

Executive Summary

This section of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed Gaviota Coast Plan summarizes the characteristics of the proposed Plan, alternatives, environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impacts.

Project Applicant/Lead Agency

County of Santa Barbara
Planning and Development Department
Long Range Planning Division
123 East Anapamu Street, First Floor
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Contacts

David Lackie, Deputy Director: dlackie@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

~~Brian Tetley, Senior Planner: btetley@co.santa-barbara.ca.us~~

Julie Harris, Senior Planner. jharris@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

Phone: (805) 568-3380

Project web page: <http://longrange.sbcountyplanning.org/planareas/gaviota/gaviota.php>

Project Location

The Gaviota Coast is an unincorporated area of coastal plain and foothills on the south coast of Santa Barbara County (County). The proposed Gaviota Coast Plan Area encompasses 158 square miles (101,199 acres) of unincorporated land north of the City of Goleta. The Plan Area is bounded by Eagle Canyon in the East, Jalama County Beach on the West, the crest of the Santa Ynez Mountains on the North, and the Pacific Ocean on the South.

Background

In June 2009, the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors approved funding the proposed Gaviota Coast Plan as a project in the Planning and Development Department Annual Work Program. The Board of Supervisors support for this planning effort was based in large part from the community's expressed desire to develop a local solution to address the land use and resource issues specific to the Gaviota Coast.

On October 20, 2009 (Resolution 09-309) the Board of Supervisors established the proposed Gaviota Coast Plan Area boundaries and appointed the 11-member Gaviota Coast Planning Advisory Committee (GavPAC). The GavPAC is a diverse group of community members that voluntarily serve as an advisory body to the County of Santa Barbara with the responsibility to receive community input on planning issues in the Gaviota Coast Plan Area and advise staff on the development of the Plan. The GavPAC hosted 68 noticed public meetings, one all day

workshop, and 56 GavPAC subcommittee meetings (concerning visual resources, agriculture and recreation & trails subcommittees).

The Gaviota Coast Plan is intended to preserve the rural character of Gaviota by protecting and enhancing its varied and unique natural and cultural resources, agricultural productivity, and by enhancing public recreation and access consistent with the capacity of its resources.

Project Description and Objectives

The purpose of the Plan is to update the Comprehensive Plan goals, policies, and implementation actions that define and regulate land use and development within the Plan Area, consistent with California Planning and Development laws. California State law (Government Code Section 65300 et seq.) requires jurisdictions to prepare a comprehensive, long-term general plan with land use diagrams and text to guide development.

CEQA Guidelines Subsection 15124(b) requires that the EIR project description include "a statement of objectives sought by the proposed project." The Plan is necessary to reflect and manage current conditions, facilitate proper and informed planning, and accurately reflect the vision and goals in the Plan Area. The Plan project objectives are to:

- Protect and ensure continued suitability and productivity of agricultural lands
- Protect and enhance interconnected habitat areas and watersheds from the ridgeline to the ocean
- Preserve and enhance public access to the coast, including a robust interconnected coastal and inland trail system
- Preserve and enhance important scenic views of the valley, mountains and coastal open spaces
- Ensure public infrastructure is scaled to the community and water and wastewater systems are protected, enhanced and sustainably managed and maintained
- Protect, enhance and preserve important cultural and historic resources
- Ensure the transportation system is well-planned and maintained and the traffic level of service standards are consistent with the goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan
- Support a safe, complete, pedestrian friendly, and sustainably managed and maintained transportation system that provides full multi-modal access to the community, and connections regionally and between commercial and residential areas

Alternatives

As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15126.6, this EIR examines a reasonable range of alternatives to the Plan that potentially minimize environmental impacts while achieving most of the main objectives. The alternatives assessed in this EIR include:

- No Project Alternative compares the proposed Plan to buildout of land use under the land use designations of the existing 1982 Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan for inland areas and the existing 1982 Santa Barbara County Coastal Land Use Plan (CLUP) for Plan areas in the Coastal Zone, and existing implementing zoning ordinances (the Land Use and Development Code (LUDC) for the inland, and the Coastal Zoning Ordinance, Article II for the Coastal Zone)
- Alternative 1 identifies new and revised Plan policies to provide greater protection to the Coastal Zone to enhance protection of riparian and other natural and visual resources, and clarifies allowed uses within the Coastal Zone.
- Alternative 2 explores the likelihood of significant effects on visual resources, biology, recreation, and prioritizes conservation of the area's resources and character when considering development proposals. It includes different policy approaches that are capable of a higher level of conservation and better access to the coast in the Plan Area.
- Alternative 3 identifies voluntary landowner actions that provide a demonstrated public benefit. This may be achieved through the creation of an incentive-based program for the Gaviota Coast. As envisioned, the incentive framework ranges from encouraging agricultural conservation easements (ACE), to dedication of public trails, to the restoration of historic structures.

This analysis finds that Alternative 2 is environmentally superior alternative, as it would maximize reductions in potential significant impacts while attaining most of the objectives of the Plan-update.

Required Actions and Approvals to Implement the Project

The following actions are required to implement the Plan prepared by the County:

1. Adopt findings and overriding considerations for any environmental impacts which have been determined to not be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the Plan policy framework or mitigation identified in this EIR.
2. Certify the Final EIR for the Gaviota Coast Plan; and

3. Amend the County Comprehensive Plan by adopting text and map amendments to the GCP, the local coastal program, the County LUDC, the Coastal Zoning Ordinance, and the County land use and zoning maps.

Environmental Analysis

This EIR addresses all potentially significant environmental impacts associated with the Plan as determined in the Environmental Scoping Study for the Gaviota Coast Plan, responses to the Notice of Preparation (NOP), and input at the EIR scoping meeting. Potentially significant impacts on the following environmental resources are addressed in detail:

- 4.1 Land Use and Development
- 4.2 Transportation and Circulation
- 4.3 Aesthetics/Visual Resources
- 4.4 Agricultural Resources
- 4.5 Air Quality
- 4.6 Biological Resources
- 4.7 Flooding and Water Resources
- 4.8 Cultural and Historic Resources
- 4.9 Public Services
- 4.10 Noise
- 4.11 Geologic Hazards/Soils/Mineral Resources
- 4.12 Hazardous Materials and Risk of Upset
- 4.13 Parks, Recreation, and Trails

Areas of Known Controversy

The Notice of Preparation process and subsequent response from agencies and the public and recent events have identified concerns regarding the following issues: potentially inconsistencies in the priorities of state planning agencies (California Coastal Commission, California Department of Transportation [Caltrans], Department of Fish and Wildlife, and State Parks and Recreation) for the use of the coast (public access, habitat, protection, interstate commerce and commuting); potential for use conflicts between agricultural operations; recreational users; and contiguous habitat; ongoing oil operations leading to significant air quality and greenhouse gas emissions in the region and the risk of upset, pollution, and impacts to important flora and fauna from accidental oil and gas and hazardous materials releases; transportation conflicts from the lack of integrated multimodal (highways, roadways, trails, bicycle, and transit) transportation system and circulation system planning in the Plan Area.

Issues to be Resolved

Issues to be resolved include how to reduce programmatic significant, unavoidable adverse environmental impacts associated with the Plan to the maximum extent feasible while achieving

Plan objectives, by adoption of mitigation measures and/or alternatives to the Plan identified in the EIR.

Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The summary table, Table S-1, located at the end of this chapter, summarizes the identified environmental impacts for each issue area identified during the environmental analysis completed for the Plan. The table also includes mitigation measures to reduce or avoid the environmental effects, with a conclusion as to whether the impact would be mitigated to below a level of significance. The mitigation measures listed in Table S-1 are also discussed within each relevant topical area. Each impact listing also contains a statement of the significance determination for the environmental impact as follows: Class I impacts are defined as significant, unavoidable adverse impacts, which require a statement of overriding considerations to be issued per Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines if the project is approved. Class II impacts are significant adverse impacts that can be feasibly mitigated to less than significant levels and which require findings to be made under Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines. Class III impacts are considered less than significant impacts. Class IV effects are those for which the Plan's impact would be beneficial. In addition to Table S-1, a list of impacts by class is also provided below.

Class I – Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Biological Resources: Sensitive Vegetation Communities.

Biological Resources: Sensitive Plant Species.

Biological Resources: Sensitive Wildlife Species.

Biological Resources: Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters.

Biological Resources: Cumulative Impacts to Sensitive Vegetation Communities.

Biological Resources: Cumulative Impacts to Sensitive Plant Species.

Biological Resources: Cumulative Impacts to Sensitive Wildlife Species.

Biological Resources: Cumulative Impacts to Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters.

Biological Resources: Cumulative Impacts to Wildlife Movement Corridors.

Cultural Resources: Impacts on Historical and Archaeological Resources.

Cultural Resources: Cumulative Impacts to Historical and Archaeological Resources.

~~*Parks and Recreation: Adverse Physical Environmental Effects Resulting from Additional Recreational Facilities.*~~

Agricultural Resources: Conversion of Agricultural Lands: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Agricultural Resources: Land Use Compatibility: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Biological Resources: Sensitive Vegetation Communities: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Biological Resources: Sensitive Wildlife Species: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Biological Resources: Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Biological Resources: Wildlife Movement Corridors: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Cultural Resources: Impacts on Historical and Archaeological Resources: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Class II – Significant Impacts that can be Mitigated to Less than Significant Levels

Traffic and Circulation: Circulation System.

Traffic and Circulation: Hazards Due to a Design Feature.

Traffic and Circulation: Cumulative Impacts to Circulation System.

Traffic and Circulation: Cumulative Impacts to Hazards Due to a Design Feature.

Visual and Aesthetic Resources: Visual Character Changes.

Visual and Aesthetic Resources: Public Scenic Views, Routes, and Gateways.

Visual and Aesthetic Resources: Increased Light and Glare.

Visual and Aesthetic Resources: Cumulative Impacts to Visual Character.

Visual and Aesthetic Resources: Cumulative Impacts to Public Scenic Views, Routes, and Gateways.

Visual and Aesthetic Resources: Cumulative Impacts to Increased Light and Glare.

Biological Resources: Adopted Conservation Plans.

Geologic Hazards/Soils/Mineral Resources: Soil Erosion.

Geologic Hazards/Soils/Mineral Resources: Geologic Instability and Radon Gas.

Land Use: Compatibility Conflicts: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Land Use: Plan Consistency: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

~~*Traffic and Circulation: Impacts on Plan-Wide Roadways: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.*~~

~~*Traffic and Circulation: Impacts on Plan-Wide Intersections: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.*~~

Visual and Aesthetic Resources: Changes to Visual Character: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Visual and Aesthetic Resources: Impacts to Public Scenic Views, Routes, and Gateways: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Visual and Aesthetic Resources: Increased Light and Glare: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Geologic Hazards/Soils/Mineral Resources: Soil Erosion: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Geologic Hazards/Soils/Mineral Resources: Geologic Instability and Radon Gas: Parks, Recreation, and Trails

Geologic Hazards/Soils/Mineral Resources: Mineral Resources: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Parks, Recreation, and Trails: Cumulative Adverse Physical Impacts.

Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset: Hazardous Materials Sites: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Class III – Less Than Significant Impacts

Land Use: Compatibility Conflicts.

Land Use: Construction-Related Compatibility.

Land Use: Land Use Plan Consistency: Plan Buildout and Rezones.

Land Use: Cumulative Impacts to Construction-Related Compatibility.

Land Use: Cumulative Impacts to Land Use Plan Consistency.

~~*Traffic and Circulation: Circulation System.*~~

~~*Traffic and Circulation: Cumulative Impacts to Circulation System.*~~

~~*Traffic and Circulation: Cumulative Impacts to Hazards Due to a Design Feature.*~~

~~*Visual and Aesthetic Resources: Mountainous Areas.*~~

Agricultural Resources: Conversion of Agricultural Lands.

Agricultural Resources: Land Use Compatibility.

Agricultural Resources: Cumulative Impacts to Direct Conversion of Prime Agricultural Land to Non-Agricultural Use.

Agricultural Resources: Cumulative Impacts to Land Use Compatibility/Agricultural Interface (Indirect Impacts).

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Plan Consistency.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Construction and Operation Criteria Pollutants.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Sensitive Receptors.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Odors.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions: GHG Emissions.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Cumulative Impacts on Plan Consistency.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Cumulative Impacts on Criteria Pollutants.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Cumulative Impacts to Sensitive Receptors.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Cumulative Impacts to Odors.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Cumulative Impacts to GHG Emissions.

Biological Resources: Wildlife Movement Corridors.

~~*Biological Resources: Adopted Conservation Plans.*~~

~~*Biological Resources: Cumulative Impacts to Wildlife Movement Corridors.*~~

Biological Resources: Cumulative Impacts to Adopted Conservation Plans.

Flooding and Water Resources: Flooding.

Flooding and Water Resources: Runoff & Alteration to Drainage Patterns.

Flooding and Water Resources: Water Quality.

Flooding and Water Resources: Groundwater Supply.

Flooding and Water Resources: Cumulative Impacts to Flooding.

Flooding and Water Resources: Cumulative Impacts to Runoff and Drainage.

Flooding and Water Resources: Cumulative Impacts to Water Quality.

Flooding and Water Resources: Cumulative Impacts to Groundwater Supply.

Public Services and Facilities: Emergency Response Plan.

Public Services and Facilities: Wildland Fire.

Public Services and Facilities: Fire Protection.

Public Services and Facilities: Law Enforcement.

Public Services and Facilities: Library Impacts.

Public Services and Facilities: School.

Public Services and Facilities: Solid Waste.

Public Services and Facilities: Water and Wastewater Facilities.

Public Services and Facilities: Water Supplies.

Public Services and Facilities: Cumulative Impacts on Emergency Response Plans.

Public Services and Facilities: Cumulative Impacts to Wildland Fires.

Public Services and Facilities: Cumulative Impacts to Fire Protection.

Public Services and Facilities: Cumulative Impacts to Law Enforcement.

Public Services and Facilities: Cumulative Impacts to Library Impacts.

Public Services and Facilities: Cumulative Impacts to Schools.

Public Services and Facilities: Cumulative Impacts to Solid Waste.

Public Services and Facilities: Cumulative Impacts to Water and Wastewater Facilities.

Public Services and Facilities: Cumulative Impacts to Water Supplies.

Noise: Noise Exposure: ~~Vehicle Traffic, Railroad, and Interior Noise~~Noise Exposure.

Noise: Ambient Noise Level Increase.

Noise: Construction.

Noise: Cumulative Impacts to Noise Exposure: Vehicle Traffic, Railroad, and Interior Noise.

Noise: Cumulative Impacts to Ambient Noise Level Increase.

Noise: Cumulative Impacts to Construction.

Geologic Hazards/Soils/Mineral Resources: Seismic Hazards.

Geologic Hazards/Soils/Mineral Resources: Mineral Resources

Geologic Hazards/Soils/Mineral Resources: Cumulative Seismic Hazards.

Geologic Hazards/Soils/Mineral Resources: Cumulative Soil Erosion.

Geologic Hazards/Soils/Mineral Resources: Cumulative Geologic Instability and Radon Gas.

Geologic Hazards/Soils/Mineral Resources: Cumulative Mineral Resources.

Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset: Hazardous Material Sites.

Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset: Release of Hazardous Material.

Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset: Cumulative Impacts to Hazardous Material Site.

Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset: Cumulative Impacts to Release of Hazardous Material.

Land Use: Construction-Related Compatibility: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Traffic and Circulation: Circulation System: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Traffic and Circulation: Impacts on Hazards Due to a Design Feature: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Air Quality and GHG Emissions: Plan Consistency: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Air Quality and GHG Emissions: Criteria Pollutants: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Air Quality and GHG Emissions: Stationary Toxic Air Contaminant Sources: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Air Quality and GHG Emissions: Odors: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Air Quality and GHG Emissions: GHG Emissions: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Water Resources: Flooding: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Water Resources: Runoff and Drainage: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Water Resources: Water Quality: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Public Services: Emergency Response Plans: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Public Services: Wildland Fires: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Public Services: Fire Protection: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Public Services: Law Enforcement Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Public Services: Libraries: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Public Services: Schools: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Public Services: Solid Waste: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Public Services: Water and Waste Water Facilities: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Public Services: Water Supplies: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Public Services: Cumulative Impacts.

Noise: Noise Exposure: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Noise: Ambient Noise Level: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Noise: Construction: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

Geologic Hazards/Soils/Mineral Resources: Seismic Hazards: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.

~~Geologic Hazards/Soils/Mineral Resources: Mineral Resources: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.~~

~~Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset: Hazardous Material Sites: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.~~

~~Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset: Release of Hazardous Materials: Parks, Recreation, and Trails.~~

~~Parks, Recreation, and Trails: Increased Demand for Recreational Facilities.~~

Class IV – Beneficial Impacts

Parks, Recreation, and Trails: Increased Demand for Recreational Facilities.

Parks, Recreation, and Trails: Cumulative Impacts to Increased Demand for Recreational Facilities.

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
LAND USE AND PLANNING				
LU-1: Land Use Compatibility	The proposed Plan includes certain features that address potential incompatibility, such as the Environmentally Sensitive Habitat and Critical Viewshed Overlay zones that would ensure development is sensitive to natural and visual resources in high priority areas. In addition, various policy citations are proposed that would address potential land use incompatibility issues with regards to potential agricultural incompatibility. Overall, potential land use incompatibility impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
LU-2: Construction-Related Compatibility Impacts	Construction activities are subject to numerous regulations prior to obtaining a permit, including the existing policies set forth by the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, no major or large-scale construction operations would occur under the proposed Plan. Plan buildout would include the potential development of 167 additional single-family residences and 9 agricultural employee housing units. These units would not all be constructed simultaneously. Construction would involve limited ground disturbance and building construction over a 20-year period. Therefore, compliance with existing regulations would ensure that construction-related compatibility impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
LU-3: Land Use Plan Consistency Impacts	The proposed Plan would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan in that it seeks to protect and support expansion of agricultural land uses in the Plan Area in an environmentally sensitive manner, but would not result in a change to the development potential within the Plan Area. Plan policies recognize existing constraints to development, such as a lack of services and steep slopes. Furthermore, the Plan policies and zone changes would be consistent with the County's Comprehensive Plan goals and Land Use Development Code requirements to protect natural resources, minimize the impacts of outdoor lighting, provide recreational facilities, and support and protect agricultural land uses. The Plan would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
Cumulative Impacts Analysis	The Plan includes certain features that address potential incompatibility such as the ESH and Critical Viewshed Overlay that would ensure development is sensitive to natural and visual resources in high priority areas. The Plan includes numerous goals, policies, and development standards that have been developed specifically to manage cumulative land use incompatibilities. For example, Plan Policy LU-11 and DevStd LU-1 address rural commercial uses and provide that any development within the CH Zone shall be low intensity, compatible with the rural setting and subordinate to the surrounding landscape. Other policies reinforce existing regulations, such as the Right-to-Farm Ordinance, which would ensure that projects implemented under the Plan would not conflict with existing uses. Therefore, cumulative land use compatibility impacts would be less than significant. Cumulative construction-related compatibility impacts would have the potential to occur if, for example, numerous construction projects would occur at the same time within close proximity. As previously detailed, construction activities are subject to numerous regulations prior to obtaining a permit, including the existing policies set forth by the Comprehensive Plan. Furthermore, the proposed Plan does not call for an extensive amount of development. The proposed Plan buildout is limited to a potential of 167 low-density residential units and 9 agricultural employee units over a 20-year period. It is not likely that numerous construction projects would occur at the same time within close proximity. Therefore, compliance with existing regulations would ensure that cumulative construction-related compatibility impacts would be less than significant. With regard to cumulative land use plan consistency impacts, the Proposed Plan was specifically developed in order to ensure that potential future development would be consistent with existing plans, such as the Comprehensive Plan and Coastal Land Use Plan. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION				
TC-1: Circulation System	Implementation of Plan policies, actions and development standards would generally protect the rural character of the transportation network in the Plan Area, protect the integrity of Highway 101 as a major transportation corridor through the Plan Area, enhance transportation and rail corridor safety, support enhancements of the bikeway system, and encourage coordination between agencies. However, comprehensive planning efforts would need to be in place to ensure that all modes of transportation are balanced. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant.	<p>MM TC-1 Addresses Circulation System</p> <p>The Plan action shall be revised as follows (removed language in strikeout, new language in <u>underline</u>):</p> <p>Action TEI-2: Comprehensive Corridor Plan.</p> <p><u>The County, in cooperation with Caltrans, SBCAG, California Department of Parks, and Union Pacific Railroad, shall seek funding for preparation of a Comprehensive Corridor Plan for the Highway 101 corridor between Gaviota Tunnel and Farren Road. The Plan shall address:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Operational and safety improvements to Highway 101, the Union Pacific Railroad, and County roads along the Gaviota Coast;</u> <u>New Union Pacific Railroad crossing points (e.g., at grade crossings, bike lanes, bridges and tunnels);</u> <u>Adaptation planning to address Sea Level Rise impacts (including possible long-term realignment of Highway 101 and the Union Pacific Railroad) to address bluff retreat, and to avoid the need for new coastal protections structures;</u> <u>Implementation of the California Coastal Trail and Pacific Coast Bike wayRoute; and</u> <u>Retention and enhancement of public coastal access</u> <p>The County shall prepare a Transportation Corridor Plan, in coordination with the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments, to govern all future improvements to U.S. Highway 101, the Union Pacific Railroad, and County roads along the Gaviota Coast, including new Union Pacific Railroad crossing points (e.g., at grade crossings, bike lanes, bridges and tunnels), long term relocation of the Union Pacific Railroad to address bluff retreat, and to avoid the need for new coastal protections structures and improved access off of U.S. Highway 101.</p>	With implementation of additional policy guidance, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	Class II
TC-2: Hazards Due to a Design Feature	The proposed Plan, with implementation of Policy TEI-7 requiring safety review of discretionary uses with vehicular access to Highways 1 and 101 would not substantially increase design related hazards. The Gaviota Agriculture Tiered Permit Structure allowed uses, however, may increase access and egress onto Highways 1 and 101. The current ministerial project review requirements applicable to the Gaviota Agriculture Tiered Permit Structure allowed uses may allow a project without undergoing Caltrans safety review and result in a potentially significant impact related to design.	<p>MM TC-2 Addresses Hazards Due to a Design Feature</p> <p>The Plan development standards shall be augmented as follows (additions with <u>underline</u>) with a new development standard recommended to further address potential hazards due to a design feature with implementation of the Plan allowed uses:</p> <p>Policy TEI-7: U.S. Highway 101 Operational Conflict Impacts. Proposed new or expanded public or private uses, commercial uses, and visitor-serving uses may be required to submit an analysis that evaluates the anticipated operational conflicts impacts to U.S. Highway 101 operations and makes recommendations on how conflicts can be overcome or mitigated for any discretionary project. <u>All uses for which primary property ingress and egress is either directly or indirectly through an at-grade intersection with Highway 1 or Highway 101, shall be submitted to Caltrans for comment prior to permit approval by the Planning and Development Department. Caltrans review shall be in the form of a letter commenting on the effects, if any, of the proposed highway access, and identify any recommended safety requirements applicable to the project. Confirmation of compliance with any applicable safety requirements must be verified prior to zoning clearance. DevStd TEI-9: All proposed</u></p>	With implementation of additional policy guidance, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	Class II

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
		Gaviota Agriculture Tiered Permit Structure allowed uses for which primary property ingress and egress is either directly or indirectly through an at-grade intersection with Highway 1 or Highway 101, shall be submitted to Caltrans for comment prior to permit review and approval by the Planning and Development Department. Caltrans review shall be in the form of a letter commenting on the effects, if any, of the proposed highway access, and identify any necessary safety requirements applicable to the project. Confirmation of compliance with Caltrans conditions must be verified prior to zoning clearance.		
Cumulative Impacts	<p>MM TC-1 calls for the approval of Action TEI-2 in the Plan, which requires the County to prepare a Comprehensive Corridor Plan. The Plan shall be prepared in coordination with the SBCAG and shall govern all future improvements to Highway 101, the Union Pacific Railroad, and County roads along the Gaviota Coast, including new Union Pacific Railroad crossing points (e.g., at grade crossings, bike lanes, bridges, and tunnels), long-term relocation of the Union Pacific Railroad to address bluff retreat, and to avoid the need for new coastal protections structures and improved access off of Highway 101. This programmatic mitigation measure, which is included as part of the Plan, would also mitigate any potential cumulative transportation impacts associated with the circulation system.</p> <p>In addition, recommended Mitigation Measure MM TC-2 calls for a Caltrans safety review of all proposed new uses under the Gaviota Agriculture Tiered Permit Structure that would either directly or indirectly utilize an existing at-grade intersection with either Highway 101 or Highway 1 prior to receiving zoning clearance. This would ensure that ministerial projects, which do not require discretionary review by the County, would be reviewed by Caltrans to address potential safety concerns. In addition, the Plan proposes additional policies that serve to protect the rural setting of the Plan Area, encourage planned improvements, and supplement existing regulations related to the design of new facilities to prevent hazards. Incorporating Mitigation Measure MM-TC-2 will further reduce potential cumulative effects for hazards due to a design feature.</p>	MM TC-1 and MM TC-2 would also apply to the cumulative issues.	With implementation of additional policy guidance, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	Class II
AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES				
VIS-1: Visual Character Changes	<p>The Plan's new policies and development standards intend to meet the goal of protecting visual resources and preserving the natural beauty and rural character specific to the Plan Area. Several tools are included in the Plan to help ensure potential impacts on visual resources that could occur as a result of development from buildout of the Plan land uses and rezones are minimized. These tools include the addition of the new MT-GAV zone (LUDC only) and the Critical Viewshed Corridor – Gaviota Coast (CVC), and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat – Gaviota Coast (ESH-GAV) overlays to address potential use impacts to steep slopes, critical viewsheds and sensitive habitat in the Plan Area. The Plan also includes a Scenic Highway Corridor/Scenic Corridor to highlight areas of potential scenic value along public travel ways without applying additional specific policy requirements. Rather, The Scenic Highway Corridor/Scenic Corridor highlights areas for visual issues related to potential development. To formalize the recognition of the scenic values from Highway 101, an application for scenic highway status for Highway 101 is included as an item for future action. Outside of overlay areas, development would be required to be visually subordinate to the surroundings, but may have the potential to result in impacts. Impacts would be considered potentially significant, and mitigation is required.</p>	<p>MM VIS-1 Addresses Impacts on Visual Character</p> <p>The Gaviota Coast Design Guidelines (Appendix D) shall be adopted and used by Planning and Development and the Board of Architectural Review in approving future development. The Design Guidelines are intended to preserve the region's natural, agricultural and scenic resources by establishing architectural and aesthetic goals for the Gaviota Planning Area. To accomplish this purpose, the Guidelines are set forth to ensure all building and landscape designs are compatible with the design objectives of the Gaviota Plan, the overall environment, and the specific building site.</p> <p>The Design Guidelines apply to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All residential structures and associated improvements, building additions, site work and landscaping within the Gaviota Plan Area and, All projects currently subject to Central Board of Architectural Review <p>The Guidelines shall be used throughout the design process to incorporate the Site Design Hierarchy, which is the interconnection of the various design disciplines including Site Selection, Architecture, Grading, and Landscape. The Guidelines detail specific requirements under each of these design disciplines that shall be met by subsequent projects implemented under the Plan.</p>	With implementation of additional policy guidance, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	Class II

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
VIS-2: Public Scenic Views, Routes and Gateways	The Plan identifies a CVC Overlay in the eastern coastal portion of the Plan Area from Gaviota State Park to the eastern Plan boundary. This overlay encompasses views from Highway 101. The Plan contains policies and development standards that apply within the overlay area and within areas outside of the overlay, within the Plan Area. These policies, discussed above under Impact VIS-1, would minimize impacts on scenic views within the Plan Area by requiring development to be subordinate to the surrounding visual environment, protecting ocean and mountain views from Highway 101, requiring landscape screening, protecting ridgelines, and requiring development of design guidelines and design review requirements within the Plan Area. However, impacts on public visual corridors would be potentially significant.	Implementation of MM VIS-1 would also serve to mitigate this potential impact.	With implementation of additional policy guidance, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	Class II
VIS-3: Increased Light and Glare	Outdoor lighting regulations (see Section 4.3.2) would require future projects to ensure that exterior lighting is hooded and not directed toward a nearby residential use. Also, all lighting shall be designed to not interfere with vehicular traffic. However, the regulatory framework does not address all types of lighting or lighting from all sources; therefore, impacts related to increased light and glare from buildout of the Plan and rezones throughout the Plan Area would be potentially significant.	Implementation of MM VIS-1 would also mitigate this impact. In addition, the Proposed Ordinance Amendments (Appendix B) shall be adopted and used by Planning and Development and the Board of Architectural Review in approving future development. Section 35.30.120, Outdoor Lighting, included within Chapter 35.30, Standards for Development and Land Uses, is intended to minimize light pollution, glare, and light trespass caused by inappropriate or misaligned light fixtures within the Plan Area.	Impacts would be significant but mitigable.	Class II
Cumulative Impacts Analysis	<p>Implementation of the Plan would not change allowable land uses appreciably and includes program level mitigation that address potential visual character impacts of future projects on a case-by-case basis, such as the CVC Overlay, Site Design Hierarchy, and new enhanced design review measures in the Gaviota Coast Design Guidelines and Outdoor Lighting Ordinance. As a result, the cumulative development potential associated with the Plan and approved, planned, and pending projects would be potentially significant but mitigable.</p> <p>Cumulative development in and around the Plan Area could result in potential impacts related to view obstruction and degradation if future development were to occur in rural areas, or residential, commercial, or other development was to be located along local scenic routes or adjacent to public viewsheds, or located along a state-designated Scenic Highway. However, screening landscaping or other design solutions are required to avoid or lessen visual impacts. The site design hierarchy and policies in this Plan and surrounding communities augment the existing countywide regulations to protect the unique visual character of the Gaviota Coast. Additional development in neighboring jurisdictions would be in areas that are already largely urban with similar policies or development standards that protect important public scenic views. Therefore, impacts would be significant but mitigable.</p> <p>all proposed residential development and larger scale agricultural structures in the Plan Area would be subject to the Outdoor Lighting Ordinance and undergo the Design Review process of the BAR, which addresses the effect of future development which could alter the night sky. The BAR review would consider potential lighting and glare impacts for such larger-scale projects in the Plan Area, and standard conditions of approval addressing new sources of light and glare would be applied, thus reducing their contribution to cumulative impacts. Implementation of MM-VIS-1 and the proposed Plan's mitigative policies related to avoiding excessive lighting and glare would apply, as discussed above; therefore, impacts would be significant but mitigable.</p>	Implementation of MM VIS-1 would also serve to mitigate this potential impact.	Impacts would be significant but mitigable.	Class II
AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES				
AG-1: Direct Conversion of Prime Agricultural Land to Non-Agricultural Use	In addition to existing County permit processes, development standards provided in the Gaviota Agricultural Tiered Permit structure would provide a mechanism to ensure development within the Plan Area is appropriately sited to minimize and avoid impacts to agricultural resources to the extent feasible. Policies, development standards and action items listed in the proposed Plan, in addition to policies detailed in Appendix B, would ensure that development within the Plan Area is appropriately sited to avoid impacts to agricultural operations and prime soils, where feasible. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
AG-2: Land Use Compatibility/Agricultural Interface (Indirect Impacts)	At the Plan level, impacts would be less than significant through the proposed policies, development standards, and actions, in conjunction with the County's Right-to-Farm Ordinance, the Agricultural Buffer Ordinance, and the policies and development standards within the proposed Plan.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
Cumulative Impacts Analysis	Plan buildout, rezones, and ordinance amendments would not represent a cumulatively considerable contribution to an adverse agricultural impact because the Plan is largely beneficial to agriculture. The Plan supports agriculture by supporting clustering to retain large tracts of grazing lands while allowing development to occur within a smaller footprint, supporting agricultural diversification and intensification, and including policies and development standards that would ensure development is appropriately sited with consideration to agricultural resources and potential agricultural interface conflicts. As a result, while there is a cumulative impact to agriculture in the Plan Area based on the potential agricultural conversion that would occur as a result of cumulative development, the project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the impact. Cumulative impacts of Plan buildout, rezones, and ordinance amendments would be less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				
AQ-1: Plan Consistency	The proposed Plan would be considered consistent with the 2013 CAP if it is consistent with anticipated growth in SBCAG's most recent regional growth forecast. The proposed Plan does not alter the buildout potential of the Plan Area and new land use policies are intended to limit the expansion of residential development in favor of less intense, agricultural land uses. Therefore, growth under the proposed Plan would not exceed current growth projections and impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
AQ-2 Criteria Pollutants	No major or large-scale construction operations would occur under the proposed Plan. Buildout of the Plan Area would include development of 167 additional single-family residences and 9 agricultural employee housing units. These units would not all be constructed simultaneously. Rather, construction activities would involve limited ground disturbance and building construction over a 20-year period. This limited amount of development would not result in substantial emissions from construction-related activities. Operational emissions would be less than County adopted threshold of significance. Therefore, operational impacts associated with criteria pollutant emissions would be less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
AQ-3: Sensitive Receptors	<p>Although existing stationary sources of air pollution are located in the Plan Area, the proposed Plan does not include land use changes that would alter plant operations and result in an increase in new stationary sources of pollutants and TAC emissions. Adoption of the proposed Plan would not increase the amount of pollutants and TACs produced by stationary sources, and does not propose to locate new sensitive land use receivers adjacent to the plants. As a result, the proposed Plan's potential to expose sensitive receptors to new or existing stationary pollutants and TAC sources would be less than significant.</p> <p>As the Plan Area does not contain signalized intersections there is no potential for CO hotspots to occur. Additionally, implementation of the proposed Plan is expected to result in only a nominal increase in traffic. Due to the relatively low background ambient CO levels in Santa Barbara County, localized CO impacts associated with congested intersections are not expected to exceed the CO health-related air quality standards. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p><u>MM AQ-1 Sensitive Receptors (Recommended)</u></p> <p>None required. However, the following new development standards should be added to the Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Dev Std LU-5: Air Quality Siting and Design.</u> Development that provides housing or care facilities shall establish adequate buffers from sources of air pollution. Future projects shall be designed to minimize exposure to roadway-related pollutants, and exposure shall be mitigated to the maximum extent feasible. Design features may include but not be limited to maximizing the distance between Highway 101 and sensitive receptors and locating air intake at the non-roadway facing sides of buildings. • <u>Dev Std LU-6: Ventilation Systems.</u> Ventilation systems that are rated at a Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value of "MERV13" or better for enhanced particulate removal efficiency shall be provided on all residential units located within 500 feet of Highway 101. The residents of these units shall also be provided information regarding filter maintenance/replacement. 	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Dev Std LU-7: Air Quality Disclosure Statement.</u> Future project applicants of residential developments within 500 feet of Highway 101 shall be required to record a "Notice to Property Owner" that provides an Air Quality Disclosure Statement to potential buyers, summarizing the results of technical studies that reflect a health concern resulting from exposure of children to air quality emissions generated within 500 feet of Highway 101. 		
AQ-4: Odors	As the Plan does not propose any potential sources of significant odor or placement of receptors adjacent to existing odor sources, it is not anticipated that the Plan would result in objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts associated with odors would be less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
AQ-5: GHG Emissions	The ECAP is designed to mitigate the impacts of climate change and achieve meaningful GHG reductions by implementing goals and strategies within the County, consistent with AB 32, EO S-3-05, and to provide a mechanism that subsequent projects within the County may use as a means to address GHG impacts under CEQA. By being consistent with the ECAP GHG reduction measures, a project would in turn be consistent with the CARB Scoping Plan and AB 32 goals. Population and growth projections associated with Plan buildout are accounted for in the adopted ECAP. In addition, the proposed Plan does not include the development of new stationary sources of emissions, and would not contribute new significant sources of GHG emissions. Additionally, potential projects in the future would be subject to the County's Industrial Stationary Source GHG Threshold of Significance. Therefore, GHG emission impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
Cumulative Impacts	<p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <p>The Plan would not result in significant emissions that would exceed AAQS, and would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollution concentrations. Therefore, as total development under the Plan would not exceed project-level significance thresholds, cumulative localized impacts would be less than significant</p> <p><u>GHG Emissions</u></p> <p>By being consistent with the ECAP GHG reduction measures, a project would in turn be consistent with the CARB Scoping Plan and AB 32 goals. As demonstrated, the Plan would be consistent with the ECAP and state plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purposes of reducing GHG emissions. As such, cumulative GHG impacts would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
BIO-1: Impacts on Sensitive Vegetation Communities	The Plan update contains numerous policies and development standards, which seek to provide further protection of sensitive vegetation communities within the Plan Area. These policies and development standards would ensure that sensitive vegetation community impacts resulting from Plan buildout are minimized. However, mitigation is required to ensure that the Plan is consistent with numerous policies of the Local Coastal Program.	<p>MM BIO-1 Addresses Impacts on Sensitive Vegetation Communities</p> <p><u>MM BIO-1 shall modify Policy LU-1 instead of proposing a new Policy NS-12 (additions with underline).</u></p> <p>Policy NS-12: Within the Coastal Zone, if any policy or provision of the Gaviota Coast Plan conflicts with any policy or provision of the certified Local Coastal Program, the policy or provision that is most protective of coastal resources shall take precedence (consistent with certified Coastal Plan Policy 1-2).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy LU-1: Gaviota Coast Plan Boundary. All pertinent countywide Comprehensive Plan policies apply within the Gaviota Coast Plan Boundary in addition to the specific policies and action items identified in this Plan. Countywide Coastal Land Use Plan and Coastal Zoning Ordinance provisions that are pertinent apply within the Coastal Zone area of the Gaviota Coast Plan. <u>If any policy or provision of the Gaviota Coast Plan conflicts with any policy or provision of the Coastal Land Use Plan or Coastal Zoning Ordinance, the policy or provision that is most protective of coastal resources shall take precedence.</u> The Gaviota Coast Plan 	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.	Class I

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
		<p>Boundary shall not be moved except as part of a County-initiated update of the Plan.</p> <p>MM BIO-1.1 shall revise Development Standard NS-2, as drafted in the Board of Supervisors initiated Plan, to distinguish applicability in Inland and Coastal Zone areas. Development Standard NS-2 shall be revised for the Inland Area as follows (additions with underline, deletions with striketrough):</p> <p>DevStd NS-2: ESH Setbacks and Buffers. (INLAND) Mapped riparian ESH-GAV overlay areas shall have a development area setback buffer of 100 feet from the edge of either side of the top-of-bank of creeks or the existing edge of riparian vegetation, whichever is further. Development within other ESH areas shall be required, subject to the list below, to include setbacks or undeveloped buffer zones from these areas as part of the proposed development, except where setbacks or buffers would preclude reasonable use of the parcel. In determining the location, width and extent of setbacks and/or buffer areas, the County's biological resources and/or vegetation maps and other available data shall be used (e.g., maps, studies, or observations). Appropriate public recreational trails may be allowed within setbacks or buffer areas.</p> <p>Required buffers for riparian ESH-GAV may be adjusted upward and or downward in both the Coastal Zone and Inland Area on a case-by-case basis but shall not preclude reasonable use of a parcel. Adjustment of the riparian buffer shall be established based on an investigation of the following factors and, when appropriate, after consultation with the Department of Fish and Wildlife and Regional Water Quality Board, if required, in order to protect the biological productivity and water quality of streams:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of a net environmental benefit; • Existing vegetation, soil type and stability of stream corridors; • How surface water filters into the ground; • Slope of the land on either side of the stream; • Location of the 100 year flood plain boundary; and • Consistency with adopted Gaviota Coast Plan, Coastal Land Use Plan, and Comprehensive Plan policies. <p>Development Standard NS-2 shall be revised for the Coastal Zone, as follows (additions with underline, deletions with striketrough):</p> <p>DevStd NS-2: ESH Setbacks and Buffers. (COASTAL) Mapped riparian ESH overlay areas shall have a development area setback buffer of 100 feet from the edge of either side of the top-of-bank of creeks or the existing edge of riparian vegetation, whichever is further. <u>Wetland ESH areas shall include a minimum development area setback buffer of 100 feet from the edge the wetland. Monarch butterfly trees shall include a minimum development area setback buffer of 50 feet from the edge of the trees.</u></p> <p>Development within other ESH areas shall be required, subject to the list below, to include setbacks or undeveloped buffer zones from these areas as part of the proposed development, except where setbacks or buffers would preclude reasonable use of the parcel <u>consistent with applicable law. The buffers shall be determined on a case-by-case basis and be based upon site-specific conditions such as slopes, erosion potential, biological resources, etc.</u> In determining</p>		

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
		<p>the location, width and extent of setbacks and/or buffer areas, the County's biological resources and/or vegetation maps and other available data shall be used (e.g., maps, studies, or observations). Appropriate public recreational trails may be allowed within setbacks or buffer areas.</p> <p>Required buffers for riparian ESH may be adjusted upward and/or downward in both the Coastal Zone and Inland Area on a case-by-case basis but shall not preclude reasonable use of a parcel consistent with applicable law. Adjustment of the riparian buffer shall be established based on an investigation of the following factors and, when appropriate, after consultation with the Department of Fish and Wildlife and Regional Water Quality Board, if required, in order to protect the biological productivity and water quality of streams:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of a net environmental benefit; • Existing vegetation, soil type and stability of stream corridors; • How surface water filters into the ground; • Slope of the land on either side of the stream; • Location of the 100 year flood plain boundary; and • Consistency with adopted Gaviota Coast Plan, Coastal Land Use Plan, and Comprehensive Plan policies. <p><u>In addition, the recommended mitigation measure identified as MM SERV-1 in Section 4.9.2.3 can further reduce impacts to sensitive vegetation communities.</u></p>		
BIO-2: Impacts on Sensitive Plant Species	Buildout in accordance with the Plan has the potential to impact 20 sensitive plant species known to occur within the Plan area. A number of other plants or trees would need to be evaluated as subsequent projects are proposed under the Plan. Additional federally- or state-listed plant species may occur within the Plan area that have yet to be observed. Precise locations of sensitive plant species would be identified through on-site reconnaissance in conjunction with proposed future development. Compliance with Plan update policies is not anticipated to completely avoid the conversion of areas supporting sensitive vegetation communities.	<p><u>MM BIO-2 Addresses Impacts on Sensitive Plant Species</u></p> <p>In addition to the development standards listed under BIO-1, the Plan development standards shall be augmented as follows (additions with underline):</p> <p><u>DevStd NS-3: Rare Plants.</u> Where appropriate and feasible, as determined by County staff, if potentially suitable habitat exists for sensitive plant species, prior to approval of Coastal Development or Land Use Permits for any projects in the Gaviota Coast any grading or vegetation clearing for future projects in the Plan Area, focused rare plant surveys shall be conducted during the appropriate time of year to optimize detection of potentially occurring rare plants. Focused s Surveys shall be conducted in accordance with the County's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (County of Santa Barbara 2008) and applicable resource agency survey protocols to determine the potential for impacts resulting from the project on these species.</p>	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.	Class I
BIO-3: Impacts on Sensitive Wildlife Species	Buildout in accordance with the Plan has the potential to impact at least 68 sensitive wildlife species known or with potential to occur within the Plan Area, as well as active nests of raptors or migratory bird species. These Plan policies and development standards would ensure that sensitive wildlife species impacts resulting from Plan buildout are minimized. However, even with implementation of these policies, a significant impact related to sensitive plant species would occur as a result of Plan buildout.	<p><u>MM BIO-3 Addresses Impacts on Sensitive Wildlife Species</u></p> <p>The Plan update development standards shall be augmented as follows (additions with underline):</p> <p><u>DevStd NS-4: Sensitive Wildlife Species.</u> Where appropriate and feasible, as determined by County staff, if potentially suitable habitat or critical habitat exists for sensitive wildlife species on or adjacent to a project site, prior to approval of Coastal Development or Land Use Permits for any projects in the Gaviota Coast any grading or vegetation clearing for future projects in the Plan Area, focused presence/absence surveys shall be conducted in accordance with the County's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (County of Santa Barbara 2008 and any subsequent revisions) to determine the potential for impacts resulting from the project on these species.</p>	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.	Class I

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
BIO-4: Impacts on Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	Buildout in accordance with the Plan has the potential to impact wetlands, non-wetland waters, and riparian habitat. The Plan contains several policies and actions that would be applied to future development in order to minimize potential impacts to riparian habitat, wetlands, and waterways. While these policies provide additional protection of sensitive resources for the Plan Area, impacts would be potentially significant.	<p>MM BIO-4 Addresses Impacts on Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters</p> <p>The Plan update development standards shall be augmented as follows (additions with <u>underline</u>):</p> <p>DevStd NS-5: Wetlands. <u>If potentially jurisdictional wetlands or waters are found on or adjacent to a project site in the Plan Area and have potential to be impacted by implementation of the project, a formal wetlands delineation of the project site shall be completed following the methods outlined in the USACE's 1987 Wetlands Delineation Manual and the Regional Supplement to the USACE Delineation Manual for the Arid West Region (USACE 2008). A determination of the presence/absence and boundaries of any Waters of the U.S. and Waters of the State shall also be completed following the appropriate USACE guidance documents for determining Ordinary High Water Mark boundaries. The limits of any riparian habitats on-site under the sole jurisdiction of CDFW shall also be delineated, as well as any special aquatic sites that may not be within the USACE jurisdiction under the CWA or meet federal jurisdictional criteria but are regulated by FESA, CESA, RWQCB, and/or CCC. In the Coastal Zone, jurisdictional waters and ESH areas as defined by CCC will also be delineated.</u></p> <p><u>Mitigation for unavoidable impacts to wetlands and waters shall be based on the impacted type of wetland and project design. Mitigation should prevent any net loss of wetland functions and values of the impacted wetland. Plan Policy NS-11 requires a replacement ratio to compensate for the destruction of native habitat and biological resources that exceeds the biological value of that which is destroyed. The Plan update policies require mitigation of impacts to sensitive biological resources at a minimum 2:1 replacement ratio. However, the resource agencies may require higher mitigation ratios depending on the type and quality of resource impacted. Mitigation ratios for impacts to wetlands and riparian habitat are typically around 2:1 or 3:1, but can be as high as 8:1 for especially rare or valuable wetland types such as vernal pools.</u></p>	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.	Class I
BIO-5: Impacts on Wildlife Movement Corridors	Buildout in accordance with the Plan has the potential to impact wildlife movement corridors. The Plan contains the several policies and actions that would be applied to future development in order to minimize potential impacts to wildlife corridors. These Plan policies and development standards would ensure that wildlife corridor impacts resulting from Plan buildout are minimized. In addition, given the limited and rural-scale development associated with Plan buildout, impacts to wildlife corridors would be less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
BIO-6: Impacts on Adopted Conservation Plans	The proposed Plan does not address adopted conservation plans for the Plan Area as there are none. However, the County's Comprehensive Plan includes a Conservation Element and the County's CLUP addresses the conservation of coastal biological resources. Both include policies, programs, and standards that serve to enforce conservation within the Plan Area. However, mitigation is required to ensure that the Plan is consistent with numerous policies of the Local Coastal Program.	MM BIO-1, detailed above, would also apply to this issue.	Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation	Class II
Cumulative Impacts	The proposed Plan policies and development standards serve to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to biological resources in the Plan Area. However, these measures are not anticipated to ensure full avoidance of impacts to biological resources or reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the Plan's contribution to impacts to sensitive vegetation communities, sensitive plant and wildlife species, critical habitat, jurisdictional wetlands and waters, and wildlife movement corridors would be significant on a cumulative basis. Potential impacts would be significant	Mitigation measure BIO-1 through BIO-4 would apply to this issue.	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.	Class I

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
FLOODING AND WATER RESOURCES				
WR-1: Flooding	Flood hazards are limited to the coastal areas and mouths of rivers and creeks near the coast. The presence of bluffs limits the extent of inland flooding from storm surge. Mapped flood hazard areas occur within limited coastal portions of Gaviota State Park, Refugio State Beach, and El Capitan State Beach. Flooding hazards are also present at the existing Arroyo Quemada rural residential community. The Plan would retain existing land use designations for recreation and rural residential land use in these locations and would not increase development potential at Arroyo Quemada. Sea level rise which has the potential impact to increase the severity and frequency of storms may affect the State Parks and County beaches. Over the 20-year Plan horizon, the implications of sea level rise may begin to potentially affect the coastal areas both in the form of direct flooding by high tides and storm surges and indirectly through increased coastal erosion.	<p><i>MM-WR-1 Addresses Impacts on Flooding (Recommended)</i></p> <p>The following development standard is recommended to be added to the Plan to mitigate potentially significant further reduce impacts associated with sea level rise, including the potential for coastal erosion and flooding:</p> <p>Mitigation Measure MM-FLD-1: A new Development Standard FLD-1 shall be added to the Plan as follows (addition in underline):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DevStd FLD-4LU-2: Sea Level Rise and Coastal Hazards.</u> <u>Sea level rise and coastal hazard analyses shall be required for near-shore development. Using best available science, the coastal hazard analysis shall consider the impacts of sea level rise on the proposed development including vulnerability assessment, and identification of adaptive measures to reduce expected risk and increase resiliency to sea level rise. Near-shore development includes sites on and along the beaches, bluffs, tidally influenced water bodies and areas potentially subject to inundation given topography and proximity to the ocean.</u> 	Impacts would remain less than significant. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation	Class III
WR-2: Runoff and Drainage	Adherence to County regulations and conformance to the County's post-construction requirements and Flood Control Standard Conditions, the Comprehensive Plan and Plan policies would ensure that implementation of the Plan would result in less than significant impacts from increased runoff from developed areas. Similarly, adherence to the Floodplain Management Ordinance, the Water Course Setback ordinance, the County Grading Code, the Plan Steep Slope Guidelines (Appendix E), Flood Control standard conditions of approval, and application of the Storm Water Technical Guide for Low Impact Development would ensure that impacts of Plan buildout related to alterations in drainage patterns would be less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
WR-3: Water Quality	With adherence to existing regulations, including the County Grading Code and the Storm Water Management and Discharge Control Ordinance along with conformance to post-construction development standards, Comprehensive Plan policies, in addition to the Plan polices above, water quality impacts associated with the proposed Plan would be less than significant..	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
WR-4: Groundwater Supply	While the proposed Plan would not directly result in any new groundwater wells; ultimate buildout of the Plan would require additional groundwater use, most likely derived from bedrock aquifer wells. Each discretionary project that would use groundwater resources would be subject to review using the County's Groundwater Thresholds Manual, which describes the adopted County methodology for estimating the safe yield of bedrock aquifers. As future development with the Plan Area would be evaluated at the project level to ensure proposed groundwater use would not exceed County thresholds, a less than significant impact related to groundwater supply would occur as a result of Plan buildout.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
Cumulative Impacts	With regards to cumulative flooding impacts, future residential buildout and agricultural uses allowed under the Gaviota Agricultural Tiered Permit Structure would be subject to compliance with Floodplain Management and Water Course Setback ordinances, County Grading Code, engineering standards and codes, and Comprehensive Plan polices and development standards. These existing regulations would ensure that development does not contribute to downstream flooding impacts. With regards to water quality, future development within the Plan Area would be subject to the County's storm water regulations, Grading Code, and Comprehensive Plan policies. Future development outside of the Plan Area and within neighboring cities would be subject to similar storm water regulations. Compliance with existing regulations and County policies in addition to compliance with the Plan policies would ensure the project's contribution to cumulative impacts related to runoff and storm water quality to less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
CULTURAL RESOURCES				
CR-1: Historical and Archaeological Resources	Ground-disturbing activities related to construction of new buildings and structures have the potential to impact prehistoric archaeological resources, tribal cultural resources, and traditional tribal cultural places as well as any subsurface remains associated with historic structures that may have once been located on the property. No listed or previously identified historical resources are currently planned for alteration or demolition. However, impacts to historical resources could result from demolition or alterations to resources not listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources, or not identified in an historical resources survey. Demolition of a building that qualifies as a historical resource is a significant and unavoidable impact. Historical research and documentation of the property may reduce the impact, but not necessarily to a less than significant level if the building is demolished. At a program level, impacts to historical and archaeological resources would be potentially significant.	<p>MM CR-1 Addresses Impacts on Historic and Archaeological Resources</p> <p>Existing development standards and actions in the draft Plan shall be revised and augmented as follows (additions with <u>underline</u>, deletions with strikethrough).</p> <p>Cultural Resources Stewardship Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CS-2: Properties of Concern. Potentially significant cultural resources including historic buildings, structures, Rural hHistoric Landscapes, archaeological sites, Traditional eCultural pProperties, Tribal eCultural rResources, and other traditional tribal cultural places and other places of concern to the Native Americans shall be protected and preserved to the maximum extent feasible. <p>Cultural Resources Stewardship Implementing Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action CS-1: Landmarking Buildings, Structures, & Places. The County and the community should continue to work with willing landowners to identify buildings, structures, and places, including Rural Historic Landscapes, Traditional eCultural pProperties, Tribal eCultural rResources, and other traditional tribal cultural places that qualify for nomination listing as a County Landmark or Place of Historical Merit Status and forward these requests <u>nominations</u> to the County Historical Landmarks Advisory Commission (HLAC). Action CS-2: New Development and Rehabilitation Projects. Development resulting in increased building size or demolition of buildings/structures included in the list of historic resources, or buildings and structures over 50-years of age and evaluated as important at the local, state, or national level, shall be reviewed by Planning & Development for consistency with historic resource preservation policies. Action CS-3: Community Cultural Center. The County and Gaviota Coast residents shall investigate, consider and pursue options to develop a community cultural center and/or other community cultural research and education opportunities including Native American culture. Action CS-4: Government-To-Government—Native American Consultation. The County shall continue its government-to-government consultations with the tribes identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) pursuant to <u>Assembly Bill 52 and Senate Bill 18</u> to ensure that traditional cultural resources of concern to the Chumash are identified and taken into account in future development planning. Action CS-5: Confidential Site Locations. The County shall maintain as <u>confidential information</u> about the location of Traditional eCultural pProperties, Tribal eCultural rResources, and other traditional tribal cultural places historical, and spiritual areas as confidential. Action CS-6: Tribal Access. The County, Chumash representatives and willing landowners should work together to ensure appropriate tribal access to Traditional eCultural pProperties (TCP), Tribal eCultural rResources, and other 	Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.	Class I

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
		<p>traditional tribal cultural places, historical, and spiritual properties while respecting the rights and privileges of property owners.</p> <p>Cultural Resources Stewardship Development Standards <i>(Development Standards will be implemented in the Land Use Development Code and the Coastal Zoning Ordinance but are included here for review and discussion)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dev Std CS-1: Phase 1 Archaeological Surveys. A Phase 1 archaeological survey shall be performed when identified as necessary by a County archaeologist or contract archaeologist. The survey shall include all areas of the project that would result in ground disturbance. The content, format, and length of the Phase 1 survey report shall be consistent with the nature and size of the project and findings of the survey. • Dev Std CS-2: Phase 2 and 3 Archaeological Studies. If archaeological remains are identified and cannot be avoided through project redesign, the proponent shall fund a Phase 2 study to determine the significance of the resource prior to issuance of any permit for development. All feasible mitigation recommendations resulting from the Phase 1 or Phase 2 work, including completion of additional archaeological analysis (Phase 3) and/or project redesign shall be incorporated into any permit issued for development. • Dev Std CS-3: Identification of Traditional Cultural, Historical, and Spiritual Sites. <u>Native Americans shall be consulted when development proposals are submitted that impact significant archaeological or cultural sites. Cultural sites may include †Traditional eCultural pProperties, †Tribal eCultural rResources, and other traditional tribal cultural places as identified through consultation with Native Americans.</u> • Dev Std CS-4: Native American Contact List. <u>When existing documentation or a Phase 1 survey indicates that significant prehistoric cultural resources may be affected by a proposed project, the County shall obtain a Native American Contact List from the NAHC and consult with the Chumash in accordance with Assembly Bill 52 during each stage of cultural resources review.</u> • Dev Std CS-5: Integrity of Historic Resources. <u>No permits shall be issued for any development or activity that would adversely affect the integrity of officially designated County Landmarks and Places of Historical Merit, historical resources eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources, or identified historical resources unless a professional evaluation of the proposed project has been performed by a qualified Architectural Historian pursuant to the County’s most current Regulations Governing Archaeological and Historical Projects. All such professional studies shall be reviewed and approved by Planning & Development, and reviewed by the HLAC and all feasible mitigation measures shall be incorporated into any permit issued for development.</u> • Dev Std CS-6: Historical Resources Studies. A Phase 1, and if required Phase 2, historical resources investigation and report shall be performed when identified as necessary 		

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
		by the Director of Planning and Development. The investigation shall include areas of the project that could result in direct or indirect impacts to historic-age buildings, structures, rural historic landscapes, or districts or that could change the integrity of the setting and context for such resources on adjacent parcels. The content, format, and length of the Phase 1, and if required Phase 2, historic report shall be consistent with the nature and size of the project and findings of the investigation. The investigation shall be performed by a qualified Architectural Historian pursuant to the County's most current regulations governing archaeological and historical projects. All such professional studies shall be reviewed and approved by the HLAC and Planning and Development. All feasible recommendations resulting from the Phase 1, and if required Phase 2, shall be incorporated into any permit approved for development.		
Cumulative Impacts	As future applications for individual projects are submitted at a project level of detail, the precise evaluation of future project cumulative impacts would be coordinated through the required individual project-level environmental review, as applicable. Careful review of design and siting, and compliance with existing and proposed policies and programs, would reduce but not eliminate the impacts related to the change in the integrity of significant cultural resources.	MM CR-1, detailed above, would also apply to this issue. At a program level, no potential mitigation measures are available to fully address this impact.	Impacts would remain cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable.	Class I
PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES				
SERV-1: Emergency Response Plan	The proposed Plan would not substantially interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan due to existing procedures in place, development standards, and that the Plan would maintain low levels of potential growth within the Plan Area. This is consistent with the existing rural agricultural character of the land. Impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
SERV-2 Wildland Fire	Development within the Plan Area would be limited to low density rural agriculture and residential uses. Although future residential buildout of the Plan could subject people and structures to a potential risk involving wildland fires, existing and proposed Plan policies and development standards reduce these risks to less than significant.	None required. <u>MM SERV-1 Addresses Impacts Associated with Wildland Fires (Recommended)</u> <u>The following new development standard should be added to the Plan (addition in underline):</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DevStd LU-3: Fire Protection. Development shall be sited to minimize exposure to fire hazards and reduce the need for grading, fuel modification (including thinning of vegetation and limbing of trees), and clearance of native vegetation to the maximum extent feasible. Building sites should be located in areas of a parcel's lowest fire hazard, and should minimize the need for long and/or steep access roads and/or driveways. 	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
SERV-3 Fire Protection	No new facilities or services are proposed as part of this Plan, and therefore, no environmental impacts would occur as a result of the construction of new facilities. In addition, service ratios would remain acceptable. Impacts associated with fire protection service would be less than significant	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
SERV-4 Law Enforcement	Buildout of the Plan Area would place minimal additional demands on law enforcement services. No new or expanded facilities have been identified as part of the Plan and no new services are included as part of this Plan. Therefore, no environmental impacts would occur as a result of the construction of new facilities, and physical impacts related to the provision of law enforcement services would be less than significant	None required	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
SERV-5 Schools	The Plan does not include the construction of any new schools and none are anticipated as a result of student generation resulting from Plan buildout. Furthermore, if in the future, schools are over capacity due to residential development consistent with the Plan, the collection of state-mandated fees (pursuant to Section 65995 (3)(h) of the California Government Code) is considered full and complete mitigation for impacts to public schools. As a result, Plan buildout would result in less than significant impacts related to school facilities.	None required	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
SERV-6 Solid Waste	Future projects implemented under the Plan would be required to comply with the County's integrated solid waste management program and project-specific thresholds. The Tajiguas Landfill has adequate capacity to serve the buildout proposed under the Plan through approximately 2026 and, with approval of the Tajiguas Resource Recovery Project, through the Plan buildout horizon year (2036). Therefore, impacts associated with solid waste would be less than significant	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
SERV-7 Water and Wastewater Facilities	Extensions of water or wastewater infrastructure to accommodate Plan buildout are not planned or anticipated. However, should any future extension of infrastructure occur, it would be required to undergo environmental review pursuant to CEQA by the respective district prior to approval, which would require detailed information on the potentially significant environmental effects of the extension and information on how the significant environmental effects would be minimized. Because no new water or wastewater facilities are required to implement the Plan, no environmental impacts as a result of the construction of such facilities would occur. Impacts associated with water and wastewater facilities would be less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
SERV-8 Water Supplies	As the Plan does not increase development potential within the Plan Area, the existing planning documents for the GWD would remain valid, and no increase in water supply would be required. Impacts would be less than significant	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
NOISE				
NOS-1 Noise Exposure	<p><u>Vehicle Traffic Noise</u></p> <p>Traffic noise levels associated with the proposed Plan would result in potentially significant impacts at noise-sensitive land uses proposed in areas where exterior noise levels would exceed 65 CNEL (see Table 4.10-3). However, as discussed, should these residential uses be located within the 65 CNEL contour for Plan Area roadways, they would be subject to the existing Comprehensive Plan policies associated with exterior noise and interior exposure and would be less than significant.</p> <p><u>Railroad Noise</u></p> <p>Policies in the Comprehensive Plan would reduce railroad noise exposure because they set standards for the siting of sensitive land uses. In accordance with Noise Element Policies 1, 5, and 6, residential uses would be designed so that noise levels in exterior living areas would not exceed 65 CNEL, and interior living areas would not exceed 45 CNEL. Future residential development located within 335 feet of the railroad tracks would be required to demonstrate that exterior noise levels would not exceed 65 CNEL and interior noise levels would not exceed 45 CNEL. Implementation of Comprehensive Plan policies would reduce impacts associated with exterior noise and interior exposure to less than significant.</p> <p><u>Interior Noise</u></p> <p>For new development proposed where exterior noise levels are projected to exceed 65 CNEL, interior noise levels could potentially exceed 45 CNEL. Comprehensive Plan Policy 5 requires that proposed buildings are designed in such a way that interior noise levels due to exterior noise sources would not exceed 45 CNEL. Future residential development located would be required to demonstrate that interior noise levels would not exceed 45 CNEL. Thus, impacts associated with interior noise would be less than significant.</p>	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
<i>NOS-2 Ambient Noise Level Increase</i>	Noise levels within the Plan Area would increase by 1.0 dB(A) as a result of regional growth. As discussed previously, the average human ear can barely perceive changes of 3 dB(A), increase or decrease, and a change of 5 dB(A) is readily perceptible. As all of the Plan Area roadways would experience less than a 3 dB(A) change as a result of proposed Plan buildout, there would be no perceptible change in ambient noise levels. Buildout of the proposed Plan would not result in a noise increase of 5 dB(A) or greater adjacent to the studied roadways. Thus, impacts associated with the increase in ambient noise levels for noise-sensitive receptors would be less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
<i>NOS-3 Construction Noise</i>	Due to the rural nature of the Plan Area and the limited potential for future development, and with enforcement of the Santa Barbara County Municipal Code, noise impacts associated with construction would be less than significant. Existing code requirements limiting construction noise to daytime hours and avoiding construction at times when noise levels are lower and receivers are more sensitive to increases in noise.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
<i>Cumulative Impacts</i>	The incremental exposure of sensitive receptors to increased vehicular noise levels along roadways in the Plan would be cumulatively less than significant. Increases in traffic noise adjacent to the studied roadways would not exceed 1 dB(A), which is not a perceptible increase in noise. Thus, impacts associated with the cumulative increase in ambient noise levels for noise-sensitive receptors would be less than significant. Cumulatively considerable noise impacts from construction activities would not occur due to the rural nature of the Plan area, limited development potential, and likelihood that there is ample distance between construction sites and sensitive receptors to ensure noise levels are not significant. For the same reasons, there is a very low potential for multiple active construction sites to be located in proximity to each other, resulting in a cumulative construction noise impact. Future projects would be required to comply with the Santa Barbara County Municipal Code and Comprehensive Plan policies which would ensure cumulative noise impacts associated with construction would be less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
GEOLOGIC HAZARDS AND SOILS				
GEO-1 Seismic Hazards	Compliance with established development and engineering standards and codes, as well as conformance to the recommendations of a site-specific geotechnical report, would avoid risks in conjunction with future development related to seismic hazards. Impacts related to seismic hazards would be less than significant through compliance with the existing regulatory framework	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
GEO-2 Soil Erosion	Portions of the Plan Area are susceptible to both coastal erosion along sea cliffs and erosion from runoff (slopewash). The Plan does not propose major residential or commercial development plans that would cause adverse soil erosion to occur. However, the expansion of agricultural operations, especially on steeper slopes, would be potentially significant.	MM GEO-1 Addresses Steep Slope Impacts The Steep Slope Guidelines and Standards (Appendix E) for orchards shall be adopted as ordinance amendments into the County Land Use and Development Code (LUDC) and Article II to minimize and reduce erosion impacts associated with agricultural development and orchard expansions on steep slopes. The ordinance amendments identify preferred land clearing methods and reclamation provisions for abandoned operations. These standards address agricultural uses to prevent the degradation of steep slopes. Future agricultural and orchard expansion on steep slopes must comply with the new ordinance amendments in order to manage potential soil erosion impacts.	Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	Class II
GEO-3 Geologic Instability and Radon Gas	Future development within the Plan Area would be required to adhere to the County's Grading Code, which requires the preparation of a site-specific geotechnical report. Impacts associated with landslides or compressible and expansive soils would also be avoided or reduced through engineering design that meets or exceeds adherence to the County's Building Code and the California Building Code. However, the Plan does not include a policy that addresses radon gas issues for state-mapped elevated radon hazard zones. Thus, impacts associated with radon gas would be potentially significant.	MM GEO-2 Addresses Impacts on Radon Gas A new Development Standard LU-2-4 shall be added to the Plan as follows (addition in underline): DevStd LU-24: Radon. <u>Development proposed on Rincon Formation soils or within state-mapped elevated radon hazard zones shall be avoided to the extent feasible; if infeasible, development shall be subject to an evaluation of conformance to EPA radon gas exposure standards. For any sites exposed to radon gas levels exceeding acceptable health standards, incorporation of construction techniques, which reduce the interior radon gas concentrations to acceptable levels, shall be required.</u>	Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	Class II
GEO-4 Mineral Resources	Plan adoption would not place adverse constraints in relation to mineral resources in the Plan Area. The Mineral Resources Area overlay on the County Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map would be removed within the Plan Area. Extraction has been permitted in these areas with the required permits and environmental safeguards. However, the Plan proposes to remove the mapped overlay within the Plan Area since information used to map the adopted overlay is out of date and more accurate information exists regarding mineral resource areas. The proposed Plan changes would not result in an increase or change to allowable mineral or oil and gas extraction activities. Impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would remain less than significant.	Class III
Cumulative Impacts Analysis	Grading and seismic issues would be addressed on a case-by-case basis to mitigate impacts resulting from individual projects. Potential impacts associated with future development would be addressed through project-level analysis and the application of remedial measures identified in site-specific geotechnical investigations (when applicable). Cumulative development projects would be subject to seismic standards contained in the Uniform Building Code, the California Building Code, and policies within the County Comprehensive Plan and General Plans of neighboring jurisdictions. Adherence to policies and development standards contained in the Plan, as well as seismic standards contained in the Uniform Building Code, the California Building Code, and County Building Codes and Ordinances would assure that potential impacts would be less than significant.	Mitigation measures MM GEO-1 and MM GEO-2 would apply to this issue.	Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	Class II

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/RISK OF UPSET				
HAZ-1 Hazardous Material Sites	Existing regulations would require future projects to complete site assessments for hazardous materials and, if necessary, require the completion of site cleanup or abatement in a manner that prevents impacts on workers, future occupants, and the environment. Future development projects would be required to assess and identify the potential presence of hazardous materials during the land use permitting process. If hazardous materials are identified, further evaluation or remediation may be necessary, depending upon the substances present, their concentration, and their location. Implementation of Comprehensive Plan Hazardous Waste and Safety Element policies and compliance with the aforementioned regulatory framework would ensure that impacts on hazardous material sites are minimized and impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.	Class III
HAZ-2 Release of Hazardous Materials	Permitting of development in the Plan Area would be subject to standard SBCFD review pursuant to Health and Safety Code Chapter 6.11 (sec. 25404 et seq.), which requires adequate access for emergency vehicles and appropriate evacuation routes, and regulates the storage of any flammable and explosive materials and their transport within the Plan Area. Existing federal, state, and local regulations and procedures (see Section 4.12.1.4) pertaining to the handling, storage, and transport of potentially hazardous materials would apply to all future development within the Plan Area. These regulations address the prevention of accidental releases of chemicals that would affect human health and the environment, including releases that could result in a hazard beyond the property boundaries. The transport of hazardous materials is also a regulated activity and transporters would be required to obtain permits prior to operations. Thus, regulatory compliance, in conjunction with SBCFD review, would reduce potential impacts related to the use, transport, and accidental release of hazardous materials to below a level of significance.	None required.	Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.	Class III
Cumulative Impacts Analysis	Due to the required compliance with regulations and the typically localized nature of the hazardous material sites, hazardous material impacts related to hazardous material site impacts do not typically combine to result in cumulatively significant impacts. Due to the required compliance with regulations and the typically localized nature of the hazardous materials issues, hazardous material impacts related to hazardous material sites and hazardous material releases do not typically combine to result in cumulatively significant impacts.	None required.	Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.	Class III

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
PARKS, RECREATION, AND TRAILS				
PR-1 Adverse Physical Environmental Effects Resulting from Additional Recreational Facilities				
Impact LU-1: Land Use Compatibility	Buildout of trails and associated facilities under the PRT Map Amendments would have the potential to result in land use compatibility impacts if facilities are not designed and sited with sensitivity to the surrounding rural environment. The final design of such facilities would have to be designed in a manner that fits in with the rural environment (i.e., shielded from public roadway views, design that blends in aesthetically). Trails, however, would be low profile and would blend in with rural surroundings. Therefore impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact LU-2: Construction-Related Compatibility Impacts	Trails in each of the five segments would be constructed individually as funding becomes available and specific trail alignments are refined. This would limit the amount of land that would be disturbed during trail construction at any one time along any segment. In addition, trail construction would occur along linear alignments and would not involve mass grading. Therefore impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact LU-3: Impacts on Land Use Plan Consistency	The trail alignments and recreational land uses would be implemented in a manner protective of agricultural land uses in accordance with existing Comprehensive Plan policies and proposed Plan policies. Land use plan consistency impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of Plan policies and development standards.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
TC-1: Impacts on Circulation System	With implementation of trails and amenities in each of the five segments, there would be an increase in traffic on Highway 101 and local roadways associated with use of recreational trails and amenities. However, the trailheads would all be located immediately off Highway 101 (see Figures 4.13-1 through 4.13-5), thus minimizing vehicles on local roadways. Therefore, this slight increase in traffic would not be expected to exceed available capacity. Impacts would be less than significant. Development of each segment would not have a significant impact on public transit services or other modes of transportation. Each segment proposes to implement trail construction and would increase access for pedestrians, hikers, cyclists, etc. No impact would occur.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact TC-2: Impacts on Hazards Due to a Design Feature	The proposed PRT improvements may increase hazards for recreational users, as there would be a need to cross the railroad tracks in multiple locations to gain coastal access (see Figures 4.13-1 through 4.13-5). However, the public currently crosses the tracks to access the coast where there are no official crossings and the proposed Plan would provide an opportunity to improve pedestrian safety and access by constructing a grade-separated pedestrian bridges or undercrossings within each segment. The proposed Plan contains policies and development standards that address the potential impacts associated with at-grade highway crossings and railroad crossings.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact VIS-1: Visual Character Changes	Visibility of proposed trail alignments would be minimal due to the lack of above ground structures required for trails. Trail alignments would be consistent with the rural character of each of the five segments, because they would not introduce new structures or features that would detract from the existing rural environment or from scenic views. Visual character impacts would be less than significant with the adherence to proposed plans and policies.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact VIS-2: Public Scenic Views, Routes and Gateways	Future trail construction in each segment would involve installation of trailhead signage, fencing, and amenities such as parking lots and restrooms along Highway 101. Although in some segments, especially Segment 1, there are trees along this portion of Highway 101 that prevent scenic views to the coast, it is possible that these facilities could be visible from roadways or other viewpoints and could detract from the existing rural character if not properly designed and sited. However, the proposed draft Gaviota Coast Plan design guidelines (Appendix D) would reduce this potential impact to less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would be less than significant.	Class III

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
Impact VIS-3: Increased Light and Glare	Although the proposed trails would not require lighting, the lighting associated with the proposed parking and restroom areas off Highway 101 could adversely impact night skies and create light and glare, if the proper lighting is not selected. However, the proposed ordinance amendments package (Appendix B) contains standards for outdoor lighting that would reduce this impact to less than significant.	None required.	Impacts would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact AG-1: Direct Conversion of Prime Agricultural Land to Non-Agricultural Use	An analysis of the potential for significant direct impacts to agricultural resources would be conducted at the project level as acquisition and construction of trails in each segment are proposed and implemented. In addition, to reduce the potential for trails to have significant impacts to agricultural resources, the proposed Plan includes several policies, discussed in Section 4.4, Agriculture. As previously detailed, the majority of the trails are sited along existing right-of way and private roads. Although most existing properties in Segment 1 may be residential uses by the time this segment is permitted to construct, it is not guaranteed that approval of these uses would occur. As the existing lands are designated for agricultural uses, the direct loss of agricultural lands would be significant.	<u>MM PR-1 Addresses Direct Conversion of Prime Agricultural Land to Non-Agricultural Use</u> <u>The Gaviota Coast Plan Trail Siting Guidelines shall be adopted and used by Planning and Development in approving future trail development. The Gaviota Coast Plan Trail Siting Guidelines are intended to guide future trail development while protecting and preserving natural, cultural, agricultural, and visual resources as well as the privacy of residents and landowners. The guidelines require future trail segments to be located and designed so that they are safe and accessible for users, minimize impacts upon surrounding land uses and sensitive environmental resources, and are easily maintained.</u> Plan policies, programs and development standards discussed in Section 4.4, Agricultural Resources and under impact PRT-2 above, would minimize potentially significant direct and indirect impacts by ensuring that trails are appropriately sited and designed to minimize impacts on agricultural resources (Policy AG-1.D, AG-1.D.1). However, even with incorporation of Plan policies as programmatic mitigation to ensure trails do not adversely impact agricultural resources, potentially significant direct and indirect impacts to agriculture could occur and impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.	Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.	Class I
Impact AG-2: Land Use Compatibility/Agricultural Impacts (Indirect Impacts)	While fencing and buffering between trails and active agricultural operations could minimize potential indirect impacts by placing barriers and distance between potentially incompatible uses, potential site constraints could exist that make implementation of these programmatic mitigation measures infeasible. In addition, it cannot be guaranteed that private landowners would agree to such measures. Therefore, the construction of trails in each of the five segments could result in potentially significant agricultural resource impacts.	<u>MM PR-1 Addresses PRT Land Use Compatibility/Agricultural Impacts</u> <u>The Gaviota Coast Plan Trail Siting Guidelines shall be adopted and used by Planning and Development in approving future trail development. The Gaviota Coast Plan Trail Siting Guidelines are intended to guide future trail development while protecting and preserving natural, cultural, agricultural, and visual resources as well as the privacy of residents and landowners. The guidelines require future trail segments to be located and designed so that they are safe and accessible for users, minimize impacts upon surrounding land uses and sensitive environmental resources, and are easily maintained.</u> Plan policies, programs and development standards discussed in Section 4.4, Agricultural Resources and under impact PRT-2 above, would minimize potentially significant direct and indirect impacts by ensuring that trails are appropriately sited and designed to minimize impacts on agricultural resources (Policy AG-1.D, AG-1.D.1). However, even with incorporation of Plan policies as programmatic mitigation to ensure trails do not adversely impact agricultural resources, potentially significant direct and indirect impacts to agriculture could occur and impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.	Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.	Class I
Impact AQ-1: Plan Consistency	The construction of trails would not affect regional growth projections and therefore would not affect Plan consistency with the Air Quality Plan. Impacts associated with Plan consistency would be less than significant.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
Impact AQ-2: Criteria Pollutants	There would be no operational emissions associated with the trail alignments within any of the five segments; therefore, trail alignments would not contribute to an exceedance of ambient air quality standards (AAQS). Impacts associated with AAQS would be less than significant.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact AQ-3: Stationary Toxic Air Contaminant Sources	Trails do not emit toxic air contaminants (TACs) and are not considered sensitive receptors. Thus, trail alignments would not likely expose sensitive receptors to TACs despite the presence of the Highway 101 and railroad corridor, which are potential sources of TACs. Impacts associated with TACs would be less than significant.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact AQ-4: Odors	The use of trails does not typically generate objectionable odors. Therefore, odor impacts associated with trail alignments within each segment would be less than significant.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact AQ-5: GHG Emissions	Trail construction would contribute to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, as would vehicles used by trail users to get to the trailheads. GHG emissions for the entire Plan were calculated in Section 4.5 and Appendix G. The contribution of the proposed Plan to GHG emissions was found to be less than significant. Therefore, GHG impacts associated with implementation of each segment of trails and associated facilities would be less than significant.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact BIO-1: Sensitive Vegetation	A site-specific biological review of each segment would be required prior to implementation. The biological review would set forth avoidance, minimization, and restoration measures (as necessary), which have been identified as Plan policies and development standards. It is likely that these measures would reduce potential impacts to sensitive vegetation communities to a less than significant level. However, the feasibility of implementation of these measures cannot be determined until the time of project-level review of each segment. In addition, it is unknown if feasible on-site or off-site mitigation opportunities will be available at the time each segment is proposed. Therefore, potential impacts to sensitive vegetation would be significant.	Compliance with Plan policies is not anticipated to completely avoid the conversion of areas supporting sensitive vegetation communities. In addition, it is unknown if feasible on-site or off-site mitigation opportunities will be available at the time a development project is proposed. <u>MM PR-1 also applies to this issue.</u>	Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.	Class I
Impact BIO-2: Sensitive Plant Species	Each segment has been conceptually designed to be located within or adjacent to previously disturbed areas to the greatest extent practicable. In addition, the proposed Plan contains numerous policies and development standards which seek to provide further protection of sensitive plant species within the proposed Plan Area. These Plan policies and development standards would ensure that sensitive plant species impacts resulting from development are minimized. Although a project-level biological report would specify mitigation (if necessary) for impacts to sensitive plant species, it cannot be guaranteed at this level of analysis that mitigation measures would be feasible or fully reduce impacts to a less than significant level.	Even with implementation of numerous policies and development standards which seek to provide further protection of sensitive plant species within the Plan area which ensure that sensitive plant species impacts resulting from PRT are minimized, a significant impact related to sensitive plant species would occur as a result of Plan buildout. <u>MM PR-1 also applies to this issue.</u>	Impacts would be significant and mitigable unavoidable.	Class II
Impact BIO-3: Sensitive Wildlife Species	Construction of trails and associated facilities in each segment has the potential to impact sensitive wildlife species known or with potential to occur within the proposed Plan Area (see Appendix G), as well as active nests of raptors or migratory bird species. Some of these species may have low potential to occur within certain segments, and precise locations of sensitive wildlife species and extent of habitat would need to be identified through on-site reconnaissance in conjunction with proposed future development.	Although a project-level biological report would specify mitigation (if necessary) for impacts to sensitive wildlife species in each segment, it cannot be guaranteed at this level of analysis that mitigation measures would be feasible or fully reduce impacts to a less than significant level. <u>MM PR-1 also applies to this issue.</u>	Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.	Class I
Impact BIO-4: Jurisdictional Wetlands and Waters	Although it is likely that riparian areas within each segment would require bridges or other types of crossings, final design has not occurred at this stage of analysis. A project-level biological report would specify mitigation (if necessary) for impacts to riparian areas. However, it cannot be guaranteed at this level of analysis that mitigation measures would be feasible or fully reduce impacts to a less than significant level.	It cannot be guaranteed at this level of analysis that mitigation measures would be feasible or fully reduce impacts to a less than significant level. <u>MM PR-1 also applies to this issue.</u>	Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.	Class I
Impact BIO-5: Wildlife Movement Corridors	Although it is likely that implementation of trails in each segment would not significantly disrupt or interfere with wildlife movement corridors, it cannot be specifically determined at this level of analysis. Therefore, impacts would be significant and unavoidable at this level of analysis.	It cannot be guaranteed at this level of analysis that mitigation measures would be feasible or fully reduce impacts to a less than significant level. <u>MM PR-1 also applies to this issue.</u>	Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.	Class I

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
Impact WR-1: Flooding	Flood hazards are limited to the coastal areas and mouths of rivers and creeks near the coast. The presence of bluffs, limits the extent of inland flooding from storm surge. There are many locations in the proposed Plan Area where creeks may qualify as flood hazard areas. While trail alignments and beach access would occur within these low-lying areas, they would retain previous surface levels and would not increase flooding potential. In addition, trail design would take into account the anticipated impacts of sea level rise. Therefore, due to trail design and the intermittent nature of trail use, trail users would not be subject to significant flood hazards. Potential flooding impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact WR-2: Runoff and Drainage	Trail alignments in each segment could alter drainage patterns and result in localized drainage problems such as ponding. Trailhead parking facilities could increase pervious surfaces, which could increase flooding hazards and result in runoff and drainage impacts. Trails and parking facilities in each segment would be required to comply Comprehensive Plan policies related to runoff and water quality and the County's Storm Water Regulations and Grading Code, which requires on-site retention to control runoff from new development. Potential runoff and drainage impacts would be less than significant through compliance with existing regulations.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact WR-3: Water Quality	Water quality in each segment could be adversely impacted by trash from users of recreational trails and coastal access points. In addition, erosion from trail use could increase sedimentation in downstream water bodies. Trailhead parking areas have the potential to introduce contaminants, such as motor oil, gasoline, and heavy metals. With adherence to existing regulations, including the County Grading Code and the Storm Water Management and Discharge Control Ordinance along with conformance to post-construction development standards, Comprehensive Plan policies, impacts to water quality would be less than significant. Furthermore, Policy REC-6 supports the placement of trash facilities at major trailheads, which would promote placement of trash in the correct receptacle.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact CR-1: Impacts on Historical and Archaeological Resources	The possibility exists that some of the trails and associated facilities could be proposed in areas containing historic or prehistoric sites or artifacts, as well as areas defined as rural historic landscapes, traditional cultural properties, tribal cultural resources, and traditional tribal cultural places. A site-specific cultural resources survey and report would be required prior to implementation of each segment, which would recommend avoidance, minimization, and protection measures (as necessary) for historical and archaeological resources. The feasibility of implementation of these measures cannot be determined until the time of project-level review of each segment. Therefore, impacts would be significant	Implementation of trails and associated facilities in each segment would require a project-level cultural resources survey and technical report that would detail potential impacts and associated mitigation measures, if necessary. However, at this level of analysis, it cannot be guaranteed that mitigation would be feasible, or would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. <u>MM PR-1 also applies to this issue.</u>	Impacts are significant and unavoidable.	Class I
Impact SERV-1: Emergency Response Plans	Implementation of PRT improvements would not be associated with any habitable land uses or facilities that could block or interfere with the implementation of an emergency response plan; therefore, impact SERV-1 would be less than significant.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact SERV-2: Wildland Fires	Implementation of PRT improvements in each segment would not introduce residences within wildland fire hazard areas. Many areas of the proposed Plan Area are designated as "High Fire Hazard" areas. However, the use of trails is intermittent and does not represent a use that would result in a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Trail users can represent a source of wildfire risk if users attempt to dispose of lit cigarettes in dry brush areas. However, these types of activities would not be considered typical of trail users and would be considered an unlikely scenario. In addition, the presence of trail users can result in the immediate reporting of wildfires. As a result, potential wildfire impacts within each segment would be less than significant.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
Impacts SERV-3 through SERV-5: Fire Protection, Law Enforcement, and Schools	Trails and other facilities in each segment would not result in an increase in demand for fire or police services because service ratios are based on resident population, not transitory users of recreational facilities. In addition, no new facilities are needed to serve the proposed Plan Area at buildout and no new facilities are proposed in conjunction with the proposed Plan to cover the impacts of buildout of the proposed Plan Area. Therefore, the contribution to impacts from the construction of new public facilities associated with each segment would not be cumulatively considerable and impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact SERV-6: Solid Waste	Implementation of each segment would result in a nominal increase in solid waste generation in associated with trash from recreational trailhead trash facilities and bathrooms. As previously detailed, however, existing trails within each of the five segments are informally used by recreational users. As discussed in Section 4.9 Public Services, landfill capacity is adequate to serve Plan Area at buildout, thus implementation of each segment would not result in significant impacts to solid waste. Solid waste impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact SERV-7: Water and Wastewater Facilities	The restroom facilities planned for each segment would be serviced by on-site septic systems or dry wells that are sized for the intended use. Impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact SERV-8: Water Supplies	Construction of trails and other facilities would require nominal water use during construction and operation. Operational water use would be limited to the restroom facilities in each segment, which would not require a significant amount of water supplies. Impacts would be less than significant.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact NOS-1: Noise Exposure	Implementation of trails, facilities, and access improvements in each segment would result in recreational activities such as hiking, bicycling, picnicking, swimming, surfing, windsurfing, diving, fishing, walking on the beach, and horseback riding. These passive recreational activities do not generate substantial noise levels. Human activities usually associated with sensitive receptors include, but are not limited to, talking, reading, and sleeping. Trails or recreational activities are not considered sensitive receptors. Although trails in each segment are sited along Highway 101 and the railroad, it would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels, as recreational users are not stationary and are not considered sensitive receptors. Impacts associated with the exposure of noise-sensitive receptors to elevated noise levels would be less than significant.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact NOS-2: Ambient Noise Level	Implementation of trails and facilities in each segment would not involve activities that would result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Impacts associated with the increase in ambient noise levels for noise-sensitive receptors would be less than significant.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact NOS-3: Construction Noise	A majority of the trail alignments in each segment are located within open space and agricultural areas away from sensitive receptors. In Segment 1, a secondary route is proposed adjacent to residential uses in the Naples area, however, this alignment is in an area that is relatively flat and clear of heavy vegetation, and would not require the use of heavy trail building equipment. Noise levels from construction of trails or other recreational amenities would not exceed 65 dB(A)Leq at sensitive receptors locations due to the distances between proposed trails and residential uses, the nature of trail construction (hand tools and limited small equipment use), in addition to compliance with Section 9.16.015 of the County of Santa Barbara Municipal Code which requires noise levels from construction not to exceed 5 dB(A) above ambient noise levels at the nearest property line of a property used for residential purposes between the hours of 8:00 p.m. of any day and 7:00 a.m. of the following day unless a special permit therefor has been applied for and granted by the Chief of Building and Zoning. Impacts associated with construction noise (NOS-3) within each segment would be less than significant.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
Impact GEO-1: Seismic Hazards	Seismic hazards that have the potential to impact each segment may include ground rupture, ground acceleration (shaking), liquefaction, earthquake-induced tsunamis, and earthquake-induced landslides. As previously detailed, recreational users already frequent each segment and use unimproved trails and beach access areas. Improvements in each segment would likely increase the safety and stability of trails. In addition, the PRT improvements would not lead to the development of new housing or commercial uses, the potential for seismic hazards to expose people and structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including loss, injury, or death is low. Impact GEO-1 would be less than significant.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact GEO-2: Soil Erosion	Each segment is susceptible to both coastal erosion along sea cliffs and erosion from runoff (slopewash). In addition, sea level rise threatens to inundate low lying areas and to accelerate erosion of coastal bluffs. Implementation of trails and other facilities in each segment would have the potential to result in soil erosion due to trail construction and trail use on steep slopes and construction and use of new coastal access points at coastal areas susceptible to erosion. As previously detailed, informal recreational users frequent each segment and use unimproved trails and beach access areas. Improvements would likely increase the safety and stability of trails. Conformance to mandated County grading requirements would ensure that future grading and construction operations would minimize significant soil erosion impacts, however proper siting of trail is required in order to completely avoid impacts. As a result, soil erosion impacts (GEO-2) from implementation of PRT improvements would be significant but mitigable with incorporation of Plan policies that address appropriate siting to avoid erosion impacts.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact GEO-3: Geologic Instability and Radon Gas	The main component of the PRT improvements, the construction of trails, would not be affected by radon gas. However, the proposed Plan does not include a policy that addresses radon gas issues for state-mapped elevated radon hazard zones. Thus, impacts associated with radon gas would be significant but mitigable for structures, such as restrooms.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact GEO-4: Mineral Resources	The Mineral Resources Area overlay is a Land Use Element overlay that depicts an area of known deposit of metallic and non-metallic resources and mineral fuel. Extraction is permitted in these areas with the required permits and environmental safeguards. The proposed Plan proposes to remove the mapped overlay within the proposed Plan Area since information used to map the adopted overlay is out of date and more accurate information exists regarding mineral resource areas. The California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) has mapped the location of oil and gas wells along and adjacent to the Gaviota Coast, both onshore and offshore. Potentially significant conflicts between trails in each segment and oil/gas wells and associated facilities would be avoided through adherence to the recommendations contained in the Trails Design Guidelines.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III
Impact HAZ-1: Hazardous Materials Sites	Figure 4.12-1 details the location of known hazardous materials sites. While there are no known listed sites that represent an ongoing concern within Segment 1, hazardous materials sites are known from Segments 2-5 and a hazardous materials search and assessment would be required prior to implementation of the PRT recommendations. In addition, many areas of each segment have been used for agricultural purposes, and the soils may contain pesticides or other residue. Therefore, impacts from hazardous materials sites (HAZ-1) would be considered potentially significant.	A hazardous material assessment would be required prior to implementation of trails and other facilities within each segment. This assessment would detail potential recognized environmental conditions (RECs) and measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts.	Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.	Class II
Impact HAZ-2: Release of Hazardous Materials	Trail improvements in each segment would not be associated with uses that would involve the handling or release of hazardous materials. Potential uses would include passive recreational activities such as hiking, bicycling, picnicking, swimming, surfing, and horseback riding. These activities would not involve hazardous materials or the potential upset or release of hazardous materials. Impact HAZ-2 would be less than significant.	None required.	Impact would be less than significant.	Class III

Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance after Mitigation				
Issue	Impact	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation	Impact Classification
PR-2 Increased Demand for Recreational Facilities				
	While ample recreational facilities are already in existence, the proposed Plan calls for continued development of coastal access and trails across the proposed Plan Area as further detailed under Impact PR-2 below. In addition, uses allowed under the Gaviota Agricultural Tiered Permit Structure would support expansion of private rural recreational opportunities on agriculture II zoned lands within the proposed Plan Area. Rural recreational uses could include horseback riding, fishing, guest ranch/farmstay, and camping. Furthermore, future development under the proposed Plan would require the dedication of land or payment of in-lieu fees, or a combination of both, for park and recreational purposes as a condition of approval of a tract map or parcel map. These collected fees or allocated lands would be used to create additional parks, trails, and recreation facilities, in order to help maintain demand associated with the proposed Plan Area's future residents and provide recreational opportunities for the communities surrounding the proposed Plan Area. Impacts from increased demand for recreational facilities associated with growth accommodated by Plan buildout and rezones would be positive.	None required.	Impacts would remain positive.	Class IV
Cumulative Impacts Analysis				
<u>Adverse Physical Impacts</u>	Implementation of the PRT policies, actions and development standards would reduce potentially significant adverse physical impacts from construction of recreational facilities on a project-by-project basis. While significant and unavoidable impacts on biological, agricultural, or archaeological resources could potentially result from PRT improvements for an individual project, cumulative impacts are not anticipated due to the dispersed location of recreational facilities in relation to potentially impacted resources and the likelihood that a majority of significant impacts will be mitigable by Plan policies and development standards during project level review. As a result, the proposed Plan's contribution to cumulative impacts associated with proposed park and recreation facilities would be <u>less than significant and mitigable</u> .	Plan area accommodates in excess of 673 acres of Parkland where future applicants for residential developments could propose new parks as part of their projects, either within the Plan area utilizing an in-lieu public parks fee in accordance with Quimby Act standards, which would offset incremental increases in demand. As the Plan area already accommodated adequate recreational facilities to accommodate demand and would promote expansion of recreational trails and amenities, the Plan's contribution to park demand impacts would be considered beneficial.	Impacts would be beneficial.	Class IV I
<u>Increased Demand for Recreational Facilities</u>	The Plan Area already accommodates in excess of 673 acres of Parkland. Furthermore, future applicants for residential developments could propose new parks as part of their projects, either within the proposed Plan Area or neighboring communities. They also could pay an in-lieu public parks fee in accordance with Quimby Act standards, which would offset incremental increases in demand. As the proposed Plan Area already accommodated adequate recreational facilities to accommodate demand and would promote expansion of recreational trails and amenities, the proposed Plan's contribution to park demand impacts would be considered beneficial.	None required.	Impacts would remain positive.	Class IV