significant (-)	Less than significant (+)
Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3(b)	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (-)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (+)
Substantially increase hazards due to geometric design features or incompatible equipment	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (=)
Result in inadequate emergency access	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (=)
Tribal Cultural Resources					
Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resources	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4, TCR-1, TCR-2	No Impact (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4, TCR-1, TCR-2 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4, TCR-1, TCR-2 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-4, TCR-1, TCR-2 (=)
Utilities and Service Systems					
Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)

Issue	Proposed Project Impact Classification	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative	Alternative 2: Clubhouse Renovation	Alternative 3: Revised Site Plan	Alternative 4: Extended Bicycle Path
Have sufficient water supplies to serve the project in normal, dry, and multiple dry years	No impact	No Impact (-)	Less than significant (-)	No Impact (=)	No Impact (=)
Be adequately served by a wastewater treatment provider	Less than significant	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant (=)	Less than significant (=)
General solid waste in excess of State or local standards or of the capacity of local infrastructure and Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure UTIL-1	No Impact (+)	Less than significant (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 (+)	Less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 (=)
+ Superior to the proposed project (reduced level of impact) - Inferior to the proposed project (increased level of impact) = Similar level of impact to the proposed project					

This page intentionally left blank.