Table ES-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
Class I Impacts – MOU Project			
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-22: Cumulative Loss of Coastal and Foothill Habitats.** The loss of the coastal plain as a landscape element for wildlife means that many wildlife species are restricted to areas of greater topographic relief (foothills and mountainous regions). Past developments on the coastal plain in western Goleta have already reduced the extent of the coastal terrace here and have contributed to wildlife habitat fragmentation. Several proposed residential developments near the project, including two projects proposed on the Naples town site, could contribute to the cumulative loss and/or fragmentation of existing habitats and wildlife movement opportunities along the coastal terrace south of Highway 101. The cumulative loss of coastal terrace grassland habitat and the connectivity and movement opportunity that it provides for wildlife south of Highway 101, is considered a *significant and not mitigable impact (Class I)*, even if the effect of the MOU Project has been reduced below a level of significance through design changes and other mitigation measures. Establishment of the Private Agricultural Conservation Easement (PACE), the Open Space Conservation Easement (OSCE), and implementation of the Open Space and Habitat Management Plan (OSHMP) would help reduce this cumulative impact.	**Mitigation Bio-1a: Protection and Revegetation of Native Grassland.** Design changes in the MOU Project will retain the 2.9 acres of native grassland on Lot 57, as well as the areas of native grassland along the edges of the drainages on the coastal terrace (totaling approximately 12.5 acres). Design changes and other components of the project minimized the fragmentation of grassland habitat. The Naples Planned Development (NPD) zone proposed for the project requires preparation of an Open Space and Habitat Management Plan (OSHMP) for the project, and a preliminary OSHMP has been prepared and submitted. The OSHMP identifies objectives and actions to manage and increase the areas of native grassland habitat within Open Space Conservation Easement (OSCE) areas, and to reduce the abundance of nonnative species. These measures are part of the project design and serve to minimize the potential for effects to sensitive plant species occurring in grassland habitat. **Mitigation Bio-1b: Sensitive Plant Species in Grasslands.** To reduce further the potential for direct effects on sensitive grassland species, the applicant shall retain a qualified biologist, approved by the Planning and Development Department, to survey the development envelopes and other areas to be disturbed by the construction of roadways or other improvements for special-status plant species at times of the year that are appropriate for their detection. In the event any sensitive plant species are found in these areas to be disturbed, a qualified biologist shall collect seeds, bulbs, or cuttings of these species for transplantation to suitable areas within the OSCE. **Mitigation Bio-2a: Protection and Revegetation of Scrub Habitat.** Scrub habitats onsite include coastal bluff scrub and	Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
		coastal scrub. Most areas of these habitats are avoided by siting of building envelopes and other project features, but a small area amounting to approximately 0.32 acre will be directly affected, and an area of approximately 0.79 acre may be subject to thinning for fire control purposes. The NPD zone requires preparation of an OSHMP for the project, and a preliminary OSHMP has been prepared and submitted. The OSHMP identifies objectives and actions to manage and increase the areas of coastal scrub habitat within OSCE areas and to reduce the abundance of nonnative species. These measures are part of the project design and serve to minimize the potential for effects to sensitive plant species occurring in coastal scrub. **Mitigation Bio-2b: Sensitive Plant Species in Coastal Scrub.** To reduce further the potential for direct effects on sensitive plant species within coastal scrub areas, the applicant shall retain a qualified biologist, approved by the Planning and Development Department, to survey the development envelopes and vegetation thinning areas, for special-status plant species at times of the year that are appropriate for their detection. In the event any sensitive plant species are found in these areas to be disturbed, a qualified biologist shall collect seeds, bulbs, or cuttings of these species for transplantation to suitable areas within the OSCE.	
3.9 Visual Resources	**Impact Vis-0: Change in Visual Character.** One of the major visual effects of the MOU Project will be to replace the existing sloping hillsides visible to the north of Highway 101 with a large lot residential development. This change in visual character is not dependent on any one view or key observation point (KOP), but is anticipated as a broader perception by travelers on the	**Mitigation Measure Vis-1: Landscape Screening.** To reduce visual contrast of residences as seen against the backdrop of natural hillsides and/or skyline, the preliminary landscape plan identifies several measures to reduce visual effects and to make the development blend in with the surrounding area. These include planting a combination of trees and shrub plantings around the perimeter of each proposed residence, using rock	Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	highway, users of the trail system, or other visitors to the area. Depending on the vantage point, several homes – typically up to six or more – would be simultaneously visible from the highway. Also depending on the vantage point, homes may be visible overlapping one another so there is little or no visible space between them. The combination of the number of homes, their spacing, and their intentional uniform appearance with muted earth tones and low profile design, would alter the character of the landscape in a manner that does not occur elsewhere on the Gaviota Coast. Most of the individual views of the MOU Project may not be significantly affected, or may be affected in ways that can be mitigated. The project incorporates several features that will, in fact, tend to increase agricultural production and make the development more "agricultural" than the present land. Despite these points, the visual character of the project, at least that which will be visible to the north of the highway, will be one of a planned residential development as opposed to a rural and agricultural landscape. For these reasons, in assessing the overall visual effect of the MOU Project it is considered to have a *significant and not mitigable (Class I impact)* on the visual character of the landscape.	cairns and similar unobtrusive fences to delineate boundaries or specific use areas, and maintaining the existing orchards and groves particularly north of Highway 101. These measures will add variation to the horizontal lines of the homes and help to screen the structures from view. **Mitigation Measure Vis-2: Windrow Maintenance.** To minimize visual impacts of development to travelers, recreational users, the project landscaping plans shall include a component addressing maintenance and improvements to existing windrow plantings.	
3.9 Visual Resources	**Impact Vis-5: Key Observation Point 5.** The addition of several homes across and atop the hills in the midground views of this KOP would directly affect views here in the MOU Project. The introduction of structures would contrast with the rolling hills and trees	**Mitigation Measure Vis-1: Landscape Screening** **Mitigation Measure Vis-2: Windrow Maintenance**	Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	and surrounding landscape. Eight residences would be visible in this area, two of which (lots 26 and 47) would appear relatively close to Highway 101 and be more prominent in the midground view. Views to other homes in this area would overlap one another, creating a blocking or massing effect of several homes together (structures on lots 26 and 48, and the views to structures on lots 49, 542a, and 52b). The rooflines of some homes in this area would extend into the sky above the local ridgeline (lots 47, 48, 52a, and 52b). For these reasons, the visual contrast is rated as high, and the project dominance is rated high for the MOU Project. Views to scenic mountains or oceans would not be obscured by development, and the scenic backdrop would be only slightly impaired. Therefore, view impairment from this KOP is rated as low. The visual impact susceptibility is classified as high based on high ratings for visual quality and viewer exposure, and moderate ratings for viewer sensitivity. For the MOU Project, visual impact severity is considered high, due to the high ratings for visual contrast and dominance of the visible structures, and a low rating for view impairment. Therefore, based on the criteria used in this analysis, the MOU Project would have a *significant and unavoidable impact (Class I)* from KOP 5.		

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
Class II Impacts – MOU Project			
3.2 Geology	**Impact Geol-1: Bluff Retreat.** Within the MOU Project area south of Highway 101, nine residential lots would be developed adjacent to the coastal bluffs subject to sea cliff retreat at an average rate of 0.7 feet/year. The project design incorporates a minimum setback of 110 feet for the proposed residential structures, greater than the 75-year setback requirement of the County (53 feet). The location for the proposed vertical coastal access trail is also set back from the bluff face, and the stairway access down the bluffs is designed in a manner to minimize alterations to the bluff face. Given the uncertainty in predicting future bluff retreat and associated setback requirements, the additional bluff setback distance, more than double the County's requirement, incorporated in the project design is anticipated to be an adequate response to this future effect. Potential impacts of the project relative to coastal bluff retreat are *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	**Mitigation Geol-1: Bluff Retreat.** All structures and improvements to be provided in the portions of the development adjacent to coastal bluffs shall be setback from the bluff tops as shown in the project plans. The minimum bluff top setback for structures is 110 feet.	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.2 Geology	**Impact Geol-2: Erosion from Grading.** Site preparation, grading, and construction activities can expose topsoil and unconsolidated sediments to erosive forces, resulting in the loss of topsoil and discharge of sediment. The project design avoids grading and disturbance along steep stream banks and the coastal bluffs, so the potential effects of erosion and sediment production will be limited to relatively flat areas. These effects will also be minimized through the regulatory	**Mitigation Geol-2: Erosion from Grading.** Grading and erosion and sediment control plans shall be designed to minimize erosion and shall include the following: a) Grading shall be prohibited within 50 feet of the top of bank of each stream on the property including as appropriate: Dos Pueblos Creek, any tributary to Dos Pueblos Creek, Canada Tomate Creek, and unnamed seasonal drainages leading to the ocean, as shown on project plans. The	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	processes that already apply to the development, including requirements to prepare grading and erosion control plans, and the inspection and enforcement activities by the County and other agencies. Specifically, grading for residential sites would require approximately 63,000 cubic yards of cut and 54,000 cubic yards of fill. In general, grading for roadway improvements or widening would involve cuts or fill less than two to three feet, with slopes laid back similarly in height. The exception is the northwesterly cul-de-sac, where it crosses through Lot 47, and the concrete box culvert fill for the seasonal drainage course crossing of the central area to the easterly connector road (Lot 167). Both of these fills would cover limited areas and would be ten feet or less in height. Based on a review of the Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan provided with the application, potential impacts of the project relative to erosion and sediment production are *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	protected areas shall be designated with orange construction fencing or other barrier to prevent entry by equipment or personnel. b) The applicant shall limit excavation and grading to the dry season of the year (i.e., April 15 to November 1) unless a Building and Safety approved erosion and sediment control plan is in place and all measures therein are in effect. All exposed graded surfaces shall be reseeded with ground cover vegetation to minimize erosion. c) Methods such as geotextile fabrics, erosion control blankets, retention basins, drainage diversion structures, siltation basins and spot grading shall be used to reduce erosion and siltation into adjacent water bodies or storm drains during grading and construction activities. d) Any sediment or other materials tracked off site shall be removed the same day as they are tracked using dry cleaning methods. e) Storm drain inlets shall be protected from sediment-laden waters by the use of inlet protection devices such as gravel bag barriers, filter fabric fences, block and gravel filters, and excavated inlet sediment traps. f) Grading on slopes steeper than 5:1 shall be designed to minimize surface water runoff. g) Temporary storage of construction equipment shall be limited to a 50 by 50 foot area located along existing paved or dirt roads on the property; equipment storage sites shall be located at least 100 feet from any water bodies.	

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
3.2 Geology	**Impact Geol-3: Seismicity.** No faults considered active by the California Geologic Survey cross any portion of the project area; therefore the potential for direct ground displacement is low. The entire project area is within a region subject to groundshaking and other adverse effects related to earthquakes. The development of residential structures and improvements could expose people and structures to adverse effects from potential seismic activity. Building foundation design recommendations, based on the site-specific geological investigations performed for the project, will be required in compliance with current ordinances and policies in the County. Potential impacts to the project relative to seismicity and groundshaking are *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	**Mitigation Geol-3: Seismicity.** Structures shall be designed to earthquake standards of the Uniform Building Code Seismic Zone 4.	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.2 Geology	**Impact Geol-4: Landslides.** Small portions of the project area contain mapped landslide deposits. Development of these areas could expose structures and residents to the hazards of ground movement, particularly in the event of an earthquake. The landslide deposits are generally shallow, and generally do not affect the flatter ridgetops where development is proposed. Site specific conditions may warrant specific grading and/or foundation measures to provide stable building sites. Potential impacts related to landslides are *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	**Mitigations Geol-4 and -5: Landslides and Soils Conditions.** Constraints related to landsliding or soil conditions can be mitigated through proper grading, foundation design, and inspection and enforcement of existing safety codes. These mitigations can be fully detailed in a geological and/or soils engineering study addressing structure sites and access roads. Results of such studies will assist in the preparation of structural design criteria, as recommended by the Building & Safety Division and the County Standard Conditions Manual. The study shall be submitted for review and approval by Public Works.	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.2 Geology	**Impact Geol-5: Soils Conditions.** Site specific investigations indicate that groundwater does not occur near the surface in any of the areas to be developed, and the potential for liquefaction of the soils on the site	**Mitigations Geol-4 and -5: Landslides and Soils Conditions.** Constraints related to landsliding or soil conditions can be mitigated through proper grading, foundation design, and inspection and enforcement of existing safety codes. These	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	is low. There are some lenses of loose coarse grained sand underlying southerly portions of the site, and these may be susceptible to seismically induced settlement. The colluvial soils on the property derived from the Rincon and Monterey formations can contain clay and have the potential to exhibit expansive properties that may harm foundations and similar structures. Building foundation design recommendations, based on the site-specific geological investigations performed for the project, will be required in compliance with current ordinances and policies in the County. Potential impacts to the project relative to soils conditions are *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	mitigations can be fully detailed in a geological and/or soils engineering study addressing structure sites and access roads. Results of such studies will assist in the preparation of structural design criteria, as recommended by the Building & Safety Division and the County Standard Conditions Manual. The study shall be submitted for review and approval by Public Works.	
3.2 Geology	**Impact Geol-6: Radon Gas.** Soils on the property are derived from the Rincon and Monterey formations, which underly the property, and which are commonly associated with elevated levels of radon gas. No testing has been performed for this hazard, but it can be easily detected and foundation design measures can be developed to ensure that the gas does not accumulate in structures and living areas. Potential impacts to the project from naturally occurring radon gas are *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	**Mitigation Geol-6: Radon Gas.** Applications for building permits for residential structures within the project shall be accompanied by a report documenting testing results for the presence of radon gas emitted from the soils or geologic formations underlying the property. In the event that radon gas is present, residences shall be designed and constructed in accordance with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) guidelines for minimizing impacts associated with radon gas exposure.	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.3 Hydrology and Water Quality	**Impact Flood-1: Flood Hazards.** In the event of dam failure at the reservoir on the Dos Pueblos Ranch property, no proposed homesites within the MOU Project area would be affected; but the access road to the northwest portion of the development may be damaged. Project development would reduce the amount of ground surface capable of absorbing and	**Mitigation Flood-1: Storm Water Control Structures and Devices.** Storm water retention and protection structures (i.e., detention basins, outlet dissipaters, etc.) and other industry standard erosion protection devices (i.e., silt fences, jute netting, straw bales, bioswales, etc.) shall be constructed, installed, and made operational during the initial phases of site grading. Post-construction surface runoff volumes from the new residential	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	infiltrating rainfall and, therefore, potentially increase both the net storm water runoff and peak flows within watercourses. A very small portion of the MOU Project is located upgradient and within the watershed of the dam and reservoir (W3-Eastern Tributary to Dos Pueblos Creek). The upgradient lots consist of lots 51, 52A, 52B, and 104 which are equivalent to less than 5 percent of the total watershed area. Due to the very small area contributing to increased runoff, localized effects would be limited to a minor increase in the amount of stormwater run-off into the reservoir. The potential increase in run-off is unlikely to be statistically significant and is not likely to jeopardize the flood capacity of the reservoir. Potential flooding impacts from increased surface runoff are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	developments shall not exceed existing conditions. A registered civil engineer specializing in flood control or other qualified professional shall design storm water structures to ensure that adequate flood control capability is met. The structures shall be located and designed according to specifications detailed in the County of Santa Barbara Flood Control District Standard Conditions of Project Plan Approval. Outlet structures for energy dissipation shall minimize disturbance to natural drainages and avoid the use of unnatural materials, such as concrete, grouted rock, and asphalt rubble. Where hard bank materials must be used, natural rock, gabions, crib wall or other more natural means of energy dissipation shall be preferred. Rock grouting shall only be used if no other feasible alternative is available as determined by P&D and Flood Control. The location, design, and maintenance specifications of pre- and post-construction storm water structures and devices shall be included on the final drainage plans. Implementation of **mitigation measures WQ-1a, WQ-1b WQ-1c, and WQ-1d** (see below) would serve to significantly reduce the amount of surface runoff from developed areas upgradient of the reservoir.	
3.3 Hydrology and Water Quality	**Impact WQ-1: Pollutants in Surface Waters.** The watersheds in the MOU Project area have been altered from their natural conditions by livestock grazing, agricultural development, groundwater pumping, water diversions, water impoundment, and residential development. The proposed project will further alter watershed conditions by introducing new ground disturbance and new pollutant sources associated with residential uses, equestrian use, and increased	**Mitigation WQ-1a: Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan.** The applicant shall submit to the County a copy of the completed Notice of Intent (NOI), the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) NOI acceptance letter, and the waste discharge identification number showing coverage under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Discharges Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit, 99-08-DWQ). Along with the NOI, the applicant shall submit to the County a Storm	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	agricultural activities. These changes are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II).*	Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and monitoring program consistent with Section A of the Construction General Permit prior to initiating construction. **Mitigation WQ-1b: Storm Water Quality Management.** A combination of non-structural and structural improvements and Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g., erosion control landscaping, detention features, bioswales, permeable pavement, etc.) shall be installed or implemented to minimize the discharges of pollutants from the residential units, roads, equestrian facilities, and open space easements. Stormwater retention and infiltration shall be designed into lots, and common drainage facilities where appropriate, to minimize the direct release of runoff from developed areas to surface waters. Individual lots located along the coastal bluffs (Lots 12, 35, 39, 63, 66, 91, 93, 119, and 122) shall include permeable surfaces within their design elements and pervious stone gutters to facilitate storm runoff percolation. Roof collection systems with discharge to a subsurface infiltration trench, French drains, and landscaped areas or connected to the site's irrigation system may be used as part of the design on individual lots. Catchment areas or bioswales shall be used where feasible to collect runoff from single lots or small groupings of lots to provide storm water filtering capacity. **Mitigation Measure WQ-1c: Equestrian Center Runoff.** An animal waste management plan and Storm Water Quality Management Plan shall be prepared for the proposed equestrian center. **Mitigation Measure WQ-1d: Coastal Trail and Beach Access BMPs.** The applicant shall prepare a Storm Water Quality Management Plan for the public parking area, picnic area,	

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
		restrooms, coastal access trail and beach access stair structure.	
3.3 Hydrology and Water Quality	**Impact WQ-2: Wastewater Treatment and Disposal.** Septic tanks and dry wells are proposed to be used at the 16 individual lots proposed within the Inland areas on the MOU Project area. All proposed development on the MOU Project area within the Coastal Zone would be served by a proposed package sewage treatment plant (STP). The STP would be constructed north of Highway 101 on Lot 167. The project's potential impacts to water quality as a result of the proposed use of septic systems and the installation and maintenance of the STP are considered *potentially significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*	**Mitigation WQ-2: Domestic Wastewater Treatment.** The applicant shall avoid or minimize the use of individual septic systems. All new residential units within the MOU Project area not approved by the RWQCB for an individual septic system shall be connected to the proposed package STP. For isolated individual units, the applicant may propose individual on-site treatment and disposal systems. The applicant will be required to provide information to the RWQCB adequate to make a determination that operation of the system will be adequate to meet applicable surface and groundwater objectives. All proposed individual septic systems will be subject to review and approval by the RWQCB.	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.3 Hydrology and Water Quality	**Impact WQ-3: Cumulative Development Pollutants.** The MOU Project will cause an incremental increase in pollutants from residential uses, the equestrian center and equestrian use on individual lots, and increased agricultural activities. In combination with similar contributions from the pending projects listed above for the Gaviota Coast, these increases could potentially degrade water quality. The development proposed is low intensity. Each of the pending projects would be subject to the same requirements for stormwater management during construction and post-construction as the MOU Project. The pending projects will also undergo the same drainage design review by the Planning and Development Department (P&D). Incorporation of stormwater management design features into the landscaping and construction features of the pending	**Mitigation Measure WQ-1b: Storm Water Quality Management** **Mitigation Measure WQ-1c: Equestrian Center Runoff** **Mitigation Measure WQ-1d: Coastal Trail and Beach Access BMPs** **Mitigation Measure WQ-2 Domestic Wastewater Treatment**	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	projects will serve to reduce impacts to water quality. Because of the pattern of drainages on the Gaviota Coast (a series of separate north to south flowing watersheds isolated from one another) there is no interaction or transfer of material from one drainage to the other. For these reasons, the control of pollutants through development review and implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) during construction and post-construction activities should avoid the potential for cumulative degradation of water quality within individual watersheds. So this incremental impact within the South Coast Hydrologic Unit is considered *cumulatively significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.		
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-1: Removal of Special-status Plants Associated with Grassland Habitats.** Approximately 381 acres of disturbed non-native grassland occur within the MOU Project area, approximately 166 acres of which is dominated by ruderal or weedy invasive species. Development of the MOU Project would occur primarily in these areas currently vegetated by non-native grassland. The MOU Project would involve approximately 138 acres of direct removal of this habitat by grading, paving, and the development of buildings and development envelope area. The ability of grassland habitats in the project area to support special-status and other native plants has been affected by decades of intensive livestock grazing and agricultural production, which has converted these areas from native perennial grassland to one dominated	**Mitigation Bio-1a: Protection and Revegetation of Native Grassland.** Design changes in the MOU Project will retain the 2.9 acres of native grassland on Lot 57, as well as the areas of native grassland along the edges of the drainages on the coastal terrace (totaling approximately 12.5 acres). Design changes and other components of the project minimized the fragmentation of grassland habitat. The Naples Planned Development (NPD) zone proposed for the project requires preparation of an Open Space and Habitat Management Plan (OSHMP) for the project, and a preliminary OSHMP has been prepared and submitted. The OSHMP identifies objectives and actions to manage and increase the areas of native grassland habitat within Open Space Conservation Easement areas, and to reduce the abundance of nonnative species. These measures are part of the project design and serve to minimize the potential for effects to sensitive plant species occurring in grassland habitat.	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	by non-native annual grasses and forbs. For these reasons, the likelihood of encountering special status species in the non-native grassland areas is low, relative to the less disturbed native grassland areas. Isolated individuals or small populations of sensitive plant species in nonnative grasslands may be disturbed by the development. The MOU Project's potential impacts to special-status plants associated with grassland habitats *are considered significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	**Mitigation Bio-1b: Sensitive Plant Species in Grasslands.** To reduce further the potential for direct effects on sensitive grassland species, the applicant shall retain a qualified biologist, approved by the Planning and Development Department, to survey the development envelopes and other areas to be disturbed by the construction of roadways or other improvements for special status plant species at times of the year that are appropriate for their detection. In the event any sensitive plant species are found in these areas to be disturbed, a qualified biologist shall collect seeds, bulbs, or cuttings of these species for transplantation to suitable areas within the OSCE.	
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-2: Removal of Special-status Plants Associated with Scrub Habitats.** Most or all coastal scrub and chaparral habitats found in the project area now occur north of Highway 101. Approximately 16.6 acres of land contains coastal scrub vegetation, or a mixture of non-native grassland and coastal scrub where the latter vegetation type is becoming re-established on former grazing or orchard land. Of the 41 species evaluated, at least 20 species are associated with coastal scrub plant communities. The proposed development envelopes generally avoid scrub habitats, but fuel management for fire protection around structures could degrade and/or encroach into coastal scrub habitats on the parcels north of Highway 101. In particular, the building and yard location proposed for Lot 243 would extend into the coastal scrub vegetation along the eastern portion of the MOU Project area; the total area of coastal scrub that would be directly affected is 0.32 acres. Fuel management	**Mitigation Bio-2a: Protection and Revegetation of Scrub Habitat.** Scrub habitats onsite include coastal bluff scrub, and coastal scrub. Most areas of these habitats are avoided by siting of building envelopes and other project features, a small area amounting to approximately 0.32 acres will be directly affected, and an area of approximately 0.79 acres may be subject to thinning for fire control purposes. The Naples Planned Development (NPD) zone requires preparation of an Open Space and Habitat Management Plan (OSHMP) for the project, and a preliminary OSHMP has been prepared and submitted. The OSHMP identifies objectives and actions to manage and increase the areas of coastal scrub habitat within Open Space Conservation Easement areas, and to reduce the abundance of nonnative species. These measures are part of the project design and serve to minimize the potential for effects to sensitive plant species occurring in coastal scrub. **Mitigation Bio-2b: Sensitive Plant Species in Coastal Scrub.** To reduce further the potential for direct effects on sensitive plant species within coastal scrub areas, the applicant	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	activities would involve clearing vegetation within 30 feet of all structures and thinning scrub vegetation in accordance with state regulations and County fire department guidelines out to a distance of 100 feet from all structures. The smaller 30-foot clearance zone is contained within the defined development envelopes for all proposed lots near coastal scrub vegetation. The 100-foot thinning zone is also within the development envelopes for most lots, but several lots will require vegetation thinning activities that would extend into the nearby scrub vegetation. Vegetation thinning activities for fire control will involve a total of approximately 0.46 acres. The grading and construction for development and the vegetation thinning for fire protection purposes could affect a number of special-status plants that are known from or potentially occur in these areas. These impacts can be feasibly mitigated by implementing a fuel management plan that avoids or minimizes the removal of scrub vegetation, in conjunction with the Open Space and Habitat Management Plan (OSHMP) that incorporates enhancement of the coastal scrub vegetation. These measures are incorporated into the project design as proposed. Pre-construction surveys will further reduce the potential to affect individuals of any sensitive plant species associated with the coastal scrub habitat. The MOU Project's potential impacts to special status plant species due to development activities and vegetation thinning in coastal scrub are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	shall retain a qualified biologist, approved by the Planning and Development Department, to survey the development envelopes, and vegetation thinning areas, for special status plant species at times of the year that are appropriate for their detection. In the event any sensitive plant species are found in these areas to be disturbed, a qualified biologist shall collect seeds, bulbs, or cuttings of these species for transplantation to suitable areas within the OSCE.	

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-4: Special-Status Plants Associated with Riparian Woodland Habitats and Isolated Seep Habitats.** Eight species are associated with riparian woodland and seep habitats, including ocellated Humboldt lily, Sonoran maiden fern, a bitter gooseberry, Fish's milkwort, and Plummer's baccharis. The other three species are classified as locally sensitive. Riparian woodland and seep habitats are protected by State and County regulations and are avoided by this project. Grading for access roads and building pads could cause erosion and the introduction of sediment into riparian habitat areas, adversely affecting the habitat by altering surface flows and infiltration of water or introducing pollutants associated with construction. These effects might not be substantial since only a very small fraction of the watershed containing these riparian areas would be subject to grading. Project-related impacts could also arise from fuel management for fire control, increased grazing pressure, and possibly plant collection by residents. These potential impacts can be feasibly mitigated by implementing a resident and public use education program. The MOU Project's potential impacts due to direct and indirect effects on special-status plants associated with riparian woodland and seep habitats are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	Potential indirect effects to these species and habitats would be mitigated by **Mitigation measures WQ-1a, 1b, and 1d,** which require the implementation of Best Management Practices to control erosion and siltation during construction and proper management of stormwater runoff.	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-5: Introduction of Non-native Plants.** Non-native plant material used in landscaping as well as native plant material of unknown geographic origin used	**Mitigation Bio-3: Control of Non-native Plants.** The applicant shall retain a qualified local biologist (approved by P&D) to review and approve the Landscaping Plan for this project.	Mitigated to less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	in landscaping and restoration can displace native plant communities or alter the genetic constitution of indigenous plant populations that have adapted to local climatic, soil, and hydrologic conditions. Construction of building envelopes and access roads, fuel management for fire control, and landscaping may increase the spread of invasive, non-native plants or introduce additional invasive species to the project area. These effects can be feasibly mitigated by specifications on vegetation clearing for fire protection purposes, restrictions on landscaping species, education of homeowners, and maintenance of open space areas including removal of invasive species. The MOU Project's potential impact from invasive, non-native plants is *considered significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	Species to be used in ornamental areas such as entrances, windrows, yards, and development envelopes, shall be appropriate for their intended use and shall be selected to minimize the potential for invasiveness or other adverse effects on nearby native vegetation. In order to protect the genetic integrity of the native plant populations on the undeveloped portions of the subject property, the Landscape Plan shall prohibit the use of non-locally collected native plants and seed materials for any native species used within or adjacent to open space areas (including plantings proposed for habitat/buffer restoration, native grassland mitigation, and landscape plantings outside perimeter fencing). Wherever native species are specified for plantings or seeding, all seed or plant material shall come from sources in the Gato Canyon, Dos Pueblos Canyon, or Eagle Canyon watersheds or, if not available, along the south coast between Carpinteria and Point Conception. The Landscaping Plan for the proposed project shall prohibit buried irrigation infrastructure outside of building envelopes and common areas. All temporary irrigation components (including pipe) shall be placed above ground in open space areas. The potential for damage to the pipe by vandalism or exposure is considered insufficient to offset the environmental damage and potential for non-native plant invasion resulting from trenching to install pipes and structures and subsequent digging to remove pipes and structures. Pipes shall be inspected frequently for leaks. All leaks shall be repaired promptly to avoid soil erosion, weed establishment, or other environmental damage.	levels
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-6: Naples Reef.** The proposed project creates a permanent human (and pet) population on existing vacant and agricultural land on the coastal	**Mitigation Bio-4: Naples Reef.** The Coastal Development Permit (CDP) approved for the public coastal access trail, viewing platform, and beach access stairway, shall require that	Mitigated to less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	terrace south of Highway 101 in close proximity to Naples Reef. This increase in human (and potential pet) presence could result in adverse effects on the nearshore reef at Naples due to direct effects, such as illegal collecting or inadvertent destruction of tidal organisms, and indirect effects such as increased pet waste or other types of pollution. These impacts can be feasibly mitigated by placing limitations on human use of the Naples beach as part of the controls to minimize effects on the seal haul out area. The potential impacts of the MOU Project to Naples Reef resources are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated* (*Class II*).	the applicant post information at the trail head, in the public information kiosk, and at the viewing platform or top of the stairs, informing visitors that no pets are allowed on the trail and beach, and that the beach access is closed during the months of March through July. Other activity restrictions or beach access closure dates may be approved by P&D with appropriate supporting biological information. The purpose of the pet restriction and closure period is to minimize harassment and adverse effects to the harbor seal haul-out area and to minimize the effects of visitor use on the plants and animals found in the Naples Reef and adjacent beach habitat.	levels
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-7: Effects on Native Grasslands.** The portions of the project area south of Highway 101 support at least 12.5 acres of native grasslands, including extensive areas along seasonal drainages near the bluffs and a large contiguous patch in the northwestern corner of the area south of Highway 101 (Lot 57). Native grasses were a component of non-native grassland habitats north of Highway 101, but their density and areal extent in this area did not meet County thresholds. The MOU Project has been re-designed to avoid construction of the agricultural support facility on Lot 57, as was formerly proposed. Construction of Lots 39, 63, 66, 91, 93, as well as the proposed Marine Wildlife Interpretive Kiosk in the southeastern corner of Lot 122, would place structures near mapped areas of native grasslands. Designs for these lots have also been adjusted to avoid direct impacts to mapped areas of	**Mitigation Bio-1a: Protection and Revegetation of Native Grassland** **Mitigation Bio-1b: Sensitive Plant Species in Grasslands**	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	native grassland. Fire protection requirements do not require clearing of grassland vegetation, but some areas may have to be mowed periodically to keep the vegetation height below four inches during the fire season. This type of vegetation management would typically be applied within 30 feet of structures. Such vegetation management would cause periodic and temporary affects to native grasslands. Trenching for the installation of drainage pipes will also cross native grassland vegetation, causing a temporary alteration. The public access trails are proposed generally along existing ranch roads and informal trails already cross through small areas of native grassland; but their improvement to County trail standards may have a very small additional effect. The estimated total effects on native grassland from all of these activities—fire protection, drainage line installation, and beach access trail construction—amounts to 0.22 acre. The Open Space Habitat Management Plan (OSHMP) includes a component to restore, preserve, and promote the growth of native grassland in appropriate open space areas. These areas will be placed in open space easements, protected from intense human activity and from invasive plant species such as veldt grass and Harding grass, and managed in a way to preserve and enhance the native grassland habitat value. Therefore, the MOU Project's potential impact to native grassland is considered *potentially significant but feasibly mitigated* (*Class II*).		

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-8: State and Federal Jurisdictional Waters, Wetlands, and Undelineated Seasonal Water Bodies.** Wetlands and other seasonal water bodies in the project area occur primarily south of Highway 101. The MOU Project has been designed to avoid direct impacts to all of the identified wetland or seasonal water bodies, and to provide a minimum 100 foot buffer around each one, when it was feasible to do so. Since the exact area and configuration of the seasonal ponds on the property is subject to change, and since it is likely to take over a year to complete the approval process for MOU Project, it will be necessary to perform final wetland delineations to confirm that the project design avoids wetland impacts as planned. The potential impacts of MOU on jurisdictional State and Federal waters, wetlands, and seasonal water bodies are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated* (*Class II*).	Potential indirect effects to wetlands related to erosion and sediment production during construction will be minimized through the implementation of **Mitigation Measures WQ 1a, 1b, 1c, and 1d.** **Mitigation Bio-5: Seasonal Wetlands.** The MOU Project design has been modified to avoid direct impacts to wetlands and seasonal water bodies, and to provide a minimum 100 foot buffer between the limit of all wetlands and all new development. Since the exact area and configuration of seasonal water bodies may change, the applicant shall conduct a formal wetland delineation after approval of the Development Plan for the project. The applicant shall provide confirmation that the project development would maintain a minimum 100 foot buffer from all delineated wetlands prior to issuance of CDP or LUP for any lot containing wetlands (Lot Numbers 41, 63, 66, 69, 93, and 97). In the event that a formal wetland delineation indicates that there are no wetlands present, using the definition from the County CLUP, the applicant may modify the design for the affected lot.	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-9: Construction of Stream Crossing.** North of Highway 101, a stream crossing would be constructed in Lot 167 on the SBR property. In this lot, a ranch road and secondary access drive would cross Tomate Canada. The potential area of streambed that could be impacted at this location is approximately 1,600 square feet limited to the narrow (up to six-foot wide) drainage channel. The area of disturbance would be larger, and would involve grading for the roadways leading to and from the bridge, and an associated pad for the location of the proposed packaged wastewater treatment plant. The maximum area of disturbance	Potential indirect effects related to erosion and sediment production during construction will be minimized through the implementation of **Mitigation Measures WQ 1a, 1b, 1c, and 1d,** related to controlling erosion and runoff during construction as required by current regulations. **Mitigation Bio-6: Riparian Woodlands.** The MOU Project design avoids direct effects on riparian woodlands and all streams on the project and in the project vicinity. The design includes use of an open span bridge to cross the Tomate Canada drainage north of Highway 101. The Tomate Canada stream corridor, and all stream corridors on the project will be retained either in open space easements or within stream corridors in agricultural	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	within the stream banks as mapped on the preliminary grading and drainage plans is approximately 0.5 acre. Vegetation in this area is non-native grassland/weed dominated. The bridge design minimizes direct impacts to the drainage channel and its associated habitat. Bridge construction activities could result in small-scale, temporary impacts to this drainage. The bridge could ultimately provide a *beneficial impact* to wildlife because if properly designed and sited, it could create valuable roosting habitat for bats, swifts, and swallows. Roadways constructed near other drainages in the project area could indirectly affect riparian vegetation and wetlands in these drainages. Potential impacts to stream channels and related vegetation and habitat are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	conservation easements. Revegetation of approximately 1.0 acre of willow riparian scrub along the Tomate Canada drainage, will be accomplished as part of the OSHMP (see Mitigation Bio-2).	
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-10: Effects of Increased Recreational Use on Seal Haul-out Area.** An existing harbor seal haul-out area on the beach near the mouth of Tomate Canada Canyon, lies approximately 1,600 feet east of the southeastern corner of the project area and supports up to hundreds of harbor seals that use this beach for resting, breeding, and birthing pups. The beaches adjacent to the project area, as well as the nearshore portions of Naples Reef, when exposed at low tide, also provide less-used haul-out areas for seals. The Federal Marine Mammal Protection Act and both State and County regulations protect harbor seals and their haul-out areas. The beach and nearshore waters	**Mitigation Bio-4: Naples Reef**	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	are intermittently used by low numbers of surfers, joggers, and other recreational users, who occasionally disturb seals on the beach. The proposed project would increase the frequency and number of human (and pet) visitors to these beaches and the bluff above these beaches over existing levels, potentially resulting in increased disturbance of adult seals, increased mortality of pups, and/or site abandonment. These impacts can be minimized by imposing restrictions that would eliminate the potential for dogs on the beach and reduce the number of beach visitors for a substantial portion of the year, during the breeding season for the harbor seals. The two specific restrictions are: 1) no dogs or pets allowed on the beach at any time, and 2) no access to the beach will be allowed from March through July, the time of most use and potential breeding at the haul out site. These restrictions will be identified to homeowners and to visitors through the public education component of the OSHMP and in Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions (CC&Rs). The MOU Project's potential impacts to the seal haul-out are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated* (*Class II*).		
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-11: Degradation of Grassland Foraging Habitat for Raptors and Other Special-status Wildlife.** The MOU Project would eliminate foraging habitat for these species within the building envelopes and access roads in the project area. Although large areas of foraging habitat would be retained in the project design, there will be other effects	**Mitigation Bio-1a: native grassland restoration** **Mitigation Bio-2a: coastal scrub restoration** **Mitigation Bio-3: control of nonnative plants** **Mitigation Bio-9: control of wildlife mortality.** To minimize the effect of the project on wildlife mortality, the applicant shall identify measures that can be taken by residents and public	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	that will tend to reduce the quality of habitat. Light "pollution" could increase at night in open spaces around development envelopes, which could be beneficial for bat foraging behavior, but may negatively affect diurnal raptors that roost in trees near these areas, as well as owls that may be foraging in these areas at night. Increased human and pet activity in grasslands, oak woodlands, eucalyptus windrows, and abandoned orchards in the remainder of the project area could displace or disrupt raptors and/or bats that forage, roost, and/or nest in these habitats. Construction of roads and access drives may add to the separation or fragmentation of foraging habitat, which may affect existing small populations. Introduction of non-native grasses or the creation of conditions that favor the growth of non-native plan species may influence predators either by affecting rodent (prey) populations or by physically interfering with raptor foraging behavior. Certain land use practices, such as soil disturbance and overgrazing, could increase the distribution and abundance of these grasses over the project area, with potential negative effects to raptors, bats, and the prey species on which they depend. Several features have been designed into the project to minimize these effects. These design features include: a) alterations to preserve the native grassland habitat on Lot 57; b) consolidation of access roads and driveways where possible, and the avoidance of standard curbs and gutters, fence types, and features that would hinder wildlife movement; and c) prohibitions against intensive agriculture in areas south of U.S. Highway 101. These	recreational users to avoid or minimize native wildlife mortality for the life of the project. Measures applicable to visitors shall be reflected in display materials to be incorporated into the public access trail improvements (trail head, public information kiosk). Measures applicable to residents shall be identified in materials to be distributed to all new owners.	

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	measures along with additional project conditions will reduce the potential effects of development on grassland foraging habitat. The MOU Project's potential impacts to raptors are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated* (*Class II*).		
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-13: Aquatic-associated Wildlife.** Riparian and aquatic habitats in the project area are primarily associated with the Dos Pueblos Creek and Tomate Canada Creek watersheds, as well as the seasonal drainages near the coastal bluffs. The proposed development envelopes do not encroach into the required 100-foot buffer around Dos Pueblos Creek or its tributaries, Tomate Canada Creek, or the unnamed drainage along the eastern border of the project area north of Highway 101. Therefore, these habitats are not likely to be directly affected by the proposed project. However, they could be indirectly affected during construction by sedimentation, bank erosion, and pollution from grading access roads and development envelopes near slopes that contribute to this watershed, as well as from runoff carrying sediment, concrete, stucco, and paint wash water, and other construction-related pollutants. Impacts associated with project occupation could be direct or indirect, including pollution from uncontrolled surface runoff from horse or other livestock facilities, sedimentation, and unauthorized collecting. Additionally, expanses of hardscape created within the development envelopes, including roads and driveways, could convey stormwater runoff laden with petroleum	**Mitigation Measure Bio-4: Naples Reef** **Mitigation Measures WQ-1a, WQ-1b, WQ-1c, and WQ-1d**	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	product contaminants to riparian areas in the Dos Pueblos Creek and Tomate Canada Creek watersheds. The installation of extensive landscaping in an area where none has existed before could introduce landscaping chemicals, such as fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, and fungicides, to these wetlands. These impacts could be acute in Tomate Canada Creek because proposed development surrounds this watershed on three sides. The MOU Project's potential impacts to aquatic wildlife are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated* (*Class II*).		
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-14: Monarch Butterfly Roosts.** Regionally-significant monarch butterfly overwintering roosts are associated with eucalyptus groves within and immediately west of the Dos Pueblos Creek riparian corridor south of Highway 101. The County considers both of these sites to be Environmentally sensitive habitat (ESH), but both are located to the west of the MOU Project area and would not be directly affected by development proposed in the MOU Project. Monarchs also may use the extensive eucalyptus windrows found along the UPRR tracks across the MOU Project Area, and along the eastern edge of the project area south of Highway 101 because of their proximity to these known roosts. The MOU Project has been revised to provide a minimum of 50 feet buffer distance between any structure and the nearest tree identified as a roosting site for Monarch butterflies. This measure, in conjunction with an additional mitigation measure to	**Mitigation Bio-7: Monarch Butterflies.** The MOU Project design has been revised to avoid constructing residences or major structures within 50 feet of eucalyptus windrows used for monarch butterfly resting areas. Grading and construction of access roads and building envelopes that require use of heavy equipment, including backhoes, shall be timed to avoid or minimize noise, dust, and increased human activity impacts to overwintering monarch butterflies (activities should occur between March and October). The drainage and grading plans for this project shall show eucalyptus groves and windrows within 50 feet of work areas. If grading or other heavy equipment work must occur between October and March, a qualified biologist shall survey all eucalyptus trees within 50 feet of the residential development area prior to the start of work to determine use by monarchs. If butterfly aggregations are found within 50 feet of the work area, work activities shall be halted until monarchs have left the site. An onsite environmental monitor shall monitor compliance with these requirements for the duration of construction activities.	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	monitor and restrict construction activity to avoid times when Monarch butterflies are roosting, will serve to mitigate potential effects on the butterflies. These potential impacts to monarch butterflies and their roosts are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.		
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-15: Riparian Bird Nest Parasitism.** The proposed equestrian center and equestrian ranch facility south of Highway 101 and development envelopes throughout the project area that keep horses or other livestock in focused areas (corrals, barns, feeding areas, etc.), could attract brown-headed cowbirds (*Molothus ater*). The cowbird is a significant nest/brood parasite on a number of special-status riparian birds that are known to inhabit or have a moderate to high potential of inhabiting the project such as: lark sparrow, Pacific-slope flycatcher, southwestern willow flycatcher, Swainson's thrush, warbling vireo, Wilson's warbler, yellow warbler, and yellow-breasted chat. The severe regional declines experienced by these species throughout much of the state are linked to the proliferation of cowbirds around horse and cattle facilities located close to riparian habitats. Additionally, the project site supports a large breeding population of European starlings (*Sturnus vulgaris*), an introduced species that is a significant competitor with native birds for nest holes and adjacent roosts, such as the following special-status species that are either known to occur or potentially occur in the project area: red-breasted sapsucker, bank swallow, and purple	**Mitigation Bio-8: Native Bird Protection.** Prior to issuance of the CDP and related permits for the equestrian center, the applicant shall provide a plan to minimize the potential of adversely impacting native breeding bird species. This plan will cover, at a minimum, the following four mitigation requirements: • Brown-headed Cowbird Control • Nest Predator Control • Non-native Bird Control • Beneficial Native Bird Encouragement	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	martin. These potential impacts can be feasibly mitigated by requiring certain design elements in the project plans and by a resident education program. These measures will reduce the availability of nesting sites, educate residents regarding the control of food sources that would attract the undesirable species, and provide measures such as nest removal, that will minimize the potential for adverse effects from nest parasites. The MOU Project's potential impacts to riparian and hole-nesting birds by attracting cowbirds and starlings are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated* (*Class II*).		
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-16: Effects on Beach Invertebrates.** Construction of the proposed trail system and staircase from the bluffs down to the beach south of the project area would increase human and pet use of the beaches adjacent to the project area and could result in trampling of the limited sand dune and back beach habitat remaining around the mouth of Dos Pueblos Creek. These habitats may support globose dune beetles. These impacts are feasibly mitigated by implementing the restrictions on pets and on beach use during part of the year. The MOU Project's potential impact to beach invertebrates is considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated* (*Class II*).	**Mitigation measure Bio-4: Naples Reef**	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-17: Effects on Special-status Invertebrates in Scrub and Riparian Habitats.** The San Francisco lacewing and Santa Ynez Mountains walking stick are known from coastal scrub, chaparral, and riparian scrub habitats in the vicinity of the project	**Mitigation Bio-2a: Protection and Revegetation of Scrub Habitat**	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	area and have a moderate to high potential of occurring in the project area. The proposed project may indirectly affect these species if development envelopes are situated too close to these habitats. The project design would preserve most of the 16.6 acres of coastal scrub vegetation, with development affecting only 0.32 acres. Fuel modification for fire control could result in modification of an additional 0.79 acres of scrub habitats harboring these species. None of the 9.25 acres of oak and willow riparian vegetation in the MOU Project area would be directly impacted by the project. The potential for the MOU Project to affect these special-status invertebrates is considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated* (*Class II*).		
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-18: Wildlife Mortality.** The project area is currently undeveloped and grazing land, and even after project build-out would contain extensive areas of open space that abut natural habitats. Wildlife mortality due to interactions with humans during occupancy of the parcels could be significant and extend well beyond the building envelopes. Potential impacts include: a) collisions between wildlife and vehicles on access roads; b) predation by coyotes and mountain lions on domestic pets and livestock forcing action by wildlife authorities; c) attacks by mountain lions on humans; d) nuisances caused by black bears, American badgers, raccoons, skunks, opossum, woodrats, and other species around human and livestock habitations resulting in trapping, removal, and mortality; e) routine killing of certain wildlife species, such as snakes, especially rattlesnakes, around building envelopes could extirpate local	**Mitigation Bio-9: Wildlife Mortality**	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	populations of these predators in a short time; and f) cliff swallows and other species of swallows that breed in this area may attempt to build mud nests under the eaves of homes, barns, and other structures that property owners would try to remove, however, once eggs are laid, it is a violation of the federal Migratory Bird Act to disturb these nests until young have fledged. Domestic and feral dogs and cats can significantly affect wildlife populations in an extensive area around building envelopes and beyond the project area, particularly amphibians, reptiles, birds, and small mammals. Domestic and feral cats and dogs may potentially prey upon special-status wildlife species. The use of rodenticides, pesticides, herbicides, and other chemicals and poisons toxic to wildlife outside the proposed building envelopes could have a significant negative impact on raptor and carnivore populations within and beyond the project area. Household and commercially-available rodenticides can kill non-target species as well as rodents. Individually and cumulatively, these potential impacts could significantly impact wildlife populations within the project area as well as far beyond the boundaries of the project area. These impacts can be feasibly mitigated by implementing a resident and public education program in conjunction with the Open Space Management Plan proposed with the project. The potential for the MOU Project to cause wildlife mortality is considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated* (*Class II*).		

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
3.5 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	**Impact HM-1: Impacts from Unlocated and/or Abandoned Oil Wells.** There are estimated to be three oil exploration wells on or near the MOU Project area. The three wells may not be abandoned in accordance with current safety standards. There is the possibility for oil, methane, or toxic gases (volatile hydrocarbons, hydrogen sulfide) to migrate through the wells and be released into the environment. In addition, during re-abandonment contaminated soil may be encountered during excavation of these wells, associated sumps, or construction zones near the well locations. Potential hazards from soil contamination are discussed in Impact HM-2. Additional site-specific studies are required to identify the well locations accurately enough to evaluate possible impacts to proposed building footprints or other proposed infrastructure. Impacts (and/or hazards) from abandoned wells that meet the DOGGR standards are considered to be *significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II)* for the MOU Project.	**Mitigation HM-1: Assessment and Abandonment of Wells.** A survey shall be conducted to identify subsurface structures (e.g., wells, sumps, pipelines, or underground storage tanks (USTs)) with the potential to compromise structural and infrastructure integrity or pose a risk of exposure to hazardous materials or hazardous waste. The County of Santa Barbara Fide Prevention Division (FPD) shall be notified upon identification of a subsurface structure. Historic oil wells that require re-abandonment shall be abandoned to current standards. To mitigate methane and toxic gas hazards, the Department of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) has established standards for well abandonment, including re-abandonment of historic oil wells. Historic oil wells will be re-abandoned under the direction of DOGGR and the FPD in compliance with California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 4 and the Public Resource Code, Section 3106. Recommendations by DOGGR and the FPD regarding abandonment procedures shall be incorporated into the final development plans for the proposed project, as applicable. **Mitigation HM-7: Response to Unexpected Wells or Piping.** DOGGR has determined this site to be an historical oil well. In the event that any unexpected wells or piping are encountered during normal grading operations, all grading operations shall cease until DOGGR and the FPD have been notified and appropriate actions have been taken.	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.5 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	**Impact HM-2: Impacts from Potential Contaminated Soil (Oil Well Activity).** Soils in the proposed MOU Project area are potentially impacted by	**Mitigations HM-2 and HM-3: Assessment and Removal of Contaminated Soils.** In conjunction with the assessment to identify, and properly close if necessary, any subsurface	Mitigated to less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	hazardous materials associated with past oil exploration. Construction activities associated with residential development could uncover hydrocarbon impacted soils. These areas should be assessed for environmental impacts related to oil-field activities prior to construction to reduce or minimize the potential for exposing construction workers and/or the public to the related health hazards associated with impacted soils. If contaminated soil is encountered during assessment or construction, the FPD must be contacted. FPD will require assessment and remediation of soil that exceeds FPD action levels. The impacts (and/or hazards) from potentially contaminated soil in the proposed project area are considered to be *significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	structures discussed in Mitigation HM-1, additional assessment of the soils at or near the surface in the proposed residential and infrastructure development areas shall be conducted, and any contaminated soils shall be removed or remediated as required by the County FPD. Current oil field assessment standards require a full analytical characterization of specific hydrocarbon compounds contained in crude oil or oil-derived product. In addition, current regulatory standards require that inorganic metals be assessed. Due to the potential for residual pesticide contamination at the project site, the soil assessment shall also address pesticides in surficial soils. Decisions regarding future remediation requirements for the residential areas shall be based on a screening level human health and ecological risk evaluation. Depending on the results of the screening level risk assessments, more detailed quantitative risk assessments may be required by FPD as described in the Santa Barbara County Fire Department, Fire Prevention Division, Leaking Underground Fuel Tank and Site Mitigation Unit Manual (January 2007), as necessary. **Mitigation HM-4: Remediation Action Plans.** As necessary, Site Remediation Action Plans shall be developed. Upon FPD concurrence with the recommendations presented in the Phase II Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs), remedial action plans shall be prepared for submittal to the FPD. **Mitigation HM-5: Site Remediation.** Site Remediation shall be implemented and oil field debris and solid waste debris shall be removed. Once approved by the FPD, the Remedial Action Plans (RAPs) shall be implemented. **Mitigation HM-6: Soil Management Plan.** A Soil Management Plan for the proposed development envelopes shall be developed and implemented, as appropriate. The objective of	levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
		the Soil Management Plan is to provide guidance for the proper handling, onsite management, and disposal of impacted soil that may be encountered during construction activities (i.e., excavation and grading). The plan shall include practices that are consistent with the California Title 8, Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal-OSHA) regulations, as well as FPD remediation standards that are protective of the planned use. Appropriately trained professionals will be onsite during preparation, grading, and related earthwork activities to monitor soil conditions encountered. In order to confirm the absence or presence of hazardous substances associated with former land use, a sampling strategy shall be implemented. The sampling strategy shall include procedures regarding logging/sampling and laboratory analyses. **Mitigation HM-8: Hazardous Material Storage, Handling, and Use.** In the event that generation, storage, handling, or use of hazardous materials within the provisions of the California Code of Regulations (CCRs) Title 22 or Title 23 occur onsite, the applicant shall comply with the regulations and implement the appropriate plan, permit, and or program.	
3.5 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	**Impact HM-3: Impacts from Potentially Contaminated Soils (Agricultural Operations) and Past Solid Waste Disposal Practices.** The MOU Project area has been used for agriculture for several decades. There is a potential for pesticides, herbicides, fuels and other chemicals used in various agricultural operations to be present onsite. Underground Storage Tanks (USTs) may have been abandoned in place, presenting an issue for surface improvements and structures.	**Mitigation HM-4: Remediation Action Plans** **Mitigation HM-5: Site Remediation** **Mitigation HM-8: Hazardous Material Storage, Handling, and Use**	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	In addition, a small, unregulated waste disposal area has been observed adjacent to the sea cliff on Lot 35. Another smaller waste disposal site has been observed in the adjacent drainage to the west of this site. These waste disposal areas could present a public health hazard to the residents and/or beach users. These potential hazards can be eliminated by removing the waste from these areas and restoring these sites. The impacts (and/or hazards) from potential pesticide contaminated soil or past agricultural facilities, and impacts from past solid waste disposal practices are considered to be *significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.		
3.5 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	**Impact HM-4: Impacts from Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials.** Packaged water and sewage treatment plants often use chlorine or other hazardous compounds to produce potable water or to treat wastewater. Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) would be required for the proposed project. Provided that such facilities using hazardous substances are designed, constructed, and operated in accordance with applicable regulations, no significant impacts are expected to occur. The impacts associated with accidental release of hazardous materials from the proposed water treatment and waste water treatment facilities is considered *potentially significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	**Mitigation HM-4: Remediation Action Plans** **Mitigation HM-5: Site Remediation** **Mitigation HM-8: Hazardous Material Storage, Handling, and Use**	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.7 Agricultural	**Impact AG-1: Agricultural Suitability and Land Use Conflicts.** Most of the MOU Project area is presently undeveloped open space and agricultural	**Mitigation Ag-1: Agricultural Conservation Easement and Implementation.** In order to implement the Private Agricultural Conservation Easement (PACE) as proposed and to	Mitigated to less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	operations. Existing agricultural operations include grazing and approximately 25 acres of orchard. Under the MOU Project proposal, the acreage outside of the designated development and landscaping footprint areas (and excluding roads and utility corridors) would be dedicated to agricultural uses and open space. The development of residential lots in close proximity to the agricultural easement could create conflicts between the two land uses, including excessive dust, noise, odor and other nuisances that may be associated with commercial agriculture. Residents moving to these lots must be made fully aware that the surrounding lands will remain in commercial agriculture. This impact can be feasibly mitigated through the implementation of fencing requirements at the perimeter of residential development areas, and through implementation of the proposed PACE restrictions and a buyer notification program that would ensure that new residents are made aware of the continued agricultural production within the area. Potential conflicts can be minimized and any reductions in productivity in some areas should be offset by the provision of additional agricultural support facilities, expansion of some orchard areas, and by the proposed combined management approach for most of the agricultural operations within the project area. Therefore, the potential impacts related to land use conflicts are considered *potentially significant but subject to feasible mitigation (Class II)*.	ensure continued and improved agricultural production within the project and land uses compatible with agricultural uses, the applicant shall record an easement over the designated PACE areas totaling approximately 163 acres to the Land Trust for Santa Barbara County or a similar not for profit entity to the satisfaction of the Department of Planning and Development. The easement shall provide for the continuation and expansion of agricultural uses with oversight by the Land Trust. In addition to the PACE, CC&Rs shall be recorded with each lot, which address and identify allowable uses and restrictions related to the development and continuation of agricultural uses within PACE areas. The County of Santa Barbara shall have the right to approve any amendments to the CC&Rs **Mitigation Ag-2: Agricultural Fencing.** In order to protect agricultural operations from encroaching development, agricultural fencing shall be installed along the boundaries of development envelopes shown on the project plans, where the development envelope would be contiguous to agricultural operations. Agricultural fencing shall be designed, installed and maintained to protect agricultural land from residential intrusion for the life of the project. Agricultural fencing shall be subject to design review and approval, consistent with the requirements of the NPD ordinance. Agricultural fencing design shall also take into consideration potential effects on biological resources, and shall not obstruct wildlife movement. **Mitigation Ag-3: Buyer Notification.** The buyer notification included in Section 3.7 of this document shall be recorded on a separate information sheet with the final map or deed accompanying the sale of each residential lot.	levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
3.7 Agricultural	**Impact AG-3: Cumulative Conversion of Agriculturally Designated Lands to Non-agricultural Uses.** The MOU Project would result in conversion of existing agriculturally-designated land to residential uses. When considered in combination with other pending residential projects in the Gaviota Coast area, the cumulative effect could be an overall loss in agriculturally viable land in an area that has historically been largely dedicated to agricultural uses. This loss of agricultural viability could result from fragmentation of agricultural lands into properties that are probably too small to sustain viable agricultural operations, or from land use conflicts between agricultural and residential land uses. The MOU Project would create an ACE that would preserve the existing prime agricultural land and additional grazing land in perpetuity. In addition, the proposed residences would be subject to the development standards of a new NPD land use designation and zoning ordinance. The NPD ordinance would limit the extent and type of residential uses that could occur in proximity to ongoing agricultural operations. Additional feasible mitigation, such as a buyer notification requirement, would further reduce the potential for land use conflicts between agricultural and residential land uses. Taken together, these measures would reduce the potential cumulative effects of the MOU Project on the viability of agricultural operations on the Gaviota Coast. The project's potential cumulative effects on agricultural resources	**Mitigation Measure Ag-1: Agricultural Conservation Easement and Implementation** **Mitigation Measure Ag-2: Agricultural Fencing** **Mitigation Ag-3: Buyer Notification**	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	are considered *potentially significant but subject to feasible mitigation (Class II).*		
3.7 Agricultural	**Impact AG-5: County Agricultural Suitability and Land Use Conflicts.** Most of the MOU area is presently undeveloped open space and agricultural operations. Under the MOU proposal, the acreage outside of the designated development and landscaping footprint areas (and excluding roads and utility corridors) would be dedicated to agricultural uses and open space. Effects of the project include the reconfiguration of lots through a combination of lot mergers, lot line adjustments, and a new subdivision of land (north of US Highway 101). The MOU Project would also place residential lots in close proximity to the agricultural easement and uses, which could create conflicts between the two land uses. Factors influencing such conflict include excessive dust, noise, odor and other nuisances that may be associated with commercial agriculture. The overall effect of the project on agricultural suitability is generally neutral, as the beneficial and negative effects of the MOU proposal tend to offset one another. The potential for conflicts can be reduced through design and notification measures. The effect of Alternative 1 on overall agricultural suitability of the area is considered a *potentially significant impact that can be mitigated (Class II).*	**Mitigation Measure Ag-1: Agricultural Conservation Easement and Implementation** **Mitigation Measure Ag-2: Agricultural Fencing** **Mitigation Measure Ag-3: Buyer Notification**	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.9 Visual Resources	**Impact Vis-1A: Key Observation Point 1A.** The addition of residential development to this otherwise sparsely developed rural landscape in this area would	**Mitigation Vis-1: Design Guidelines.** To reduce visual contrast of residences as seen against the backdrop of natural hillsides and/or skyline, the preliminary design guidelines (*Santa*	Mitigated to less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	appreciably change the overall views from this KOP. Some of the development would be concealed by trees. The contrast of the manmade structures to the current character of the land would be noticeable and would stand out in the same field of view. Also, the addition of nighttime lighting sources where currently there are none will draw the viewer's attention, thereby further accentuating these manmade additions to this currently rural landscape. The project impacts for this KOP are rated *significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	*Barbara Ranch Design Guidelines)* submitted with the project application identify site, architectural, and landscape measures to reduce visual effects and to make the development blend in with the surrounding area. The site design component provides form and building material criteria with the objective of maintaining the project's consistency with the rural environment. Examples of the site design criteria include: designing structures to suit the surrounding environment (for instance, placing low silhouette structures in areas of low relief); use of local materials; and locating structures in areas visually-screened by trees or agricultural groves, etc. The architectural guidelines include provisions for appropriate colors and material surfaces (for example, non-reflective surfaces) to match the rural setting. Design guidelines for the project landscaping involve planting, fence and wall criteria, and limitations on elements (example: recreational facilities and signage) outside of each homesite. The planting guidelines include a combination of acceptable trees and shrub plantings around the perimeter of each proposed residence, using rock cairns and similar unobtrusive fences to delineate boundaries or specific use areas, and maintaining the existing orchards and groves particularly north of Highway 101. The criteria are designed with the objective to provide visual screening and visual continuity with the existing rural environment. **Mitigation Vis-2: Windrow Maintenance.** To minimize visual impacts of development to travelers and recreational users, the project landscaping plans shall include a component addressing maintenance and improvements to existing windrow plantings.	levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
3.9 Visual Resources	**Impact Vis-1B: Key Observation Point 1B.** The primary viewers from this KOP will be involved in recreational activities utilizing the trail system. The actual contrast between the buildings' appearance and adjacent grassland or tree vegetation is high, but the views are in the distant mid-ground or background, and the buildings do have a low profile appearance that tends to blend somewhat with the topography. For these reasons, the visual contrast of the MOU Project in KOP 1B is considered moderate to high. For similar reasons, the project dominance is considered moderate in this KOP. The buildings would clearly be visible, but at a distance and juxtaposed to the windrows and highway, which are more dominant. The ridge of the Santa Ynez Mountains is visible from some portions of the Coastal Trail corridor, but the intervening vegetation tends to obscure the mountains to some extent. The residences proposed by the project may contribute to this effect. The view impairment of the project relative to the vantage point of the Coastal Trail corridor is considered moderate. The project impacts for this KOP are rated *significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	**Mitigation Vis-1: Design Guidelines** **Mitigation Vis-2: Windrow Maintenance**	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.9 Visual Resources	**Impact Vis-2: Key Observation Point 2.** Construction of the project, including residences, roads, and other accessory structures, would create a visual change to the mid-background view from this KOP. The development, placed on hillsides would sharply contrast with the current pasture land of the area. Architectural style and landscaping would reduce this contrast to	**Mitigation Vis-1: Design Guidelines** **Mitigation Vis-2: Windrow Maintenance**	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	some extent. However, due to the scale of the proposed development, the overall massing effect of the combined home sites would appear denser than elsewhere in the vicinity. Therefore, the overall change to the environment, and thus the visual contrast, is rated as high. From this KOP, the roof lines of the project residences will generally be at or above the height of the hilltops, although they will be behind the existing tree lines. In addition, within the MOU Project there would be several other houses more dominant in the near to midground view. Thus project dominance is rated high for the MOU Project. The ridge of the Santa Ynez Mountains is visible above the project and would only be blocked slightly by two rooflines rising above existing ridgelines. This area or aspect of the project may not be consistent with the CLUP and Comprehensive Plan policy related to preserving ridgeline views, but based on the criteria used in this analysis, the scenic backdrop would be only slightly impaired. The MOU Project potential impacts to visual resources from KOP 2 are considered *significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*		
3.9 Visual Resources	**Impact Vis-4: Key Observation Point 4.** From this vantage point, MOU Project development would be visible in the background views as the tops of a few rooflines just below the ocean horizon line. The introduction of structures would contrast with the existing rural nature and character of the land, but visual contrast is rated only moderate because all of the structures would be in the midground and distant views,	**Mitigation Vis-1: Design Guidelines** **Mitigation Vis-2: Windrow Maintenance**	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	and only a small portion of the structures would be visible. The MOU Project would develop six units visible from this point, extending only about half way across the view, and in no case would an entire structure be visible. For this reason, project dominance is rated moderate for the MOU Project. The project would intrude on midground views, but would not greatly affect scenic views to the mountain or ocean backdrops. Based on the criteria used in this analysis, the scenic backdrop would be only partially impaired. Therefore, view impairment from this KOP is rated as moderate. The MOU Project's potential impacts to visual resources from KOP 4 are considered *significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.		
3.9 Visual Resources	**Impact Vis-6A: Key Observation Point 6A.** The addition of development including several structures within this otherwise rural landscape would change the views from KOP 6A beyond and through the trees. The architectural design and landscaping would reduce this change to some extent. Even with such consideration, however, manmade structures within an otherwise rural setting (even where views would be partially blocked by trees) would be noticeable and would draw the traveler's attention. Nighttime lighting conditions, with additional lighting elements dispersed throughout the trees, would tend to be noticed by travelers. For the MOU Project, the visual contrast and dominance are rated high mainly due to the midground structures (Lots 159 and 157). Since there are no panoramic scenic views from KOP	**Mitigation Vis-1: Design Guidelines** **Mitigation Vis-2: Windrow Maintenance**	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	6A, the project development would not block views in this area. Based on the criteria used in this analysis, the scenic backdrop would not be impaired. Therefore, view impairment from this KOP is rated as low. The MOU Project's impacts to KOP 6A are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.		
	Impact Vis-6B: Key Observation Point 6B. In the direction of KOP 6B, the MOU Project would include a few residences visible on the hillside above the Canada Tomate drainage. The residences would be well-spaced and would not appear massed together. Nighttime lighting conditions, with additional lighting elements dispersed throughout the trees, would tend to be noticed by travelers. For the MOU Project, the visual contrast and dominance at KOP 6B are rated moderate mainly because only a few homes would be visible beyond a large open space and agricultural area. Since there are no panoramic scenic views from KOP 6B, the project development would not block extensive views in this area, even if one or two rooflines would extend into the skyline. Therefore, view impairment from this KOP is rated as moderate. The MOU Project's impacts to KOP 6B are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	**Mitigation Vis-1: Design Guidelines** **Mitigation Vis-2: Windrow Maintenance**	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.9 Visual Resources	**Impact Vis-7: Key Observation Point 7.** From KOP 7, four residences would be visible in the MOU Project. The homes would be located in a manner to provide large pasture areas, in keeping with the equestrian village concept. While some homes would be clearly visible in the midground view, with a high contrast, their	**Mitigation Vis-1: Design Guidelines** **Mitigation Vis-2: Windrow Maintenance**	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	dominance rating is only moderate due to the separation between structures and the extent of pasture land. The entire view from KOP 7 is backdropped by the UPRR windrow, so the MOU Project residences here would not impair the view other than occupying some of the current pasture land. Therefore, view impairment from this KOP is rated as moderate. The MOU Project's impacts to KOP 7 are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.		
3.9 Visual Resources	**Impact Vis-8a and 8b: Stairway Access to Beach.** The proposed vertical beach access stair structure would be constructed on the bluff in the southeastern portion of the SBR property. Currently, the overall visual quality of views from the beach and ocean to the undisturbed bluff area is characterized as high. The stairway and portions of the top decking would be visible from the majority of beach and ocean viewers. The sense of remoteness of the site, and the nearly unbroken natural appearance of the cliff face when viewed from the ocean, beach or bluff, would be altered. In general, the scale and orthogonal lines of the proposed stairway would contrast with the site setting. Such manmade structures within an otherwise rural setting would be noticeable and would draw the viewer's attention. Therefore, visual contrast is rated as high. Stairway dominance is rated moderate, given the higher adjacent bluffs. The proposed stairway would not impede views to existing scenic backdrops. Therefore, view impairment from this location is rated as low. The potential impact to visual resources from the	**Mitigation Vis-3: Coastal Access Structure.** To minimize impacts to visual resources by the proposed beach access stairway/viewing platform) the structure material colors and texture selected shall be selected to blend with adjacent coastal bluffs, as shown in the photo simulations. The particular color and treatment proposed shall be subject to BAR approval. This measure addresses impact Vis-8.	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	proposed public beach access stairway is considered *significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.		
3.9 Visual Resources	**Impact Vis-10: Light and Glare.** Potential generation of light and glare may occur from several sources, including street and parking lot lighting, facility and office building lighting, security lighting, landscape lighting, and lighting from within residences. While the project would create a new source of light, adverse impacts to nighttime views are not expected. In addition, there are no elements proposed that would cause a substantial impact due to glare. Therefore, the MOU Project's potential impacts due to light and glare are rated as *significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	**Mitigation Vis-4: Lighting.** To minimize nighttime lighting effects, any exterior lighting installed on the project site shall be of low intensity, low glare design, and shall be hooded to direct light downward onto the subject parcel and prevent spill over onto adjacent parcels. All light fixtures shall be shielded so that neither the lamp nor the related reflective interior surface is visible from any of the KOPs. All light poles, fixtures, and hoods shall be dark colored (non-reflective). Security and street lighting shall be shielded so as not to create glare when viewed from the KOPs. The light poles and fixtures shall not be obtrusive to travelers along Highway 101 or nearby roadways or public or private view areas.	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.9 Visual Resources	**Impact Vis-11: Sound Walls and Perimeter.** At the present time, no extensive sound walls are proposed with the project or considered necessary by the analysis in this EIR. If such walls are considered or proposed in the final plans for any of the residences near the railroad tracks, there could be a potential for visual impacts. If any such future walls were designed to shield just the immediate structure and yard of the residence, and to avoid a long continuous barrier, then visual impacts could be avoided. This potential impact is, therefore, considered *significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	**Mitigation Vis-5: Sound Walls and Perimeter Structures.** In the event that any homeowner proposes to install any sound walls and perimeter structures for individual lots, the homeowner shall be subject to design review and approval. Such walls and structures shall be prohibited in areas that would obstruct public views toward the ocean or mountains, including views from Highway 101, the railroad, and public trails.	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.9 Visual Resources	**Impact Vis-13: Cumulative Impacts.** The cumulative effect of the MOU Project, in combination with other proposed projects, could adversely affect the rural, scenic, and recreational character of the Gaviota	**Mitigation Measure Vis-1: Design Guidelines** **Mitigation Measure Vis-2: Windrow Maintenance** **Mitigation Measure Vis-4: Lighting**	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	Coast. As a result of the total low-development potential of the region and as well as implementation of the project's mitigation measures, cumulative visual impacts are *potentially significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	**Mitigation Measure Vis-5: Sound Walls and Perimeter Structures**	
3.10 Recreation	**Impact Rec-4: Short-term Construction Impacts.** Construction and maintenance of access roads, parking area, restroom, railroad under-crossing, bluff trails, and bluff stairway structure could result in adverse effects on air quality, noise, biological resources, water quality, and other resource areas. **Water Quality.** The parking lot, trails, and beach access structure could introduce pollutants into stormwater, or cause erosion and sedimentation. The greatest potential for these effects would occur during grading and construction, and the impact would be similar to that described for roads and residences to be developed (see impact Geol-2 Erosion from Grading, and impact WQ-1 Pollutants in Surface Water). With the implementation of BMPs during construction (see mitigation measure Geol-2 and WQ-1d), these potential impacts to water quality are considered *significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*. **Construction Noise.** The greatest potential for these effects would occur on lots south of Highway 101 the impact would be the result of construction of the coastal access trail. Noise generated by construction activities would occur on a temporary and intermittent basis. With the implementation Mitigation measure Noise-1, the potential impacts are considered *significant*	Impact Rec-4 would require **mitigation measures Geol-2, WQ-1d, Noise-1, HM-1, HM-2, HM-3, and HM-4.** Mitigation measures for impacts related to Biological Resources and Visual Resources, resulting from siting, design, and construction of proposed recreational facilities are found in Sections 3.3, 3.4, and 3.9 of this EIR, respectively. No additional mitigation measures are required.	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	but feasibly mitigated (Class II). **Unlocated and/or Abandoned Oil Wells.** Three oil exploration wells are estimated to be located on or near the MOU Project area in the vicinity of the proposed recreation improvements. These oil wells may pose a constraint to development. The impact would be similar to that described in impact HM-1. With the implementation of mitigation measure HM-1 the potential impacts are considered *significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II).* **Potential Contaminated Soil (Oil Well Activity).** Soils in the proposed MOU Project area are potentially impacted by hazardous materials associated with past oil exploration. With the implementation of mitigation measures HM-2 and HM-3 the potential impacts are considered *significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II).*		
3.10 Recreation	**Impact Rec-5: Visual Resources.** The proposed vertical beach access stair structure would be constructed on the bluff in the southeastern portion of the Santa Barbara Ranch (SBR) property. The structure would avoid altering the cliff face and be offset from the cliff face as much as eight feet in order to meet outdoor stairway design safety standards. Stormwater catch basins are proposed at the top of the cliff and drainage piping would discharge stormwater at the base of the cliff. The beach stairs and decking would provide a viewing platform with excellent panoramic views of the Pacific Ocean, Channel Islands, Gaviota coastline, and mountains. As such, this feature would provide a	Refer to **Mitigation Vis-3,** which requires the use of color and textures in building materials so that the appearance of the stairway will blend more with the adjacent bluff areas.	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	recreational and *aesthetic benefit* for visitors. The visual effect is considered *significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.		
3.10 Recreation	**Impact Rec-6: Cumulative Impact of the Project on the Gaviota Coast Regional Recreational Experience.** The cumulative effect of the project in combination with other proposed projects could adversely affect the rural, scenic, and recreational character of the Gaviota Coast. Changes to this regional landscape would change the experience of visitors to the south coast of Santa Barbara County. In particular, recreational visitors to the three State Parks and private campground facilities, as well as day-use visitors at beaches and mountain hiking trails, would experience a change in the scenic landscape due to the project's visual impact, when viewed in combination with other planned and potential future development. The extent of potential cumulative effects on recreation would be a function of the visual effects of future development, which is in turn a function of the design and siting of individual projects and their consistency with this character. Thus, cumulative impacts to recreation are *potentially significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	**Mitigation Measure Vis-1: Landscape Screening** **Mitigation Measure Vis-2: Windrow Maintenance** **Mitigation Vis-3: Coastal Access Structure** **Mitigation Vis-4: Lighting** **Mitigation Vis-5: Sound Walls and Perimeter Structures** Beneficial effects of the project on recreation are described in Impacts Rec-1 and Rec-2.	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.11 Cultural Resources	**Impact Cultural-1: Disturbance of Remaining Historic Resources.** Construction activities associated with the MOU Project would impact the Naples Railroad Depot Water Tower, Langtry Avenue, and the Historic El Camino Real/Stage Coach Road/Highway 101 Fragment, all CRHR- eligible cultural resources.	**Mitigation Cultural-1: Historic Resource Documentation.** The following historical resources shall be documented in their current state by a County of Santa Barbara Planning and Development (P&D) approved historian: Naples Railroad Depot Water Tower, Langtry Avenue, and Historic El Camino Real/Stage Coach Road/Highway 101 Fragment. These	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	Potential impacts to these resources are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	resources shall be documented on State of California Department of Parks and Recreation Forms (DPR) 523 Series and shall be submitted to the appropriate Office of Historic Preservation operated Regional Archaeological Information Center (ARC) for the benefit of future generations.	
3.11 Cultural Resources	**Impact Cultural-2 Potential Disturbance of Subsurface Historic Resources.** Construction activities associated with road building in Lot 69 would impact the Naples Railroad Depot Complex, a CRHR eligible cultural resource. Subsurface remains could exist. Potential impacts to such remains would be considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	**Mitigation Cultural-2: Additional Archaeological Investigations, Naples Railroad Depot Location.** Construction associated with the proposed project would directly impact the Naples Railroad Depot Complex. An Extended Phase I investigation shall be conducted to determine whether potentially significant subsurface remains exist. Is so, a Phase 2 subsurface testing program shall be conducted to evaluate the nature, extent, and significance of the cultural resources at the Naples Railroad Depot Complex. If significant, a Phase 3 data recovery program shall be implemented. These investigations shall be consistent with County Archaeological Guidelines	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.11 Cultural Resources	**Impact Cultural-3 Unanticipated Discovery and Potential Disturbance of Subsurface Historic or Prehistoric Resources.** Grading activities associated with site preparation at the MOU Project area could impact previously undiscovered CRHR eligible cultural resources. Potential impacts to previously undiscovered cultural resources are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	**Mitigation Cultural-3: Monitoring for Subsurface Resources.** All grading and excavation activities occurring in historic and/or prehistoric soil deposits shall be monitored by a qualified archaeologist and a Native American Monitor of local tribal association. The construction crew shall be cautioned not to collect artifacts and be required to inform the project archaeologist in the event that cultural remains are uncovered. If subsurface materials are uncovered, the monitoring archaeologist has the authority to halt construction work in the immediate vicinity of the find and the emergency discovery procedures shall be implemented as determined by the monitoring archaeologist. **Mitigation Cultural-4: Management of Unanticipated Subsurface Resources.** If unanticipated resources are	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
		discovered during construction, they shall be addressed under the procedures set forth in CEQA Section 5064.5. If possible, the resource shall be avoided first through design modification, or, second, through protective measures (such as protective capping of the site – if feasible). If the resource cannot be avoided, the project archaeologist shall make a determination of resource significance. If it is determined that the resource is significant, measures to mitigate impacts shall be devised and carried out by the applicant in accordance with County Archaeological Guidelines.	
3.11 Cultural Resources	**Impact Cultural-4: Potential Disturbance of Unanticipated Human Remains.** Grading activities associated with site preparation at the MOU Project area could impact previously unanticipated human remains. Potential impacts to previously undiscovered cultural resources are considered *significant, but feasibly mitigated through the appropriate construction monitoring procedures required in Mitigation Measure Cultural-5 (Class II)*.	**Mitigation Cultural-5: Management of Unanticipated Human Remains.** P&D will ensure that impacts to cultural resources related to the unanticipated discovery of human remains are reduced to below the level of significance by ensuring that, in the event human remains are encountered, construction in the area of the finding will cease, and the remains will stay in situ pending definition of an appropriate plan. The Santa Barbara County Coroner (Coroner) will be contacted to determine the origin of the remains. In the event the remains are Native American in origin the NAHC will be contacted to determine necessary procedures for protection and preservation of the remains, including reburial, as provided in the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15064.5(e), "CEQA and Archaeological Resources," CEQA Technical Advisory Series and the monitoring Native American shall provide oversight for the procedures and treatment of the remains that are agreeable to the monitoring tribe in accordance with cultural tradition. In the event that the remains are of historic origin, of no interest to the County coroner, and not of Native American origin, arrangements shall be made for the remains to be interred in an appropriate manner	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
		in a designated internment area.	
3.12 Traffic and Circulation	**Impact Traffic-2: Northbound Dos Pueblos Canyon Road Exit.** The project would not alter the roadway geometry at the Highway 101 northbound exit to Dos Pueblos Canyon Road, and does not propose roadway improvements in the Caltrans right of way. However, the project would add traffic to the existing access roads; a portion of which would be subject to the deceleration requirements and curve conditions at the intersection of Dos Pueblos Canyon Road and the access road serving the project's north central and northeast lots (103-105, 107-110, 131-139, 158-161, 163, 164, 185-188, 193, 195, and 243). The traffic conditions resulting from the project at this intersection are not formally identified as an impact, but it is possible that roadway modifications or improvements requiring additional County Public Works and/or Caltrans review may be necessary. Although there is no existing evidence of a significant impact, in order to ensure review and confirmation of the traffic conditions, this issue is characterized as *significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	**Mitigation Traffic-1: Final Design Review.** If modification or improvements are proposed within the County or Caltrans right of way, evidence of approval by County Public Works and Caltrans must be provided to P&D.	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.13 Noise	**Impact Noise-1: Construction Noise.** Lots 91, 93, 97, 119, and 122 south of Highway 101 would be impacted by construction of the coastal access trail at the eastern edge of the Coastal Area South of Highway 101. Mitigation Noise-1 limits construction occurring on the project site between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday for the purpose of limiting the noise exposure on surrounding residences. Further,	**Mitigation Noise-1: Construction Hours.** Construction activity for site preparation and for future development shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. No construction shall occur on State holidays. Construction equipment maintenance shall be limited to the same hours. Non-noise generating construction activities such as interior painting are not subject to these restrictions. **Mitigation Noise-2: Construction Noise Limits.** All	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	as noise generated by construction activities occurs on a temporary and intermittent basis, construction noise impacts generated by the development of the project are considered *short-term, but significant and feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	construction techniques and recommendations in this noise analysis shall be incorporated into the project design to reduce exterior noise at existing residences to no more than 65 dBA CNEL and interior noise at existing residences to no more than 45 dBA CNEL. **Mitigation Noise-3: Stationary Noise Equipment.** Stationary construction equipment that generates noticeable noise, such as large air compressors or generators, which exceeds 65 dBA at the project boundaries shall be shielded to P&D's satisfaction and shall be located the maximum feasible distance from nearby occupied residences.	
3.13 Noise	**Impact Noise-2: Construction Noise.** Existing residences adjacent to the reservoir would be impacted by grading and construction on lots 51, 52A, 51, 52A, 104, 105 and 107A, 107B, 108, 109, 132, 133, 134, 135, and 136. Mitigation Measure Noise-1 limits construction occurring on the project site between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday for the purpose of limiting the noise exposure on surrounding residences. Further, as noise generated by construction activities occurs on a temporary and intermittent basis, construction noise impacts generated by the development of the project are considered *short-term, but significant and feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	**Mitigation Noise-1: Construction Hours** **Mitigation Noise-2: Construction Noise Limits** **Mitigation Noise-3: Stationary Noise Equipment**	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.14 Air Quality	**Impact AQ-1: Construction PM_{10} Emissions.** Ground disturbances and equipment operation during construction activities would produce potentially significant, but feasibly mitigated short-term PM_{10} emissions. Implementation of the proposed project would generate construction-related air pollutant	**Mitigation AQ-1: Construction PM_{10} Emissions.** Dust generated by project construction shall be kept to a minimum by the following dust control measures: a) Water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used during construction to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum,	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	emissions from two general activity categories: entrained dust and vehicle and equipment emissions. Entrained dust results from the exposure of earth surfaces to wind from the direct disturbance and movement of soil, resulting in PM_{10} emissions. Vehicle exhaust results from internal combustion engines used by construction equipment and vehicles, which results in emissions of CO, ROG, NO_X, and PM_{10}. In addition to contributing to overall particulate concentrations, fine particulate emissions from vehicle and equipment exhaust are classified as carcinogenic by the State of California. Impacts related to construction PM_{10} emissions are considered *potentially significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	such areas shall be watered down in the late morning and after completion of work at the end of the day. Reclaimed water shall be used whenever possible. b) The frequency of watering shall be increased when wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour if soils are not completely wet. If wind speeds increase to the point that the dust control measures cannot prevent dust from leaving the site, construction activities shall be suspended. c) Gravel pads shall be installed at all access points to prevent tracking of mud onto public roads. d) The applicant shall provide street cleaning if soil track-out occurs. e) If importation, exportation, or stockpiling of fill is involved, soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered and kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin. f) After clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation is completed, the disturbed area shall be treated by watering, revegetating, or by spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur. g) A person or persons shall be designated by the contractor or builder to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust offsite. Such monitoring responsibilities shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The contractor shall provide the name and telephone number of such person to the APCD and the	

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
		County of Santa Barbara prior to approval of any Coastal Development Permit or Land Use Permit for any project grading or construction activities. **Mitigation AQ-2: ROC and NO_x Emission Reduction.** ROC and NO_x emissions generated by project construction shall be kept to a minimum by the following control measures listed below: a) Minimize equipment idling time. b) Maintain equipment engines in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturers' specifications. c) Lengthen the construction period during smog season (May through October), to minimize the number of vehicles and equipment operating at the same time. d) Use alternatively fueled construction equipment, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), or electric, if feasible.	
3.14 Air Quality	**Impact AQ-4: Cumulative PM_{10} Emissions.** PM_{10} emissions from project construction would result in a *potentially significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)* contribution to cumulative PM_{10} impacts in the area.	**Mitigation AQ-1: Construction PM_{10} Emissions** **Mitigation AQ-2: ROC and NO_x Emission Reduction**	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.15 Public Services	**Impact PS-2: Wastewater Treatment and Disposal.** The MOU project is located beyond the service boundary of the Goleta West Sanitary District. The MOU project proposes to install 16 individual septic systems consisting of septic tanks and dry wells on the inland lots located north of Highway 101. The remainder of the single family residences, as well as the public access restroom and other ancillary facilities, would convey sanitary wastes to a proposed package	**Mitigation PS-4: Use of Package Sewage Treatment Plant.** The applicant shall avoid the use of individual septic systems and shall connect all new residential units to the proposed package wastewater treatment facility.	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	STP to be constructed north of Highway 101 on lot 167. Based on the information provided by the applicant, the soils that would receive the effluent from individual drywell systems appear to have poor capacity to treat wastewater. The presence of highly fractured bedrock could act as a conduit for untreated wastewater, and could subsequently impact the quality of groundwater and surface water, as well as ocean water quality at the discharge points of Dos Pueblos Creek and other tributaries. In light of these potential water quality impacts, the RWQCB recommends that the project avoid the use of individual septic systems and that all wastewater be conveyed to the proposed STP. The project's potential impacts to public services as a result of the proposed use of septic systems is considered *potentially significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.		
3.15 Public Services	**Impact PS-3: Schools.** The proposed project would result in the generation of additional students for local school districts. While some schools within the GUSD and SBHSD are at or near their peak capacity, impacts would be limited because: 1) a developer fee program is in place through which the developer would provide the GUSD/SBHSD with funding that would be available to make arrangements for the additional students; 2) SBHSD has been in an overall enrollment decline, and anticipates to remain in that state through the next few years, which will ultimately result in decreased junior and senior high school enrollment; and 3) GUSD has an	**Mitigation PS-2: Impact Fees.** The applicant shall pay the applicable Development Impact Fees in effect at the time of issuance, including school, and sheriff prior to issuance of building permits. **Mitigation PS-5: School Enrollment.** The applicant shall notify GUSD and SBHSD of the expected buildout date of the project and pay the statutory schools fees to allow the districts time to plan for the new students.	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	existing school closed (El Rancho) that could be opened should enrollment require such a move. Therefore, the MOU project's impacts to local schools would be considered *potentially significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.		
3.15 Public Services	**Impact PS-5: Fire Protection.** The proposed project would present an increase of population requiring fire protection services. The County of Santa Barbara has programmed construction of a new Fire Station 10, anticipated in 2011. The station should be operational by 2012. The provision of this fire station, using land provided by the City of Goleta and funding from developer impact fees and from the County, will serve to avoid the negative effects of the MOU project and other development in the area on fire protection services. It is possible however, that some residences within the MOU project would be completed and occupied before the new fire station is constructed. In this case, there would be a short-term impact on fire protection services until the new fire station is operating. This impact is considered *potentially significant but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	**Mitigation PS-2: Impact Fees.** The applicant shall pay the applicable Development Impact Fees in effect at the time of issuance, including school, and sheriff prior to issuance of building permits. The impact fees will also be used to partially fund Fire Station 10 in the City of Goleta, which would be the nearest station to the project area. **Mitigation PS-3: Short-Term Fire Protection Facilities.** In the event that Fire Station 10 in the City of Goleta is not operational by the time that the first residential units are occupied, the applicant will consult with the County Fire Department and provide an acceptable interim on-site staging area for fire protection equipment and operations. Acceptable arrangements, at the Fire Department's discretion, may include service coordination with the California Department of Forestry or other public safety entities.	Mitigated to less than significant levels
3.15 Public Services	**Cumulative Impact PS-10: Public Services.** The proposed MOU project would result in an increased demand on numerous public services. There are three pending residential projects in the immediate project vicinity, as well as a significant number of proposed and pending projects within the City of Goleta and nearby communities of Isla Vista and the University of California, Santa Barbara. When the project is	**Mitigation Measure PS-2: Impact Fees** **Mitigation Measure PS-5: School Enrollment**	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	considered in combination with these other projects, it is anticipated that the subject project would incrementally contribute to cumulative impacts to public services in the region. One of the mechanisms utilized by the County of Santa Barbara to ensure that primary public services are maintained commensurate with growth is the Goleta Planning Area Development Impact Fees Program. These fees provide the fire and police departments and school districts with a revenue stream that enables them to provide a relatively consistent level of service. With the exception of fire protection services, it is anticipated that the use of development impact fee programs would ensure that adequate levels of service are available to future developments in the project area. The cumulative impact of additional demand on public services, excluding fire protection services, is considered *potentially significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.		
3.15 Public Services	**Cumulative Impact PS-12: Solid Waste.** Considering anticipated project build-out in the vicinity of the Gaviota Coast, City of Goleta, and other South Coast communities, the MOU project would incrementally contribute to a significant increase in the solid waste stream, further diminishing capacity at the Tajiguas landfill. Solid waste generated by the proposed project would not exceed significance thresholds established by the County, and further reductions are anticipated through the implementation of a mitigation measure requiring the establishment of a recycling	**Mitigation Measure PS-6: Construction Waste** **Mitigation Measure PS-7: Use of Recycled Materials** **Mitigation PS-8: Solid Waste Management Program.** The applicant shall develop and implement a Solid Waste Management Program for the residential development. The program shall include one or more of the following measures, but is not limited to those measures: a) Provision of space and/or bins for storage of recyclable materials within the project area b) Implementation of a curbside recycling and green waste	Mitigated to less than significant levels

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	program. Further, these types of increases have been anticipated and planned for in the region as outlined in the County's Comprehensive Plan. Even though the impact from solid waste disposal attributable to the proposed MOU project would not be considered a significant impact, the cumulative impact for the region is considered *potentially significant, but feasibly mitigated (Class II)*.	program to serve the new development c) Development of a plan for accessible collection of materials on a regular basis d) Regular composting of lawn clippings and other landscape materials	

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
Class III Impacts – MOU Project			
3.2 Geology and Soils	**Impact Geol-7: Cumulative Erosion and Sedimentation.** The project site for Santa Barbara Ranch includes several small coastal drainages and a very small portion of the drainage area of Dos Pueblos Creek. Runoff from most of the Santa Barbara Ranch (SBR) property flows to small unnamed drainages incised into the coastal terrace. The drainages within the study area are separated from each other by topographic divides. Development within the adjacent Dos Pueblos Ranch property would lead to additive effects of erosion and potential sedimentation within the Dos Pueblos Creek watershed. However, due to the separation of drainage by topography these effects would not combine with those from most of the SBR property or other developments along the Gaviota Coast. Mitigation measures within the MOU Project would also avoid or minimize individual significant impacts. For these reasons, the project's contribution to cumulative impact of erosion and sedimentation would be *less than significant (Class III)*.	None required.	Less than significant
3.3 Hydrology and Water Quality	**Impact Flood-2: Cumulative Surface Runoff.** The development proposed is low intensity, and each of the cumulative projects would be subject to the same drainage design review. For these reasons, the potential cumulative effects of anticipated development on flooding are considered *less than significant (Class III)*.	Class III impacts can be further reduced through the implementation of the following mitigation measure: **Mitigation Measure Flood 1: Stormwater Control Structures and Devices** No additional mitigation is required.	Less than significant
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-3: Impacts to Special-status Plants Associated with Oak Woodland Habitats.** Oak woodland habitats in the project area and throughout	None required.	Less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	the coastal plain have been significantly altered and fragmented by previous land use practices, especially those areas south of Highway 101. Extant oak woodland in the MOU Project vicinity is largely restricted to upper slopes surrounding drainages and north- and west-facing slopes above Dos Pueblos Creek and its tributaries and Tomate Canada Creek. Several plant species, considered locally rare or otherwise sensitive are associated with oak woodland habitats. Additionally, oak woodland habitats are considered sensitive by State and County resource protection agencies and as such, should be avoided by this project. The MOU Project would have no direct effects on oak woodland habitat or plant species since the nearest mapped area of this habitat type is about 1,500 feet north of the northern MOU Project boundary. The MOU Project would not fragment intact areas of oak woodland habitat from one another, or from remaining habitat along drainage courses in the vicinity. Indirect effects related to vegetation management and human occupation would be buffered by the intervening agricultural and open space areas planned within the MOU Project. For these reasons, the MOU Project effects on special status plant species associated with oak woodland habitat would be *less than significant (Class III)*.		
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-12: Increased Restriction of Wildlife Movements.** The configuration of the proposed building envelopes and associated access roads on the coastal terrace portions of the project area south of	None required.	Less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	Highway 101 could significantly fragment or isolate seasonal water bodies in grasslands in this portion of the project area and inhibit wildlife attempting to move east-west between the project area and open space to the east and west (e.g., between Dos Pueblos Creek and Tomate Canada Creek and other drainages), via the coastal terraces. Project construction and occupation of parcel north of Highway 101 may have similar impacts on habitat fragmentation and wildlife movements, but the magnitude here is expected to be less because of the greater extent of habitat and habitat connections north of Highway 101. The MOU Project design has been revised to increase the contiguous nature of grassland habitat to be preserved in agricultural and open space easements sough of Highway 101. Access roads and driveways have been consolidated as much as possible, and have been located as close as possible to the existing major travel routes. The roadway design itself is intended to minimize the barrier effect by using rounded and natural lined drainage improvements instead of traditional curbs and gutters. The project has also been modified to preserve all federal and state wetlands, and all of the seasonal water bodies identified as wetlands, along with 100 foot buffers from any new construction. The fencing plan proposed with the project avoids barrier fences along property lines, and requires pasture fences to have designs that will allow the passage of wildlife. These measures, in conjunction with the Open Space		

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	Management Plan that will provide additional diversity and protection of habitat, serve to mitigate the contribution of the project towards the overall loss of contiguous grassland habitat along this region of the Gaviota Coast, and that the degree of wildlife mobility that currently exists is at least maintained. The MOU Project's potential to affect ground-dwelling wildlife movements south and north of Highway 101 is considered *less than significant (Class III)*.		
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-19: Grazing Pressure.** The proposed building envelopes for most parcels are large enough to include livestock rearing areas and livestock may graze on lands outside the building envelopes. Cumulative livestock densities over the project area post-occupancy may significantly exceed pre-project grazing densities and the carrying capacity of the environment, and could result in potentially significant impacts to soil stability, riparian habitats, and other receptors of sedimentation, native grasslands, special-status plants, seasonal wetlands in grasslands, as well as the ability of these grazing lands to support native wildlife populations. The project includes a uniform agricultural management service, which will have control over all agricultural activities within the development. This component of the project will avoid the potential for overgrazing. The MOU Project's potential impacts due to grazing pressure are considered to be *less than significant* (*Class III*).	None required.	Less than significant
3.4 Biological Resources	**Impact Bio-20: PACE Areas.** The MOU Project identifies portions of the lots outside the development envelopes as proposed private agricultural conservation	None required.	Less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	easements (PACEs). Currently, some of these areas are grasslands that provide valuable foraging and nesting/denning habitat for a wide variety of special-status and non-regulated plant and animal species. Under the PACE designation, these areas on lots north of Highway 101 could be converted to row-crop agriculture, which could result in loss of local and regional habitat values by reducing or eliminating large areas of wildlife habitat, and interference with wildlife movements. The project design, however, also identifies areas of open space conservation easement on the north of Highway 101 to provide a degree of connection between the Tomate Canada drainage, adjacent grassland and coastal scrub areas and the larger grassland and other habitat areas to the north. South of Highway 101, the design specifies that the agricultural areas will be limited to private pasture land, where grazing will be allowed to continue in a manner similar to the existing conditions. In addition, the project design identifies riparian protection corridors within the agricultural conservation easement to ensure that the highest quality habitat areas on the property are protected. In conjunction with the Open Space Management Plan, the identification and retention of these areas for habitat management will minimize the potential effects of converting some areas of disturbed grassland to agricultural uses. The MOU Project's potential impacts to wildlife and wildlife movements caused by conversion of portions of the PACEs to row-crop agriculture north of Highway 101 is considered *adverse but less than significant* (*Class*		

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	III).		
3.5 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	**Impact HM-5: Offsite Contaminated Soil Disposal.** There is potential for cumulative impacts resulting from increased contaminated soil associated with remediation activities being disposed of at an appropriate offsite disposal facility, which will be determined on the type and concentration of the contaminants. The amount of contaminated soil generated by this project is expected to be relatively minor. Typical drilling pits associated with oil-well installation are generally on the order of 2,500 cubic yards. Since none of the wells located in the study area were used for production and were determined to be dry exploration wells the amount of hydrocarbon impacts would be limited to potential drilling or hydraulic fluids and other spills related to well installation. No significant contribution to cumulative effects associated with potential reduced landfill capacity is anticipated. This impact is considered to be *adverse, but less than significant (Class III)*.	Class III impacts can be further reduced through the implementation of the following mitigation measures: **Mitigation Measure HM-5: Soil Management Plan** **Mitigation HM-8: Hazardous Material Storage, Handling, and Use**	Less than significant
3.6 Land Use	**Impact Land-1: Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations.** With a determination that a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) is infeasible, the allowed density within the proposed project site would be re-evaluated and potential inconsistencies with applicable plans and regulations may be eliminated. In this case, the potential conflicts of the proposed MOU project with applicable land use plans and policies should be considered *less than significant (Class III)*. In addition, the detailed policy	None required.	Less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	consistency analysis presented in Section 4.0 concludes that the MOU Project is considered to be consistent with all applicable policies in the Coastal Act, Coastal Land Use Plan, and Comprehensive Plan.		
3.6 Land Use	**Impact Land-2: Potential Neighborhood Incompatibility.** The proposed development could result in two potential neighborhood incompatibility issues. The first is the inclusion of a residential development where a primarily agricultural community currently exists. The proposed project includes setback and fencing requirements where residences are located adjacent to agricultural uses, which would reduce potential conflicts to less than significant levels. In addition, as discussed above, the purposes of the proposed NPD designation and implementing zoning ordinance are to balance low density residential development with public access and recreational opportunities, open space, and habitat preservation while minimizing impacts to surrounding agricultural lands. It is anticipated that the implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Agricultural Resources Section and the design review process and development standards specified in the NPD would effectively reduce land use conflicts between residential, agricultural and open space uses to *less than significant (Class III)*. A second potential neighborhood incompatibility is the difference in character between the proposed residential development and the existing pattern of development along the Gaviota Coast. The visibility of	Class III impacts can be further reduced through the implementation of the following mitigation measures: **Mitigation Measure Ag-1: Agricultural Conservation Easement and Implementation** **Mitigation Measure Ag-2: Agricultural Fencing** **Mitigation Ag-3: Buyer Notification** **Mitigation Vis-1: Design Guidelines**	Less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	the proposed residences, the number of units, and the relative uniformity in style of the proposed residences could result in a change in the neighborhood character. However, this potential incompatibility is visual in nature and is evaluated in Impact VIS-0. The potential visual incompatibility does not have an effect on land use. Therefore, potential land use impacts resulting from neighborhood incompatibility are *less than significant (Class III)*.		
3.6 Land Use	**Impact Land-3: Cumulative Impacts: Long Term Changes in Land Use Patterns on the Gaviota Coast.** The proposed project, including the land use redesignation and rezone components, would affect the existing regional land use setting by introducing 54 single family residences on 485 acres of existing agriculturally designated land. The proposed MOU project would not result in a significant cumulative impact for the following reasons: 1) it would represent a reduction of the total number of units when compared to the baseline condition (Grid Development or Alternative 3A); 2) it would not set a precedent for future subdivisions with higher densities than the densities allowed by land use designation and zoning; and 3) the potential total of 150 to 250 new homes in the entire Gaviota Coast area would not be a significant cumulative impact. Therefore, even though the proposed MOU project would allow for construction of a substantial number of units, the cumulative effect of this project on the development pattern and conversion of land uses along the Gaviota	None required.	Less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	Coast would be *less than significant (Class III)*.		
3.7 Agricultural Resources	**Impact AG-2: Physical Conversion of Prime Agricultural Land to Development.** The MOU Project would result in conversion of existing agriculturally-designated land to residential uses. Approximately 1 acre of prime agricultural land will be lost to development through the grading of internal access drives for the new residential lots. This loss of prime agricultural land to development would be more than offset by the preservation of 24 acres of prime agricultural lands within the proposed PACE. Thus, the effect of MOU Project on prime agricultural land lost to development is *less than significant (Class III)*.	None required.	Less than significant
3.7 Agricultural Resources	**Impact AG-4: Potential Reduction in Grazing.** While the existing project area consists of multiple lots, large portions of land within the SBR property are managed under single ownership, such that lots that would otherwise be too small to support threshold grazing levels are able to form a continuous area available for grazing under current conditions. This grazing land supports about 0.3 animal units per acre. Using the Santa Barbara County Cattlemen's Association threshold for impact analysis, the project area's existing productivity rate indicates that between 83-100 acres of contiguous grazing land would be required to sustain between 25 to 30 animal units. Under the MOU Project, the existing lots would be sold into multiple ownerships, which may potentially result in discontinuous areas less than 83-100 acres, and reduce the overall grazing activity. However, designation of the	None required.	Less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	PACEs would provide large, permanent, agricultural preservation areas which would accommodate for grazing areas potentially disrupted from the changing ownerships. Additionally, the project area's grazing capacity is not considered to be prime agricultural grazing land according to DOC criteria, and cattle production is neither a commercially viable nor a significant production in the project area. As a result, the effect of the MOU Project on potential reduction in grazing is *less than significant (Class III)*.		
3.8 Minerals	**Impact Mineral-1: Effects from Nearby Quarry Operations on Future Residential Uses.** There is a nearby sand quarry operation approximately 5,600 feet (1.1 miles) from the nearest proposed residences on the SBR property (Lot 50). Assuming that the existing operation would continue to operate in compliance with applicable air quality regulations and other local regulations to control airborne dust and noise, then the relative small size of the facility, the distance to the proposed residences, and the intervening topography between the operation and the proposed residences would tend to greatly reduce the potential for nuisance effects on the proposed residences. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that residents of the proposed project would be adversely affected by the quarry operation. In addition, the operation is not identified as a resource of state importance based upon the Mineral Lands Classification Map. The subject operation is located in an area designated as MRZ-1, i.e., an area where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that	None Required.	Less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	little likelihood exists for their presence. The potential impacts of the proposed project on the existing quarry operation located adjacent to the project site, are considered *adverse, but not significant (Class III)*.		
3.9 Visual Resources	**Impact Vis-3: Key Observation Point 3.** As originally proposed, a large barn would have been visible at this location as part of the agricultural support facility on Lot 57. The MOU Project design has been altered to combine the agricultural support facility with the equestrian center development on Lot 97. This re-design will leave virtually all of Lot 57 as undeveloped open space. Minor improvements, such as fencing, would be installed but would not affect views from KOP 3. The visual contrast is therefore rated as low. From this KOP, any minor perimeter fencing improvements would be almost indistinguishable from the existing fence, thus project dominance is rated low. Views to the scenic backdrop of trees would be unaffected. Therefore, view impairment from this KOP 3 is rated as low. The MOU Project's potential impacts to visual resources from KOP 3 are considered *less than significant (Class III)*.	None Required.	
3.9 Visual Resources	**Impact Vis-9: Distant Views from the Pacific Ocean.** The MOU Project development would be visible from boaters traveling along the coastline south of the project site. Given the fact that any homes visible from offshore areas would be in the distance, and would not dominate or block views of the Santa Ynez ridgeline, the visual effects of the project on these distant views	None Required.	Less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	from the Pacific Ocean are considered *adverse, but less than significant (Class III)*.		
3.9 Visual Resources	***Impact Vis-12: Short-Term Construction Impacts.*** Effects on visual resources from construction include the presence of equipment, materials, and earth moving in the existing landscape. In a visual sense, construction impacts will be obtrusive and out of character with the existing rural area. This situation would be expected of moving equipment and the erection of raw materials without the mitigation of final colors and landscaping. Temporary construction staging areas are typically located on relatively flat ground adjacent to existing roads, and placed in locations to minimize travel and visual impacts to sensitive viewing areas. While this impact would be adverse, it would be short term, and is considered *adverse but less than significant (Class III)*.	None Required.	Less than significant
3.10 Recreation	**Impact Rec-3: Increased Use of Existing Neighborhood and Regional Parks.** The project would introduce new residents into the Gaviota Coast area. While this additional population from the project would tend to increase the demand for use of the existing parks and other recreational facilities within the Gaviota Coast area, as well as in the City of Goleta, it is not expected that such usage would directly cause physical deterioration of the existing parks, given existing maintenance programs. The MOU Project's potential adverse impact to regional recreational facilities is considered *adverse but not significant (Class III)*.	None Required.	Less than significant
3.12 Traffic and Transportation	**Impact Traffic-1: Increased Project-Related Trip Generation.** The MOU Project would add 746 ADT,	None Required.	Less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	56 A.M. peak hour trips, and 73 P.M. peak hour trips to the existing volumes on the study-area roadways and intersections. This increase would result in an *adverse but less than significant impact (Class III)*.		
3.12 Traffic and Transportation	**Impact Traffic-3: Cumulative Impacts from Increased Project-Related Trip Generation.** The MOU Project would add 746 ADT, 56 A.M. peak hour trips, and 73 P.M. peak hour trips on the local roadway system under cumulative conditions. This increase would result in an *adverse but less than significant impact (Class III)*.	None Required.	Less than significant
3.14 Air Quality	**Impact AQ-2: Construction NO_x and ROG Emissions.** Heavy equipment used during proposed construction activities would produce adverse, but less than significant, combustive NO_x and ROG emissions. Impacts from ROG and NO_x emissions from construction equipment are considered *adverse, but less than significant (Class III)*.	No specific mitigation is required. Class III impacts can be further reduced through the implementation of the following mitigation measures: **Mitigation Measure AQ-2**	Less than significant
3.14 Air Quality	**Impact AQ-3: Long-term Emissions.** Operations of the project would produce ROG and NO_x emissions from all combined residential project sources, including vehicular traffic, wood burning fireplaces, space heating, water heating, and consumer products. The project would generate operational vehicle emissions mainly due to commuting activities. The estimated project operations air pollutant emissions are below the County daily emission threshold. Thus, operational emission impacts are considered *adverse, but less than significant (Class III)*.	No specific mitigation is required. Class III impacts can be further reduced through the implementation of the following mitigation measure: **Mitigation AQ-3: Energy Conservation Measures.** The applicant shall incorporate the following energy conservation measures into project building plans unless the applicant proves that incorporation of a specific measure is infeasible: a) Meet or exceed the California Title 24 Energy Code for all relevant applications, including energy efficient appliances and lighting b) Install heat transfer modules in all furnaces	

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
		c) Apply light colored, water based paint and roofing materials on all structures d) If feasible, incorporate the use of solar panels for water heating systems and water heater systems that heat water only on demand into the design of all habitable structures e) Include design elements that maximize the use of natural lighting f) Construct parking areas with concrete or other non-polluting materials instead of asphalt g) Include provisions for the installation of energy efficient appliances and lighting h) Revise project landscape plans where necessary to use landscaping to shade all buildings and parking areas	
3.14 Air Quality	**Impact AQ-5: Cumulative NO_x and ROG Emissions.** Regional emissions would increase as a result of the proposed project. However, ROG and NO_x emissions resulting from operational aspects of the proposed residential development would not exceed the applicable long-term threshold for such emissions of 25 pounds per day. Therefore, potential cumulative air quality impacts in the South Coast Air Basin due to increases in ROG and NO_x emissions from project operations are considered *adverse, but not significant (Class III)* for ROG.	No specific mitigation is required. Class III impacts can be further reduced through the implementation of the following mitigation measures: **Mitigation AQ-3: Energy Conservation Measures**	Less than significant
3.14 Air Quality	**Impact AQ-6: Cumulative CO Hot Spot Emissions.** The traffic analysis presented in Section 3.12 indicates that cumulative traffic contributions do not exceed the 800 peak hour trips per lane threshold	None Required.	Less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	at any intersection in the study area. Therefore, no quantitative CO analysis was performed. Implementation of the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial CO concentrations (or "hotspots"). Impacts related to exposure to substantial CO concentrations as a result of the proposed project are considered *adverse, but less than significant impact (Class III).*		
3.14 Air Quality	**Impact AQ-7: Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** The project will contribute to cumulative greenhouse gas emissions through the release of carbon dioxide in motor vehicle exhaust and indirectly through the consumption of energy for the residences, equestrian, agricultural, and other uses. Given the early development stage of regulations to control greenhouse gas emissions, there is no standard by which the MOU estimated emission rate can be compared or even an analysis procedure suggesting that emissions should be computed and assigned on such a project-by-project basis. Similar greenhouse gas emissions would occur from vehicle travel by these future residents wherever they lived. Thus, denial of the project would not necessarily affect statewide greenhouse gas emissions. Specific future controls, such as vehicle emission reductions, energy conservation programs, and reductions accomplished through other regulatory programs would apply to project residents as well as to everyone in the state. For these reasons, the project's contribution towards	No specific mitigation is required. Class III impacts can be further reduced through the implementation of the following mitigation measures: **Mitigation AQ-3: Energy Conservation Measures**	Less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	greenhouse gas emissions and global climate change would be considered *adverse, but less than significant (Class III)*.		
3.15 Public Services	**Impact PS-1: Energy Demand.** The MOU project would increase demands on electrical and natural gas supplies. According to Southern California Edison (SCE), the impacts of providing electrical service to the proposed MOU project would be less than significant as the existing electrical infrastructure in the region has more than enough capacity to handle the increase. According to SoCal Gas, the existing natural gas distribution infrastructure is sufficient to handle the loads required by the proposed MOU project. Similar to SCE, SoCal Gas would be required to install line extensions to the residential units from the nearby feeder lines. The additional energy demand represented by this project scope is considered *adverse, but less than significant (Class III)*.	No specific mitigation is required. Class III impacts can be further reduced through the implementation of **Mitigation AQ-3.**	Less than significant
3.15 Public Services	**Impact PS-4: Police Protection.** The proposed project would present an increase of population requiring additional police protection services. This increase would not impact response time to calls for emergency services, and the number of existing officers would be adequate to provide police protection to the area served by the residential development. Therefore, impacts are considered *adverse, but less than significant (Class III)*.	No specific mitigation is required. Class III impacts can be further reduced through the implementation of the following mitigation measures: **Mitigation Measure PS-2: Impact Fees**	Less than significant
3.15 Public Services	**Impact PS-6: Hospitals.** The proposed MOU project would present an increase in the number of individuals requiring hospital facilities. According to Goleta Valley	None required.	Less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	Cottage Hospital there is sufficient capacity at the hospital to serve this increased population. Impacts to area hospitals would be *adverse, but less than significant (Class III)*.		
3.15 Public Services	**Impact PS-7: Construction Solid Waste.** Generation of solid waste would occur as a result of short-term construction impacts. The proposed MOU project would potentially generate excess construction materials during project buildout, some with the potential for reuse or recycling. These impacts would be short-term and only occur during construction activities. Impacts would be *adverse, but less than significant (Class III)*.	No specific mitigation is required. Class III impacts can be further reduced through the implementation of the following mitigation measures: **Mitigation PS-6: Construction Waste.** Demolition and/or excess construction materials shall be separated onsite for reuse/recycling or proper disposal (e.g., concrete, asphalt). During grading and construction, separate bins for recycling of construction materials and brush shall be provided onsite. **Mitigation PS-7: Use of Recycled Materials.** Materials with recycled content shall be used in project construction.	Less than significant
3.15 Public Services	**Impact PS-8: Long-Term Solid Waste.** Significant amounts of solid waste would be generated at the proposed MOU project at full build-out. Total solid waste generated would not exceed the project-specific significance threshold of 196 tons per year. Therefore, solid waste impacts would be *adverse, but less than significant (Class III)*.	No specific mitigation is required. Class III impacts can be further reduced through the implementation of the following mitigation measure: **Mitigation PS-8: Solid Waste Management Program.**	Less than significant
3.15 Public Services	**Impact PS-9: Water Treatment and Supply.** The combined domestic and landscaping water demand for the 54 new residential units proposed in the MOU project amounts to approximately 61 acre-feet per year (AFY). The applicant proposes to meet this demand through reliance upon the 200 AFY contract amount available from the State Water Project to the Naples Water	No specific mitigation is required. Class III impacts can be further reduced through the implementation of the following mitigation measures: **Mitigation PS-9: Landscape Plan.** The MOU project landscape plan shall be developed to maximize the use of low-water demand species for ornamental purposes. Project conditions, covenants, and restrictions (CC&Rs) shall include information and photographs about drought-tolerant plantings	Less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	Company (NWC), assuming an 80 percent reliability in the State Water Project deliveries would allow the entire forecast demand to be met from this source. Under limited circumstances, it may be necessary for the NWC to draw from its 252 AFY allotment from the Dos Pueblos Creek diversion system. Agricultural demands would continue to be met through the use of well water, and water stored from the Dos Pueblos Creek diversion during wet months. The project would augment these sources with the use of treated wastewater. The MOU project's potential impacts to groundwater resources and to downstream water users are considered *adverse but less than significant (Class III)*.	for individual private spaces (i.e., front and back yards) and encourage and facilitate owner use of these water-saving species. **Mitigation PS-10: Reclaimed Water.** The applicant shall, where feasible, utilize reclaimed water for all common area exterior landscaping. Where feasible, reclaimed water shall be used to water exterior landscaping. If not feasible, the applicant shall provide documentation as to the efforts made to procure reclaimed water from purveyors and the negative outcome. **Mitigation PS-11: Indoor Water Use.** Indoor water use in all proposed structures shall be limited through the following measures: a) Recirculating, point-of-use, or on-demand water heaters shall be installed b) Low flow toilets shall be installed c) Water saving fixtures, including low flow showerheads, shall be installed d) Each home shall be equipped only with high efficiency (HE) washing machines **Mitigation PS-12: Water Management Plan.** Through the use of multiple water sources and water conservation strategies, the project would provide domestic water service without diverting water from the Dos Pueblos Creek.	
3.15 Public Services	**Cumulative Impact PS-11: Fire Protection Services. T**he MOU project would increase the population requiring fire protection services. When the project is considered in combination with the other proposed development in the Gaviota area, as described above, it is anticipated that the MOU project would	None Required.	Less than significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	contribute incrementally to cumulative impacts to fire protection services in the Gaviota area. The City of Goleta (through General Plan Policy PF 3.2 and 3.3) and Santa Barbara County (through its Capital Improvements Program) have programmed construction of Fire Station 10 by the year 2011. The MOU project's contribution towards this cumulative impact will be offset by development impact fees towards the future Fire Station 10. Construction of the new Fire Station 10 will serve to reduce cumulative effects on fire protection services, and response times. Thus, the cumulative effects of this project and anticipated future development in the area on fire protection services are considered *adverse but less than significant (Class III)*.		

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
Class IV Impacts-Santa Barbara Ranch			
3.4 Biological Resource	**Impact Bio-21: Proposed OSCE.** The proposed long-term protection of open space areas in the Open Space Conservation Easement (OSCE) areas will be beneficial to biological resources. These natural areas contain valuable aquatic, wetland, and upland habitats that are known to support or potentially support a wide variety of special-status and non-regulated plants and animals. Protecting these areas could restore and enhance important habitats and ecological relationships in and around the project area. The habitat management plan for this project includes objectives to: • Maintain and/or increase diversity of native vegetation plant communities. • Maintain and/or enhance habitat and cover for native nesting birds and other native animals. • Restore/revegetate areas containing nonnative vegetation with native vegetation and reduce nonnative species' abundance onsite • Describe appropriate uses and restrictions to future property owners and the public with the intent of managing use and protecting habitats. • Describe appropriate public uses and access on trails. • Maintain the health and abundance of native grasslands onsite • Accommodate human occupancy with the acceptable restraints	None Required.	Not Applicable.

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	The Open Space Habitat Management Plan (OSHMP) includes a description of the habitats to be preserved in open space, and a series of actions to maintain and enhance these areas. The various actions include measures to enhance habitat, such as planting additional native grassland and removing non-native species, as well as prohibitions against future actions by the developer and homeowners that may be detrimental to habitat values. Typical prohibitions include not allowing the planting of any non-native species or using any herbicides or pesticides outside of designated development envelopes. The long-term protection of the proposed OSCE lands under this plan is considered a *beneficial impact* (*Class IV*).		
3.10 Recreation	**Impact Rec-1: Beneficial Impacts of New Coastal Trail and De Anza Trail.** The development of a coastal trail along the Gaviota coast has been a high priority for local, state, and federal governments in efforts to provide better public access. The Santa Barbara Coastal Access Implementation Plan identifies important recreational resources along the Gaviota Coast portion of the proposed Coastal Trail. The project's proposed trail system would include provision of new Coastal Trail and De Anza Trail segments through the project site, and would thus promote the furtherance of these planning goals, and is considered a *beneficial impact* (*Class IV*).	None Required.	Not Applicable.
3.10 Recreation	**Impact Rec-2: Beneficial Impacts of Increased Coastal Access.** The proposed project would improve public access to the Gaviota Coast by providing a public	None Required.	Not Applicable.

Table ES-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – MOU Project

Resource Area	Impact Summary	Mitigation Measure Summary	Residual Impact
	parking area, restrooms, trails, and vertical beach access. Access to this portion of the coast is presently limited due to its distance from other public trailheads and parking areas. A result of increased public access to the bluff, beach and marine waters near Naples Reef there may be effects on biological resources in these areas as described in Section 3.4 (impact Bio-6 related to Naples Reef and the adjacent beach, Bio-10 related to the nearby seal haul-out, and Bio-16 related to sensitive species present). For resource protection, public access to the beach via the new stairway would be prohibited during a specified period of the year. This mitigation measure, necessary to reduce potential effects to sensitive coastal resources, will lessen the beneficial effect of the new trail and stairway access system. The overall effect of the project on coastal access, however, will remain beneficial. From the context of recreational resource enhancement, the project's impacts to recreation would be *beneficial (Class IV)*.		