

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: David Lackie, Supervising Planner  
Planning and Development, Comprehensive Planning Division  
Staff Contacts: Greg Mohr, Dave Ward, Heather Baker

DATE: February 14, 2002

RE: **Revisions (RV1) to the Proposed Final Program EIR for the Toro Canyon Plan (2000-EIR-1, SCH#99051022): Finding that CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(b) applies and that changes made by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during their public hearings on Plan adoption do not require major revisions requiring recirculation of the EIR (reference P&D case numbers 00-GP-003 & -004 and 01-GP-002; 00-RZ-002 & -003; 00-OA-005 & -006)**

## **Introduction**

A Program Environmental Impact Report (2000-EIR-1) was prepared for the Toro Canyon Plan (Plan) to assess the potential adverse impacts resulting from new development and other activities associated with Plan implementation and full buildout. There have been subsequent changes to the Plan as a result of public review and comments as well as Planning Commission and Board of Supervisor direction during their public hearings for Plan adoption, including new and revised Plan goals, policies, actions, development standards, property-specific land use and zoning designations, and Zoning Ordinance amendments (County Code Chapter 35, Articles II & III). This EIR revision documents and evaluates Plan modifications directed by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors against the proposed Final Program EIR (2000-EIR-1) cover dated June 2000.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 describes the circumstances under which a lead agency is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review and the close of the public comment period on the draft EIR, but before EIR certification by the project decision-makers. According to Guidelines Section 15088.5(a), "information" can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of meaningful opportunity to comment on substantial

adverse project impacts or feasible mitigation measures or alternatives. Section 15088.5(b) states, “recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications to an adequate EIR.”

**Note:** 2000-EIR-1 contains several clerical errors in Table 1-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigations. These errors are noted and corrected in Section 6.0 of the attached EIR Revisions.

**EIR Revision Findings:** It is the finding of the Board of Supervisors that the proposed Final EIR (2000-EIR-1), as herein amended by the attached EIR Revisions analysis, may be used to fulfill the environmental review requirements for the Toro Canyon Plan. None of the changes directed by the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors would result in any new significant environmental impacts, nor would they result in a *substantial increase* in the severity (i.e. change in impact level classification) of any environmental impact. Therefore, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(b), the proposed revisions described in this document have not been recirculated for additional public comment. The proposed Final EIR for the Toro Canyon Plan is hereby amended by this revision document, together identified as 2000-EIR-1 RV1).

**Revisions (RV1) to 2000-EIR-1  
Toro Canyon Plan**

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0 Background .....	1
2.0 Location .....	2
3.0 Changes to the Project .....	2
4.0 Changes in Environmental Effects.....	7
4.1. Introduction and Land Use Sections .....	7
4.2. Fire Protection & Hazards.....	10
4.3. Parks, Recreation & Trails .....	11
4.4. Transportation & Circulation .....	12
4.5. Public Services: Resource Recovery, Police Protection, & Schools .....	12
4.6. Wastewater Treatment & Disposal.....	13
4.7. Water Resources .....	13
4.8. Biological Resources .....	14
4.9. Flooding & Drainage.....	17
4.10. Geology, Hillsides & Topography.....	17
4.11. Cultural Resources .....	17
4.12. Visual & Aesthetic Resources.....	18
4.13. Air Quality.....	20
4.14. Noise.....	20
5.0 Minor Text Changes and Clarifications to Original Project Description.....	20
6.0 Errata to the Final EIR Summary Table .....	20

**Attachment:** Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program

**1.0 Background**

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15156, a Program EIR (2000-EIR-1) was prepared for the Toro Canyon Plan and related zoning ordinance text and map amendments (reference P&D case numbers 00-GP-003 & -004 and 01-GP-002; 00-RZ-002 & -003; 00-OA-005 & -006). The proposed Final EIR was released in June 2000 and has not yet been certified.

The proposed Final EIR prepared for the project concluded that the Toro Canyon Plan would result in significant unmitigable (Class I) impacts related to the following subject areas: land use; fire protection & hazards; parks, recreation & trails; transportation & circulation; public services (solid waste, police

protection, & schools); wastewater treatment & disposal; water resources; biological resources; geology, hillsides & topography; cultural resources; and visual resources & aesthetics. Additional significant but mitigable (Class II) impacts were identified related to the following subject areas: land use; parks, recreation & trails; biological resources; flooding; cultural resources; air quality; and noise. Additional impacts related to land use, fire protection & hazards, transportation & circulation; wastewater, water resources, parks, recreation & trails, air quality, and noise were identified as adverse but less than significant (Class III). Significant and unavoidable (Class I) cumulative impacts were identified to land use, fire protection & hazards, parks, recreation & trails, transportation & circulation, public services (solid waste, police protection, & schools), wastewater, water resources, biological resources, geology, hillsides & topography, cultural resources, and visual resources. Significant and mitigable (Class II) cumulative impacts were identified to land use, parks, recreation & trails, transportation & circulation, flooding, cultural resources, air quality, and noise. Adverse but less than significant (Class III) cumulative impacts were identified in the areas of fire protection & hazards, transportation & circulation, wastewater, water resources, air quality, and noise.

The Planning Commission considered the Toro Canyon Plan during a series of public hearings and a group field tour between June 2000 and February 2001. The Planning Commission hearings produced its *Recommended Draft Toro Canyon Plan* cover dated April 2001, along with the Commission's recommendations that the Board approve specific related zoning ordinance text and map amendments. The Board of Supervisors considered the Toro Canyon Plan in a series of public hearings between June 2001 and January 2002, and is expected to take final action on the Plan and related matters on February 25, 2002.

## **2.0 Location**

The Toro Canyon Plan covers an area of about 5,950 acres (gross) in the western portion of the Carpinteria Valley, bounded by the Pacific Ocean on the south, the Summerland and Montecito Community Plan areas on the west, the federally-owned lands within the Los Padres National Forest on the north, and the Rancho Monte Alegre and City of Carpinteria on the east. Substantial portions of the Plan area lie both within and outside the State Coastal Zone.

## **3.0 Changes to the Project**

The original Toro Canyon Plan project description is summarized in Section 2.0 of 2000-EIR-1. The Board of Supervisors' revised project is contained in the *Toro Canyon Plan* cover dated February 2002. The final *Toro Canyon Plan* includes the following changes to the project, many of which were incorporated by the Planning Commission into its recommendations to the Board:

## **Introduction and Land Use-General**

1. Plan buildout revised to 305 additional residential units (five fewer units than under the originally proposed Preliminary Draft Plan) as the result of various changes to the Land Use Plan and zoning maps.
2. Revised the proposed Coastal Zone Boundary adjustment on several properties to accommodate the desires of property owners and avoid bisecting existing developed areas and approved development envelopes by the revised Boundary.
3. Torito Road area and some adjacent parcels are designated “Rural Neighborhood” rather than “Rural” as originally proposed, increasing potential buildout in this area by up to six lots/units.
4. The boundary between the inland Rural and Inner-Rural Areas is shifted northward on two parcels in the east-central part of the Plan area in order to accommodate a change on one parcel and a portion of another from MA-100 to MA-40, reflective of the request of the affected property owners in anticipation of a future two-way lot split on the larger of the affected parcels.
5. Several parcels currently under active cultivation in the northern and east-central portions of the Plan area are designated Agriculture (A-I-40 and A-II-100) rather than Mountainous Area (MA-40 and MA-100) as originally proposed.
6. Several parcels between Toro Canyon Road and Toro Canyon County Park, on the north side of Toro Canyon Park Road, are designated Agriculture, twenty acre minimum parcel size (A-I-20 and AG-I-20), rather than forty acre minimum parcel size (A-I-40 and AG-I-40) as originally proposed.
7. EIR mitigation measure for noise impacts incorporated as Policy LUG-TC-5 and DevStds LUG-TC-5.1 & -5.2.
8. Policy LUG-TC-6 added, clearly stating that the Plan will “be implemented in a manner that does not take private property for public use without just compensation as required by applicable law.”

## **Land Use-Residential**

1. Affordable Housing Overlay anticipated on part or all of the 11.4-acre Via Real site, pending possible future enabling amendment of the Housing Element (see Action LUR-TC-1.3).

## **Land Use-Commercial**

1. No requirement for Santa Claus-related theme or colors for development on Santa Claus Lane (see Policy C-TC-3.0 and Action C-TC-3.1).
2. “Western Seaside Vernacular Architecture” proposed rather than “Seaside Vernacular Commercial” (see Policy C-TC-3.0 and Action C-TC-3.1).

## **Land Use-Agriculture**

See changes noted above under Land Use-General.

## **Fire**

1. Clarified the fuel modification terms of “fuel load,” “fuel break” and “fire breaks,” and further detailed the evacuation setting in the Plan area.
2. Included a requirement that fuel management plans be reviewed during the permit application process.
3. Included new development standards for ingress/egress access, roadway & driveway, and fire hydrant requirements.
4. Included Fuel Management Guidelines as Appendix D.
5. Fire Protection Goal FIRE-TC and Policies FIRE-TC-1 & -3 clarified as to their public safety aspects, and tree limbing height increased from six to eight feet in DevStd FIRE-TC-3.2.
6. Fuel break requirements for tree limbing height increased from six to eight feet in DevStd FIRE-TC-3.2.

## **Parks, Recreation and Trails**

1. Trails map revised to minimize potential impacts on private property owners and the Flood Control District’s operational needs:
  - Added alternative route (2a) to the trail (2) at the northern end of Toro Canyon Road (PRT map and Action PRT-TC-2.3);
  - Staging area location revised on Toro Canyon Road;
  - Trail 6a rerouted;
  - Trails 2, 7, and 11 realigned with parcel boundaries;
  - Trail 10 reclassified from “high” to “low” priority.
2. Beach access Actions PRT-TC-1.3 & -1.4 modified to address local residents’ concerns, including a clear priority for Santa Claus Lane.
3. The required setback of new private development from existing trails and trail easements was reduced from 100’ to 50’ (see DevStd PRT-TC-2.1).
4. Included Trail Siting Guidelines as Appendix E.

## **Transportation and Circulation**

1. Roadway capacities changed to be consistent with the more conservative standards used in the Montecito Community Plan (both Design and Acceptable [LOS B] Capacities reduced).

## **Public Services**

1. Resource Recovery and Police Protection: Incorporated EIR Mitigations PS-1 & -2 related to Resource Recovery.
2. Schools: Text modified to acknowledge that siting of a new school in the Toro Canyon Plan area may or may not be appropriate because the Toro Canyon Plan area is a small part of the larger geographic area served by the Carpinteria Unified School District. The Plan acknowledges that the

District owns property on Toro Canyon Road, but the Plan neither designates nor prohibits a future school site here or elsewhere in the Plan area. New Action PS-TC-3.1 added at the Carpinteria Unified School District's request, to express the county's intent to work cooperatively with the District on future school site identification.

## **Wastewater and Water**

1. The two sections of Wastewater and Water were combined into one section for improved clarity.
2. Deleted Preliminary Draft Plan Action W-TC-2 regarding a countywide Conservation Landscape Design Program, DevStd W-TC-2.4 regarding dual plumbing for graywater systems, DevStd S-TC-1.3 regarding a two-acre minimum parcel for septic system siting, Action S-TC-1.5 regarding sewer hook-up evaluations, Policy S-TC-3 and Action S-TC-3.1 regarding on-site worker sanitation facilities, and Action S-TC-4.2 regarding disposal of dog waste on public trails.

## **Biology**

1. Provided a summary of the methodology used by P&D staff to identify the biological resources in the Plan area. Included the full habitat classifications from the Plan EIR, rather than the summaries contained in previous drafts of the Plan.
2. Action BIO-TC-1.2 clarified to state that the listed habitat types are not categorically ESH but shall be presumed to be "environmentally sensitive," provided that the actual habitat area(s) on a project site meet the criteria for ESH of either the Coastal Act or, for inland areas, Action BIO-TC-7.1.
3. New section format to clarify the distinct regulations for ESH in Coastal areas and Inland areas.
4. Coastal Sage Scrub is designated as ESH throughout the Plan area.
5. Within the Coastal areas of the Plan, development standards were revised to ensure compliance with the Coastal Act.
6. Some newly identified biological resources in Rural Neighborhoods (RNs) located in Coastal areas have been changed from ESH designations to "areas of potential biological merit" requiring further biological study for ESH delineation during an application for development (note: ESH areas mapped under the existing certified LCP are to remain as is). A new policy and development standards specific to the RNs of Torito Road, Serena Park, La Paquita and Ocean Oaks Road were included to provide regulations for the protection of ESH related to both new development and additions to existing development.
7. In the Inland areas of the Plan, several ESH buffer and development standards were revised to provide greater flexibility: 1) siting guidelines were added for additions to existing development within ESH and ESH buffer areas; 2) new policies were included to provide flexibility for ESH regulations on agriculturally zoned parcels; and 3) native tree protection was clarified, with greater weight given to the protection of mature protected trees that have grown into the natural stature particular to the species.
8. Landscaping regulations were clarified for development subject to a Restoration Plan requirement or a Landscape Plan requirement. Using plants grown from local seed stock is encouraged.

9. Eliminated the Constrained Site Guidelines from the Plan, due to the Constraint Mapping Tools that were implemented countywide by P&D in February 2001.
10. Numerous site-specific refinements of the biological resources/ESH map, at the request of property owners.
11. Included Guidelines for Salmonid Passage at Stream Crossings as Appendix G (see also DevStd BIO-TC-15.2), and a list of invasive plants to be avoided in landscape plans near ESH areas as Appendix I (see also DevStd BIO-TC-2.2).
12. Special exemptions written into the applicable zoning ordinances making it possible to repair, reconstruct and replace many nonconforming structures throughout the Plan area, with various provisions for residential, agricultural, and other non-residential structures (see Policies BIO-TC-6 & -10 and Development Standards BIO-TC-4.4, -5.1, -5.3, -7.5, & -7.8, as well as the TCP Overlay Districts of the Art. II & III zoning ordinances).

### **Flooding and Drainage**

1. An action item was added to the Plan to address drainage issues along the southeastern portion of Padaro Lane (see Action FLD-TC-1.5).

### **Geology**

1. Threshold for general restrictions on slope development raised from 20% to 30% (DevStd GEO-TC-1.1).
2. DevStd GEO-TC-4.3 added to clarify that repair and maintenance of existing seawalls, and the filling of gaps between them, may be permitted consistent with the Coastal Plan Policy 3-1.
3. EIR mitigation measures for air quality impacts (fugitive dust) incorporated as Policy GEO-TC-5 and DevStds GEO-TC-5.1 & -5.2.

### **History and Archaeology (Cultural Resources)**

1. Phase 1 Archaeological Report requirements were modified for greater property owner flexibility (see DevStd HA-TC-1.1.)
2. Santa Claus Lane addresses removed from table of historic resources (Table 13, formerly Table IV.D-1) and from DevStd HA-TC-2.3, and former Figure IV.D-2 removed, in recognition of the Board's intent to allow removal of the Santa/chimney structure contingent upon photo-documentation of the entire "Santa's Village" complex and other mitigation measures applied under a separate Coastal Development Permit.
3. Added Action HA-TC-2.4 regarding placing a sign along Highway 101 to recognize the historic value of the historic memorial oak trees.



## **Visual and Aesthetics**

1. Visual & Aesthetic Resources policies and standards rewritten in some cases and re-organized as a result of Planning Commission review and collaboration with the County Board of Architectural Review (BAR).
2. Design Overlay zoning added to the entire Plan area, so that most new development projects will be reviewed by the BAR. Also, requirement to mail notices to property owners of a project's initial BAR hearing added.
3. Height limits in the Plan area were simplified (overall twenty-five foot limit throughout the Plan area, with pre-existing standard height limits and possible exceptions for those projects subject to the Ridgeline and Hillside Development Guidelines). Rather than prohibiting currently permissible exemptions to the Ridgeline and Hillside Development Guidelines' height limits (at the BAR's discretion), exemptions to the height limits may be granted but the reasons why any such exemptions are granted must be documented.
4. Rather than a standard where a 16 foot height limit applies to projects that include ten feet or more of fill or foundation elevation, a simpler guideline is included stating that fill generally should not be more than five feet above natural grade (Policy GEO-TC-6.)
5. Requirements added that the total height of cut slopes and fill slopes shall not exceed 16 vertical feet and the visible portion of a retaining wall shall not exceed six feet (see TCP Overlay District, items H and I).
6. Deleted Preliminary Draft Plan Policy VIS-TC-2 and associated development standards regarding prohibition against landscaping that blocks or obstructs public views of the ocean.
7. Deleted Preliminary Draft Plan Policy 5 regarding Greenhouses.

## **4.0 Changes in Environmental Effects**

As a result of these changes to the project no new impacts have been identified, nor have any Class II or III impacts become Class I (significant and unmitigable), nor have Class I impacts become substantially more severe. The following sections assess the potential change in environmental effects for each topical issue analyzed in the proposed Final EIR. These sections repeat the previously-described changes made in the various sections of the Plan, and explain how these changes do not affect the impact significance levels presented in the FEIR.

### **4.1 Introduction and Land Use Sections**

#### **Introduction and Land Use-General**

**Revision 1:** Plan buildout revised to 305 additional residential units (five fewer units than under the originally proposed Preliminary Draft Plan) as the result of various changes to the Land Use Plan and zoning maps.

**Effect of Revision 1 on Impact Levels:** This minor change in full Plan buildout potential does not substantially change the overall magnitude or severity of any Plan impacts.

**Revision 2:** Revised the proposed Coastal Zone Boundary adjustment on several properties to accommodate the desires of property owners and avoid bisecting existing developed areas and approved development envelopes.

**Effect of Revision 2 on Impact Levels:** The revised Coastal Zone Boundary adjustment transfers some potentially developable land from the Coastal Zone to the inland area. Coastal Zone policies and regulations are generally more protective of resources. This change may create a higher potential for the properties to develop in a manner that would contribute to Impact LU-3 (Class I), but the increase in severity of the impact would not be substantial and in any case Impact LU-3 remains a Class I impact.

**Revision 3:** The Torito Road area and some adjacent parcels are designated “Rural Neighborhood” rather than “Rural” as originally proposed, increasing potential buildout in this area by up to six lots/units.

**Effect of Revision 3 on Impact Levels:** A rural designation includes provision for a 16' height limit in Hillside and Ridgeline areas. A rural neighborhood designation on Torito Road would also potentially make sewer extension to the area more likely, given an ability to demonstrate consistency with Coastal Land Use Plan Policy 2-10. When sewers are extended to an area, potential development is no longer limited by a land's septic system carrying capacity and larger developments often become possible. This change, because it could result in developments higher than 16' in Hillside and Ridgeline areas and could facilitate larger developments supported by sewers, creates a higher potential for some Torito properties to develop in a manner that would contribute to Impact LU-3 (Class I). The increase in severity of the impact is not substantial and in any case Impact LU-3 remains Class I.

**Revision 4:** The boundary between the inland Rural and Inner-Rural Areas is shifted northward on two parcels in the east-central part of the Plan area. This shift occurred in order to accommodate a change on one parcel and a portion of another from MA-100 to MA-40, reflective of the request of the affected property owners in anticipation of a future two-way lot split on the larger of the affected parcels.

**Effect of Revision 4 on Impact Levels:** An additional lot creates the potential for development of an additional residence and associated structures. Additional development could contribute to impacts within many categories in the Plan. However, the incremental additional impact of this change is not enough to change any of the EIR's impact classifications.

**Revision 5:** Several parcels currently under active cultivation in the northern and east-central portions of the Plan area are designated Agriculture (A-I-40 and A-II-100) rather than Mountainous Area (MA-40 and MA-100) as originally proposed.

**Effect of Revision 5 on Impact Levels:** Mountainous Area designations provide additional safeguards for biologic and geologic resources when areas are developed for agriculture. Parcels affected already have some existing agricultural operations on site, but other portions of the parcels may not have been recently farmed. Contributions to Class I Biology impacts (BIO-1, -2, -3, and -4) and

Geology impacts (GEO-1) under these zone districts would be more likely to occur than under the Preliminary Draft Plan, although the Class I impact classifications remain the same.

**Revision 6:** Several parcels between Toro Canyon Road and Toro Canyon County Park, on the north side of Toro Canyon Park Road, are designated Agriculture, twenty acre minimum parcel size (A-I-20 and AG-I-20), rather than forty acre minimum parcel size (A-I-40 and AG-I-40) as originally proposed.

**Effect of Revision 6 on Impact Levels:** This change would allow for one additional lot to be created in this area. This is not a substantial change that would substantially threaten the area's current agricultural uses or future viability for continued commercial agriculture, and in any case a future lot split would be subject to site-specific environmental review. None of the EIR's overall impact levels would change.

**Revision 7:** EIR mitigation measure for noise impacts have been incorporated as Policy LUG-TC-5 and DevStds LUG-TC-5.1 & -5.2.

**Effect of Revision 7 on Impact Levels:** The incorporation of these mitigation measures from the EIR does not change the noise impact levels (Class II).

**Revision 8:** Policy LUG-TC-6 added, clearly stating that the Plan will "be implemented in a manner that does not take private property for public use without just compensation as required by applicable law."

**Effect of Revision 8 on Impact Levels:** This text revision does not change potential development patterns. This revision was included for clarification purposes only. No changes to Impact classifications result from this revision.

## **Land Use-Residential**

**Revision 1:** Affordable Housing Overlay anticipated on part or all of the 11.4-acre Via Real site, pending possible future enabling amendment of the Housing Element (see Action LUR-TC-1.3).

**Effect of Revision 1 on Impact Levels:** The revision only recognizes and anticipates a potential future action that would be dependent upon a separate project (Housing Element amendment) to be considered by the Board of Supervisors. The development potential for the Via Real site in the final Plan is the same as in the Preliminary Draft 1999 Plan. Therefore there is no change in impact levels as a result of this revision.

## **Land Use-Commercial**

**Revision 1:** No requirement for Santa Claus-related theme or colors for development on Santa Claus Lane (see Policy C-TC-3 and Action C-TC-3.1).

**Effect of Revision 1 on Impact Levels:** Impact CR-5 in the EIR relates to demolition or alterations that would remove character-defining features of historically significant buildings associated with the Santa Claus theme. The EIR found that the Plan's architectural guidelines would provide an inducement

for changes that would have a potentially significant impact on the Santa Claus theme. The EIR also suggested that measures were available to mitigate this potential effect of the architectural guidelines, including requiring preservation of the Santa figure in place. The Board's Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations will explain why the mitigation measure to preserve the Santa figure in place is not feasible and will not be adopted. The Santa Claus figure, and along with it the remaining associative historic significance of the former Santa's Village complex, will be removed prior to implementation of the Toro Canyon Plan (see following discussions under Cultural Resources [History and Archaeology], Section 4.11). The Plan's design guidelines for a "Western Seaside Vernacular" architectural style are generally compatible with the area's historic architectural styles, and partially incorporate EIR Mitigation CR-4. The Board's disagreement with the EIR that a measure is infeasible to mitigate an already-identified potentially significant impact would not require recirculation of the EIR.

**Revision 2:** "Western Seaside Vernacular Architecture" proposed rather than "Seaside Vernacular Commercial" (see Policy C-TC-3 and Action C-TC-3.1).

**Effect of Revision 2 on Impact Levels:** This change of architectural style does not change impact classification levels.

## 4.2 Fire Protection and Hazards

**Revision 1:** Fire Protection Goal FIRE-TC and Policy FIRE-TC-3 clarified as to their public safety aspects.

**Effect of Revision 1 on Impact Levels:** These text revisions were included to clarify that fire prevention measures should be appropriately sited and designed to minimize exposure of people and property to wildfire hazards, while minimizing the impacts on the environment to the maximum extent feasible. This text clarification does not change the fire hazards identified under Impacts FIRE-1 and FIRE-2. No changes to the impact classifications result from this revision.

**Revision 2:** Clarified the fuel modification terms of "fuel load," "fuel break" and "fire breaks," and further detailed the evacuation setting in the Plan area.

**Effect of Revision 2 on Impact Levels:** This text revision was included to clarify the terms "fuel load," "fuel break" and "fire breaks" and does not affect environmental resources and no change to impact classification levels will result.

**Revision 3:** Clarified that fuel management plans required on parcel and tract maps in high fire hazard areas shall be reviewed during the permit application process.

**Effect of Revision 3 on Impact Levels:** This revision modified the sequence for reviewing fuel management plans from only final review and approval before recordation of the final map to include an additional review process for fuel management plans during the application review process. No changes to the Impact classifications result from this revision.

**Revision 4:** Included new development standards for ingress/egress access, roadway & driveway, and fire hydrant requirements.

**Effect of Revision 4 on Impact Levels:** This revision requires development to provide adequate ingress/egress access, minimum roadway & driveway widths and fire hydrant water pressure and distance requirements. Application of these requirements would reduce, but not substantially change the fire hazards identified under impacts FIRE-1 and FIRE-2. No changes to the impact classifications result from this revision.

**Revision 5:** Included Fuel Management Guidelines as Appendix D for development siting criteria and vegetation clearance/trimming methods to minimize fire hazards while reducing impacts to native vegetation to the maximum extent feasible.

**Effect of Revision 5 on Impact Levels:** This revision provides guidelines applicable to development in high fire hazard areas, but does not change the fire hazards identified under Impacts FIRE-1 and FIRE-2. No changes to the impact classifications result from this revision.

**Revision 6:** Fuel break requirements for tree limbing height increased from six to eight feet in DevStd FIRE-TC-3.2.

**Effect of Revision 6 on Impact Levels:** This revision permits a greater amount of tree trimming within fuel breaks adjacent to development. The increased amount of trimming is minimal and does not change impact level classifications.

### 4.3 Parks, Recreation and Trails

**Revision 1:** Trails map revised to minimize potential impacts on private property owners and the Flood Control District's operational needs:

- Added alternative route (2a) to the trail (2) at the northern end of Toro Canyon Road (PRT map and Action PRT-TC-2.3);
- Staging area location revised on Toro Canyon Road;
- Trail 6a rerouted;
- Trails 2, 7, and 11 realigned with parcel boundaries;
- Trail 10 reclassified from "high" to "low" priority.

**Effect of Revision 1 on Impact Levels:** The above map revisions would reduce the severity of Impact REC-3 regarding development of future trails being potentially constrained by vacant parcel development. Siting trails along property boundaries provides a higher potential that development of vacant properties will not preclude trail siting on the same property. The beneficial effects of this revision are not great enough to reduce Impact REC-3 from Class II to Class III.

Revision of the map to route trails along property boundaries also reduces the severity of Impact REC-5 (Class II) regarding the potential for proposed trail use to conflict with agricultural land use. Fencing to protect agricultural land uses is easier to achieve when trails are sited along property boundaries. The beneficial effects of this revision are not great enough to reduce Impact REC-5 to Class III.

The trail map revisions would also reduce the severity of Impacts REC-4 and TR-2 (Class II) regarding increased safety concerns of trail users on roadways. The new staging area location is further up Toro Canyon Road. If route 2a is built rather than 2, then the distance pedestrians would travel up Toro Canyon Road would be reduced. However, because the majority of on-road trails in Toro Canyon remain, Impacts REC-4 & TR-2 remain Class II.

**Revision 2:** Beach access Actions PRT-TC-1.3 & -1.4 (formerly Actions PRT-TC-1.4 and -1.5 under the Preliminary Draft Plan) modified to address local residents' concerns, including a clear priority for access provision at Santa Claus Lane. Deleted Preliminary Draft Plan Action PRT-TC-1.6 regarding examination of floodways for potential beach access.

**Effect of Revision 2 on Impact Levels:** Because Actions PRT-TC-1.3 and -1.4 provide more specific approaches for beach access provision, achievement of a formal beach access at Santa Claus Lane may be expedited. Former Action -1.6 was carried out during the planning process and floodways in the Plan Area were found to be infeasible for formal beach access. The benefits of the revisions within Actions PRT-TC-1.3 and -1.4 to provision of beach access outweigh the loss of Action -1.6 as a feasible mitigation measure, but neither change is enough to change the significance level of Impact REC-2, obstruction of beach access from seawall construction. Impact REC-2 remains Class II.

**Revisions 3 & 4:** The required setback of new private development from existing trails and trail easements was reduced from 100' to 50' (see DevStd PRT-TC-2.1). Deleted Preliminary Draft Plan Action PRT-TC-1.2. Added Appendix E, Trail Siting Guidelines.

**Effect of Revisions 3 & 4 on Impact Levels:** These revisions could result in increased contributions to conflicts between agricultural and residential land uses and recreational trail use, since the two uses would be more likely to occur in closer proximity (Impacts LU-4 and LU-5). However, the additional provisions under the Trail Siting Guidelines further mitigate potential land use conflicts. Impacts LU-4 and LU-5 remain Class II.

#### **4.4 Transportation and Circulation**

**Revision 1:** Roadway capacities changed to be consistent with the more conservative standards used in the Montecito Community Plan (both Design and Acceptable [LOS B] Capacities reduced). Added DevStds CIRC-TC-1.6, -4.2, -9.1 and -9.2 regarding additional provisions for alternative transportation and possible traffic calming methods.

**Effect of Revision 1 on Impact Levels:** The impacts associated with the Preliminary Draft Plan proposed Design and LOS Capacities were insignificant. The changes to the standards would not raise the level of impact to potentially significant. The additional development standards create potentially beneficial impacts in the area of transportation and circulation.

#### **4.5 Public Services: Resource Recovery, Police Protection, Schools**

**Resource Recovery and Police Protection:** Incorporated EIR Mitigations PS-1 & -2 related to Resource Recovery.

**Effect of Resource Recovery Changes on Impact Levels:** As identified in the EIR, Impact PS-1 (increased solid waste generation and landfill loading from development allowed under the Plan) would remain Class I.

**Schools:** Text modified to acknowledge that siting of a new school in the Toro Canyon Plan area may or may not be appropriate because the Toro Canyon Plan area is a small part of the larger geographic area served by the Carpinteria Unified School District. The Plan acknowledges that the District owns property on Toro Canyon Road, but the Plan neither designates nor prohibits a future school site here or elsewhere in the Plan area. New Action PS-TC-3.1 added at the Carpinteria Unified School District's request, to express the county's intent to work cooperatively with the District on future school site identification.

**Effect of Schools Changes on Impact Levels:** Text changes neither substantially contribute to nor detract from Impact PS-3 (Plan buildout would increase demands on public school facilities), although Action PS-TC-1 largely incorporates Mitigation PS-3 and the role of the County in school land use planning approaches is clarified. Impact PS-3 remains Class I.

#### **4.6 Wastewater Treatment and Disposal**

#### **4.7 Water Resources**

**Revision 1:** The two sections of Wastewater and Water were combined into one section for improved clarity. Appendix F (originally Appendix D), regarding wastewater, includes additional information regarding advanced treatment for nitrate removal in septic systems using drywells.

**Effect of Revision 1 on Impact Levels:** None, format and background information changes only, resources or impacts unaffected by the revision.

**Revision 2:** Deleted Preliminary Draft Plan Action W-TC-2 regarding a countywide Conservation Landscape Design Program, DevStd W-TC-2.4 regarding dual plumbing for graywater systems, DevStd S-TC-1.3 regarding a two-acre minimum parcel for septic system siting, Action S-TC-1.5 regarding sewer hook-up evaluations, Policy S-TC-3 and Action S-TC-3.1 regarding on-site worker sanitation facilities, and Action S-TC-4.2 regarding disposal of dog waste on public trails.

**Effect of Revision 2 on Impact Levels:** Former Action W-TC-2 regarding a countywide Conservation Landscape Design Program, is already called for in the adopted Orcutt Community Plan (Action WAT-O-3.1); deletion of this action does not affect water supply or any EIR impact significance levels.

DevStd W-TC-2.4 regarding dual plumbing for graywater systems was deemed to have the potential to create other unintended surface water quality problems. Although this standard may have had beneficial

water conservation effects, the deletion of this standard would not affect water supply or EIR impact significance levels.

Although logically, larger areas for septic disposal can create additional safeguards for water quality, the data are not currently available to show that the additional burden on property owners of a two-acre minimum lot size for septic systems would create a substantial enough gain in water quality to make the standard necessary and feasible. Although some additional beneficial safeguards for water quality may have been achieved by this standard, the one-acre minimum lot size for septic system use is considered adequate, and in any case Impact WATER-1 remains Class I.

Action S-TC-1.5 regarding sewer hook-up evaluations is appropriately covered under Final Plan Actions WW-TC-1.4 and -1.5 and would not affect Plan area water quality or EIR impact levels.

Policy S-TC-3 and Action S-TC-3.1 regarding on-site worker sanitation facilities and Action S-TC-4.2 regarding disposal of dog waste on public trails already have implementation plans under county and state agencies, therefore inclusion of the Policy and Actions would not have created a substantial beneficial effect on water quality. Impact WATER-1 remains Class I.

#### **4.8 Biological Resources**

**Revision 1:** Provided a summary of the methodology used by P&D staff to identify the biological resources in the Plan area. Included the full habitat classifications from the Plan EIR, rather than the summaries contained in previous drafts of the Plan.

**Effect of Revision 1 on Impact Levels:** This informational text revision to the Plan provides staff, applicants and the general public the methods used by P&D to identify the planning area biological resources. Full habitat classifications from the Plan EIR provide more biological information. These text revisions do not affect environmental resources and do not change impact classification levels.

**Revision 2:** Action BIO-TC-1.2 clarified to state that the listed habitat types are not categorically ESH but shall be presumed to be “environmentally sensitive,” provided that the actual habitat area(s) on a project site meet the criteria for ESH of either the Coastal Act or, for inland areas, Action BIO-TC-7.1.

**Effect of Revision 2 on Impact Levels:** This revision establishes that not all occurrences of the habitat types identified as environmentally sensitive in the coastal or inland areas of the Plan, including identification on the ESH-TCP Overlay Map, may satisfy the criteria for ESH. At the time of future development, assessment of the biological resources presumed to be environmentally sensitive would be required to determine if the on-site habitat meets the ESH criteria and subject to the policies and development standards for ESH in the Plan. At the time of development, biological habitats found not to satisfy the criteria for environmentally sensitive habitat would not be an issue, potentially reducing Impacts BIO-1, BIO-2 and BIO-6 at those locations to less than significant since ESH resources in fact would not be present.

**Revision 3:** New section format to clarify the distinct regulations for ESH in Coastal areas and Inland areas.



**Effect of Revision 3 on Impact Levels:** This text revision was included for clarification purposes only. No change to impact classification levels result.

**Revision 4:** Coastal Sage Scrub is designated as ESH throughout the Plan area.

**Effect of Revision 4 on Impact Levels:** Coastal sage scrub already designated ESH in the coastal zone would also become ESH in the inland planning area. The impact to coastal sage throughout the Plan area was identified as significant, Impact BIO-1. No change to impact classification level would result.

**Revision 5:** Within the Coastal areas of the Plan, development standards were revised to ensure compliance with the Coastal Act.

**Effect of Revision 5 on Impact Levels:** These revisions identify the appropriate Resource Protection and Development Policies of the County Local Coastal Plan, regulations of the Coastal Zoning Ordinance (Article II), and Coastal Act sections applicable to the proposed Plan policies and development standards. No change to impact classification levels would result.

**Revision 6:** Some newly identified biological resources in Rural Neighborhoods (RNs) located in Coastal areas have been changed from ESH designations to “areas of potential biological merit” requiring further biological study for ESH delineation during an application for development (note: ESH areas mapped under the existing certified LCP are to remain as is). A new policy and development standards specific to the RNs of Torito Road, Serena Park, La Paquita and Ocean Oaks Road were included to provide regulations for the protection of ESH related to both new development and additions to existing development.

**Effect of Revision 6 on Impact Levels:** The change in these Rural Neighborhoods from ESH designations to areas of potential biological merit recognizes the existing land subdivision and built environment where existing structures and related landscaped areas are within the ESH buffer and not part of the ESH itself. At the time of development, further biological study for ESH delineation would be required, and where no ESH is identified this could change the impact level classification to less than significant. Areas identified at the time of development as ESH would be subject to the Plan regulations for new development and additions to existing development. Impact BIO-1 level classification would remain significant (Class I).

**Revision 7:** In the Inland areas of the Plan, several ESH buffer and development standards were revised to provide greater flexibility: 1) siting guidelines were added for additions to existing development within ESH and ESH buffer areas; 2) new policies were included to provide flexibility for ESH regulations on agriculturally zoned parcels; and 3) native tree protection was clarified, with greater weight given to the protection of mature protected trees that have grown into the natural stature particular to the species.

**Effect of Revision 7 on Impact Levels:** While the revised development standards provide additional flexibility, the intent remains to design development in a manner that protects biological resources to the maximum extent feasible. Impact classification levels would remain significant for Impacts BIO-1, BIO-3 and BIO-6 (Class I).

**Revision 8:** Landscaping regulations were clarified for development subject to a Restoration Plan requirement or a Landscape Plan requirement. Using plants grown from local seed stock is encouraged.

**Effect of Revision 8 on Impact Levels:** The revised landscape regulations for development require a more stringent planting restriction within ESH and ESH buffer areas (Restoration Plan) than landscaping regulations outside the ESH and ESH buffer area (Landscape Plan). Allowing for less restrictive planting requirements located outside the ESH and ESH buffer areas does not change the impact level classification since the Impact BIO-6 identifies impacts to sensitive species as significant (Class I).

**Revision 9:** Eliminated the Constrained Site Guidelines from the Plan, due to the Constraint Mapping Tools that were implemented countywide by P&D in February 2001.

**Effect of Revision 9 on Impact Levels:** Removing the Constrained Site Guidelines from the Plan does not substantially change the remaining Plan policies and development standards intended to site development in a manner to protect environmentally sensitive habitat resources and general biological resources to the maximum extent feasible. No change to impact classification levels would result. The Constrained Site Guidelines would still be applicable as a countywide implementation tool to review future development.

**Revision 10:** Numerous site-specific refinements of the biological resources/ESH map, at the request of property owners.

**Effect of Revision 10 on Impact Levels:** The refinement of the biological/ESH map was done on several properties, reducing or eliminating the amount of mapped ESH on the respective properties. On properties where no ESH has been identified, any impacts to actual ESH resources in fact would not occur. In areas where the amount of ESH mapped was reduced, but not eliminated, impacts to ESH would remain potentially significant. Overall, impacts to ESH due to buildout allowed under the Plan would remain Class I.

**Revision 11:** Included Guidelines for Salmonid Passage at Stream Crossings as Appendix G (see also DevStd BIO-TC-15.2), and a list of invasive plants to be avoided in landscape plans near ESH areas as Appendix H (see also DevStd BIO-TC-2.2).

**Effect of Revision 11 on Impact Levels:** Inclusion of these two Appendices provides supplemental reference information to the development standards contained in the Biological Resources Section in the Plan addressing protection of the Southern California steelhead trout and landscaping outside ESH and ESH buffer areas. This additional reference information does not change Impact BIO-6. Impact level to sensitive species would remain significant (Class I).

**Revision 12:** Special exemptions written into the applicable zoning ordinances making it possible to repair, reconstruct and replace many nonconforming structures throughout the Plan area, with various provisions for residential, agricultural, and other non-residential structures (see Policies BIO-TC-6 & -10 and Development Standards BIO-TC-4.4, -5.1, -5.3, -7.5, & -7.8, as well as the TCP Overlay Districts of the Art. II & III zoning ordinances).

**Effect of Revision 12 on Impact Levels:** This modification will allow many structures that are currently nonconforming or become nonconforming under the Plan to be maintained in biologic resource areas. The continued fragmentation and impacts to resources from these structures would continue. Fire safety clearing and impacts to sensitive species is also likely to continue. Impact level classifications for Impact BIO-1, BIO-3, BIO-4 and BIO-6 would remain significant (Class I).

#### **4.9 Flooding and Drainage**

**Revision 1:** An action item was added to the Plan to address drainage issues along the southeastern portion of Padaro Lane (see Action FLD-TC-1.5.)

**Effect of Revision 1 on Impact Levels:** This action addresses an existing issue in the plan area, it would not lead to the expenditure of public funds to address issues associated with new development. It would not exacerbate Impacts FLOODING-1 or -2, and these Impacts remain Class II.

#### **4.10 Geology, Hillsides and Drainage**

**Revision 1:** Threshold for general restrictions on slope development raised from 20% to 30% (DevStd GEO-TC-1.1).

**Effect of Revision 1 on Impact Levels:** Approximately 100 potential new units could be built in areas with slopes of 20 percent or greater. DevStd GEO-TC-1.1 would require geologic evaluation for development on slopes of 20% or more to establish that the proposed project will not result in unstable slopes or severe erosion, and development would be prohibited on slopes over 30% unless this would preclude reasonable use of property. Despite the required geotechnical evaluations, development on 20% to 30% slopes would contribute to potential erosion, geologic hazard risks, and potential for scarring from pre-permitting activities. Revision 1 contributes to Impacts GEO-1, -2, and -3 and all three impacts remain Class I.

**Revision 2:** DevStd GEO-TC-4.3 added to clarify that repair and maintenance of existing seawalls, and the filling of gaps between them, may be permitted consistent with Coastal Plan Policy 3-1.

**Effect of Revision 2 on Impact Levels:** Revision 2 would contribute to impact GEO-4 because the revision allows the potential for additional shoreline protection structures to be built. Impact GEO-4 remains Class I.

**Revision 3:** EIR mitigation measures for air quality impacts (fugitive dust) incorporated as Policy GEO-TC-5 and DevStds GEO-TC-5.1 & -5.2.

**Effect of Revision 2 on Impact Levels:** The incorporation of these mitigation measures from the EIR does not change the air quality impact levels (Class II).

#### **4.11 Cultural Resources (History and Archaeology)**

**Revision 1:** Phase 1 Archaeological Report requirements were modified for greater property owner flexibility (see DevStd HA-TC-1.1 and 1.2).

**Effect of Revision 1 on Impact Levels:** The Preliminary Draft Plan Action HA-TC-1.2 and DevStd HA-TC-1.1 are based on the “County Regulations Governing Archaeological and Historical Projects” for Phase I and Phase II requirements in archaeologically sensitive areas. The revised development standards HA-TC-1.1 and 1.2 also refer to typical Phase I and II archaeological requirements, with the added flexibility of a “short form” report where an archaeologist finds that the likelihood for presence of archaeological resources at a site is extremely low. The revised development standard would result in similar levels of protection for archaeological resources. Impacts CR-1, -2, and -4 remain Class I.

**Revision 2:** Santa Claus Lane addresses removed from table of historic resources (Table 13, formerly Table IV.D-1) and from DevStd HA-TC-2.3, and former Figure IV.D-2 removed, in recognition of the Board’s intent to allow removal of the Santa/chimney structure contingent upon photo-documentation of the entire “Santa’s Village” complex and other mitigation measures applied under a separate Coastal Development Permit.

**Effect of Revision 2 on Impact Levels:** These revisions result from the legal infeasibility of Mitigation CR-3 to require preservation of the Santa figure in place. These revisions are not related to the Lane’s rezone to C-1 under the Plan, but rather are a result of permits applied for by the owner of the Santa Claus building (still subject to pre-Plan CH zoning). The Board’s Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations will explain why the mitigation measure identified in the EIR will not be adopted, and the Board’s disagreement with the EIR that a measure is infeasible to mitigate an already-identified potentially significant impact would not require recirculation of the EIR.

**Revision 3:** Added Action HA-TC-2.4 regarding placing a sign along Highway 101 to recognize the historic value of the historic memorial oak trees.

**Effect of Revision 3 on Impact Levels:** Revision 3 has a beneficial effect for cultural resource protection, but does not affect the significance of any impacts identified in the EIR.

#### **4.12 Visual & Aesthetic Resources**

**Revision 1:** Visual & Aesthetic Resources policies and standards rewritten in some cases and re-organized as a result of Planning Commission review and collaboration with the County Board of Architectural Review (BAR).

**Effect of Revision 1 on Impact Levels:** The wording changes for some policies and standards and re-organization of the Visual & Aesthetic Resources section of the Plan is in keeping with the Preliminary Draft Plan’s protection of Visual & Aesthetic Resources. The changes make the section easier to interpret and apply, but do not affect the significance of Impacts VIS-1, -2, or -3.

**Revision 2:** Design Overlay zoning added to the entire Plan area, so that most new development projects will be reviewed by the BAR. Also added requirement to mail notices to property owners of a project's initial BAR hearing.

**Effect of Revision 2 on Impact Levels:** BAR review of projects and notification of affected property owners provides additional safeguards to ensure projects are compatible with surrounding development, minimize alteration of viewsheds, and reduce unnecessary nighttime glare. Revision 2 somewhat lessens Impacts VIS-1, -2 and -3, but these impacts remain Class I.

**Revision 3:** Height limits in the Plan area were specified (overall twenty-five foot limit throughout the Plan area, with pre-existing standard height limits and possible exceptions for those projects subject to the Ridgeline and Hillside Development Guidelines). If exemptions to height limits are granted, the reasons why any such exemptions are granted must be documented.

**Effect of Revision 3 on Impact Levels:** Revision 3 provides additional safeguards to ensure that projects are compatible with surrounding development and that alteration of viewsheds is minimized. Revision 3 somewhat lessens Impacts VIS-1 and -2, but these impacts remain Class I.

**Revision 4:** Rather than a standard where a 16 foot height limit applies to projects that include ten feet or more of fill or foundation elevation, a simpler guideline is included stating that fill generally should not be more than five feet above natural grade (Policy GEO-TC-6.) Added Development Standard VIS-TC-1.4 regarding siting of structures on ridgelines and VIS-TC-2.2 regarding grading methods.

**Effect of Revision 4 on Impact Levels:** Revision 4 provides additional safeguards to ensure that projects are compatible with surrounding development and that alteration of viewsheds is minimized. Revision 4 somewhat lessens Impacts VIS-1 and -2, but these impacts remain Class I.

**Revision 5:** Requirements added that the total height of cut slopes and fill slopes shall not exceed 16 vertical feet and the visible portion of a retaining wall shall not exceed six feet (see TCP Overlay District, items H and I).

**Effect of Revision 5 on Impact Levels:** Revision 5 provides additional safeguards to ensure that projects are compatible with surrounding development and that alteration of viewsheds is minimized. Revision 5 somewhat lessens Impacts VIS-1 and -2, but these impacts remain Class I.

**Revision 6:** Deleted Preliminary Draft Plan Policy VIS-TC-2 and associated development standards regarding prohibition against landscaping that blocks or obstructs public views of the ocean.

**Effect of Revision 6 on Impact Levels:** Preliminary Draft Plan Policy VIS-TC-2 lessened Impact VIS-1 regarding the character of viewsheds. Without this policy, Impact VIS-1 may be somewhat more severe, but not substantially so, and in any case Impact VIS-1 remains Class I.

**Revision 7:** Deleted Preliminary Draft Plan Policy 5 regarding Greenhouses.

**Effect of Revision 7 on Impact Levels:** In general, items in the Plan related to greenhouse development were deleted because such items are covered in the Carpinteria Valley Greenhouse

Program. The deletion does not affect Impacts VIS-1, -2 and -3, and greenhouse development environmental impacts are analyzed separately under the Carpinteria Valley Greenhouse Program EIR.

#### **4.13 Air Quality**

**Revisions:** EIR mitigation measures for air quality impacts (fugitive dust) were incorporated as Policy GEO-TC-5 and DevStds GEO-TC-5.1 & -5.2; see Geology Revision 3 above.

**Effect of Revisions on Impact Levels:** Impacts AQ-1 and -2 remain Class II.

#### **4.14 Noise**

**Revisions:** EIR mitigation measures for construction noise impacts were incorporated as Policy LUG-TC-5 and DevStds LUG-TC-5.1 & -5.2; see Land Use-General Revision 7 above.

**Effect of Revisions on Impact Levels:** Impacts NOISE-1 and -2 remain Class II.

### **5.0 Minor Text Changes and Clarifications to Original Project Description**

Various other text edits and clarifications were made throughout the Plan, none of which have any effects on the conclusions of 2000-EIR-1 regarding the potential adverse or beneficial environmental effects of the Plan.

### **6.0 Errata to the Final EIR Summary Table**

- **Pages 1-17 & -18:** Due to a table formatting error, Mitigations VIS-6, -7 & -8 appear to be “orphaned.” Mitigations VIS-6 & -7 address Impact VIS-2 on p. 1-17, and Mitigation VIS-8 addresses Impact VIS-3 on p. 1-18.
- **Page 1-20:** The first entry in the third column (incorrectly labeled Mitigation REC-4) is erroneous and should be disregarded.
- **Pages 1-26 through -28:** The table headings on these pages should read “CLASS III - ADVERSE BUT LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS” as on p. 1-25.

## Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program (2000-EIR-1)

### Toro Canyon Plan: February 14, 2002

When making findings required for project approval, Public Resources Code 21081.6 requires public agencies to "adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes made to the project [which] mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment." The following table comprises the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for the Toro Canyon Plan. Mitigation measures are cited by title as they appear in the EIR; the Plan's Policies, Actions, Development Standards and associated Zoning Ordinance provisions that reflect these mitigation measures are cited and explained in the adopted legislative Findings.

Mitigation Measure	Policy, Action, and/or Development Standard	Monitoring Action	Timing	Party Responsible for Implementation	Monitoring/Reporting Schedule	Party Responsible for Verification
LU-1: Landscaping plans for new development	GEO-TC-1.2	Review landscaping plan, verify installation of plantings and maintenance	Prior to approval of development permit(s)	P&D	Verification prior to occupancy clearance and periodic ongoing checks to ensure compliance	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance
LU-3: Incorporate "No Subdivision" alternative for area north of East Valley Road and west of Ladera Lane	Partially reflected in land use and zoning designations of the adopted Plan (ten-acre minimum lot size); only the La Casa de Maria Retreat Center property could be further subdivided	N/A	Upon Plan adoption	P&D	N/A	P&D, Comprehensive Planning
LU-4: Locate trails, where feasible, along property boundaries	Trail Siting Guidelines, Appendix E of the adopted Plan	Plan and implement trails in conformance with siting guidelines	At time of trail siting and/or construction	Parks; P&D (if permits required)	N/A	Parks; P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance (if permits required)
LU-5: Install internal access control barriers to prevent trespass, vandalism, and/or entry into environmentally sensitive areas	Trail Siting Guidelines, Appendix E of the adopted Plan	Plan and implement trails in conformance with siting guidelines	At time of trail siting and/or construction	Parks; P&D (if permits required)	N/A	Parks; P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance (if permits required)

Mitigation Measure	Policy, Action, and/or Development Standard	Monitoring Action	Timing	Party Responsible for Implementation	Monitoring/Reporting Schedule	Party Responsible for Verification
LU-6: Realign proposed Lambert Trail along property boundaries	Reflected on PRT Map adopted in the adopted Plan	N/A	Upon Plan adoption	P&D	N/A	P&D, Comprehensive Planning
LU-7: Consider locating trail staging area on upper Toro Canyon Road	Action PRT-TC-1.8, also reflected on PRT Map in the adopted Plan	N/A	Non-specific; likely at such time as either Trail 2 or 2a (Romero Trail-Toro Canyon Road) connector may be implemented	Parks, Public Works	N/A	Parks
LU-8: Site and design trailhead parking to minimize disruption to existing neighborhoods	Action PRT-TC-1.9	Incorporate into plans for any trailhead parking areas	Non-specific	Parks, Public Works, P&D (if permits required)	N/A	Parks; P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance (if permits required)
REC-1: Develop neighborhood park in lower Toro Canyon-Serena Park area	Action PRT-TC-1.2	N/A	Non-specific	Parks; P&D (if permits required)	N/A	Parks; P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance (if permits required)
REC-3: On Padaro Lane, allow only pedestrian & bicycle visitation; work with residents and Public Works to install "No Parking" signs; provide bicycle racks & trash cans	Action PRT-TC-1.3	N/A	At such time as a specific vertical access on Padaro Lane may be planned and opened for public use	Parks, P&D	N/A	Parks; P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance
REC-4: Formalize public beach access on Santa Claus Lane	Action PRT-TC-1.4	N/A	At such time as a specific vertical access on Santa Claus Lane may be planned and opened for public use	Parks, P&D	N/A	Parks; P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance



Mitigation Measure	Policy, Action, and/or Development Standard	Monitoring Action	Timing	Party Responsible for Implementation	Monitoring/Reporting Schedule	Party Responsible for Verification
REC-5: Public Works to consult with Park Dept. before issuing encroachment permits affecting on-road trails	Action PRT-TC-1.6	Review and approval of site and building plans	Prior to approval of encroachment permits	Public Works, Parks	Ongoing, as encroachment permits may be requested	Parks, Public Works
REC-7: Adopt Trail Siting Guidelines	Trail Siting Guidelines, Appendix E of the adopted Plan	Plan and implement trails in conformance with siting guidelines	At time of trail siting and/or construction	Parks; P&D (if permits required)	N/A	Parks; P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance (if permits required)
TR-1: Investigate source of elevated collision rates at SR 192/Cravens Lane and implement any appropriate corrective measures	Action CIRC-TC-1.2	Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) or other appropriate means	Non-specific - at such time as TIP or other appropriate means may be undertaken	Public Works, Caltrans	At such time as TIP or other appropriate means may be undertaken	Public Works, Caltrans
TR-2: Design new on-road trails to maximize road shoulder width to separate vehicles & trail users	DevStd PRT-TC-2.2 and the Trail Siting Guidelines, Appendix E of the adopted Plan	Plan and implement trails in conformance with siting guidelines	At time of trail siting and/or construction	Parks, Public Works, Caltrans; P&D (if permits required)	N/A	Parks; P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance (if permits required)
PS-1: Encourage residential participation in existing recycling and green waste collection programs	Action PS-TC-1.1	Ongoing	Ongoing	Public Works	Ongoing (periodic reports required under Integrated Waste Management Plan)	Public Works, Integrated Waste Management Board
PS-2: Collect and recycle materials from construction sites	DevStd PS-TC-1.3	Review and approval of site and building plans	At time of development permit approval	P&D	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance
PS-TC-1.3: Work with Carpinteria Unified School District to identify suitable new school site(s)	Action PS-TC-3.1	N/A – commitment to work with District upon request	Non-specific; depends upon District	P&D,	N/A	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance

Mitigation Measure	Policy, Action, and/or Development Standard	Monitoring Action	Timing	Party Responsible for Implementation	Monitoring/Reporting Schedule	Party Responsible for Verification
WAT-1: Require measures to decrease nitrate loading of groundwater	DevStd WW-TC-2.3	Inspect installation of advanced treatment for nitrate removal on drywell systems	At time of permit review for new drywell disposal fields	EHS	Ongoing, through project conditions	EHS
WAT-2: Install second backup wastewater disposal field, and reserve area for third field	DevStd WW-TC-2.1	Inspect installation upon approval of new disposal fields	At time of permit review for new disposal fields	EHS	Ongoing, through project conditions	EHS
BIO-1: Minimize impacts to butterfly trees in development of public beach access on Padaro Lane	Action PRT-TC-1.3	Review access plans for potential impacts to butterfly trees	At such time as a specific vertical access on Padaro Lane may be planned and opened for public use	Parks, P&D	N/A	P&D, Development Review and Permit Compliance
BIO-2: Buffers for Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest to be measured from top of bank or edge of canopy, whichever is further	DevStd BIO-TC-1.4	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance
BIO-3: Preserve significant resources within and near ESH areas by using appropriate plantings	DevStds BIO-TC-4.3 & -7.7	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance
BIO-4: Buffers for oak riparian forest to be measured from top of bank or edge of canopy, whichever is further	DevStds BIO-TC-1.4 & -11.1	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance
BIO-5: Maintain streamflow for alluvial well and stream diversion projects	DevStd BIO-TC-11.2	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance
BIO-6: Recognize and protect wildlife corridors that provide connections between communities	Policy BIO-TC-12 and DevStd BIO-TC-12.1	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance

Mitigation Measure	Policy, Action, and/or Development Standard	Monitoring Action	Timing	Party Responsible for Implementation	Monitoring/Reporting Schedule	Party Responsible for Verification
BIO-7: Limit amount of ESH cleared for development on inland area parcels entirely covered by ESH	DevStd BIO-TC-7.6	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance
BIO-8: Develop list of invasive species to avoid planting in and near ESH areas	Policy BIO-TC-2, DevStds BIO-TC-2.1 & -2.2, Appendix H	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance
BIO-10: Tree protection for raptor roosting sites	Policies BIO-TC-13 & -14, DevStds BIO-TC-13.1 & -13.2	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance
BIO-11: Prevent adverse surface water quality impacts due to septic system waste loading	DevStd WW-TC-2.7	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	EHS and P&D	Ongoing, through permit decisions and project conditions	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance
BIO-12: Designate watershed lands not currently used for agriculture as "Mountainous Area"	Reflected in land use and zoning designations of the adopted Plan	N/A	Upon Plan adoption	P&D	N/A	P&D, Comprehensive Planning
BIO-14: Fuelbreaks to avoid or minimize impacts to oaks and other sensitive species	DevStds FIRE-TC-3.2 and BIO-TC-4.3 & -7.7	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D and Fire Protection Districts	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance
BIO-15: Minimize removal of vegetation for fuel breaks	Policy FIRE-TC-3 & DevStd FIRE-TC-3.1	Implemented through development review conditions	At time of permit review	P&D and Fire Protection Districts	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance
BIO-17: Prepare Fire Protection Plan	Actions FIRE-TC-2.8 & -2.9	N/A	Non-specific	Fire Protection Districts, USFS, P&D, Public Works, County Fire Dept.	Non-specific	P&D, Comprehensive Planning
BIO-19: Prohibit jet skis and other motorized recreational craft from using the Santa Claus beach access	Action PRT-TC-1.4	Ongoing enforcement upon implementation of accessway(s) at Santa Claus beach	Non-specific	Parks	N/A	Parks

Mitigation Measure	Policy, Action, and/or Development Standard	Monitoring Action	Timing	Party Responsible for Implementation	Monitoring/Reporting Schedule	Party Responsible for Verification
BIO-20: require appropriate biological assessment for projects that could affect steelhead trout	Policy BIO-TC-15 & DevStd BIO-TC-15.1	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D, Fish & Game, USFWS, NMFS, Army Corps of Engineers	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance
BIO-21: Follow NMFS "Guidelines for Salmonid Passage at Stream Crossings" as appropriate	Policy BIO-TC-15 & DevStd BIO-TC-15.2; Guidelines included in Plan as Appendix G	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D, Fish & Game, USFWS, NMFS, Army Corps of Engineers	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance
GEO-1: Use temporary erosion control measures at construction sites during the rainy season	DevStd GEO-TC-2.1	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review, Permit Compliance, and Building & Safety
GEO-2: Revegetate project sites to prevent erosion and mass wasting	DevStd GEO-TC-2.3	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review, Permit Compliance, and Building & Safety
GEO-3: Require appropriate geotechnical reports and plans for development on steep slopes and other hazard areas	DevStds FLD-TC-2.2, GEO-TC-1.2, -3.1, & -3.3	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D, Flood Control	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review, Permit Compliance, and Building & Safety; Flood Control (drainage plans)
GEO-4: Consider amending countywide grading ordinance to require permits for roadways needed for geotechnical investigations involving substantial grading	Action GEO-TC-3.4	N/A	Non-specific	P&D	N/A	P&D, Comprehensive Planning and Building & Safety
CR-1: Archaeological reports for development in potentially sensitive areas	DevStds HA-TC-1.1 & -1.2	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance
CR-2: Consider creation of archaeological resource sensitivity map	Action HA-TC-1.3	N/A	Non-specific	P&D	N/A	P&D, Comprehensive Planning

Mitigation Measure	Policy, Action, and/or Development Standard	Monitoring Action	Timing	Party Responsible for Implementation	Monitoring/Reporting Schedule	Party Responsible for Verification
CR-4: Mitigation of development-related impacts to historically significant buildings	DevStd HA-TC-2.3	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance
VIS-1: Design review guidelines for development visible from public locations	DevStds VIS-TC-1.2, -1.3 & -2.1, Actions VIS-TC-2.4 & -2.6 (latter incorporated into TCP Zoning Overlay), and DevStd GEO-TC-1.2	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D, BAR	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance
VIS-9: Minimize fugitive lighting	Action VIS-TC-2.6, incorporated into TCP Zoning Overlay	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance
FLD-1: Limit excavation and grading to the dry season unless there is an approved erosion control plan in place	DevStd FLD-TC-2.5	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review & Permit Compliance, Flood Control
FLD-2: Require grading and drainage plans for development that increases site runoff or substantially alters drainage patterns	DevStd FLD-TC-2.2	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review, Permit Compliance and Building & Safety; Flood Control
AQ-1: Implement APCD dust control measures	DevStd GEO-TC-5.1 and Policy GEO-TC-5	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review, Permit Compliance and Building & Safety; APCD
NOISE-1: Limit hours of construction near existing residential uses	DevStd LUG-TC-5.1 and Policy LUG-TC-5	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review, Permit Compliance and Building & Safety
NOISE-2: Shield excessively noisy stationary construction equipment at site boundaries, and locate away from sensitive receptors	DevStd LUG-TC-5.2 and Policy LUG-TC-5	Implemented through development permit conditions	At time of permit review	P&D	Ongoing, through project conditions	P&D, Development Review, Permit Compliance and Building & Safety

