BURTON RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN
REVISED FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
EIR 02-01
LIST OF REVISIONS

AS AMENDED FOR
LOMPOC CITY COUNCIL MEETING
FEBRUARY 7, 2006

The following document lists revisions to the Revised Final Environmental Impact Report dated September 2005. Additions are underlined, and deleted text is indicated by strikeouts.

Executive Summary

Page	*Revision*

ES-5 *Description of Impact* **AES-1:**

Development of the existing open space character of the project site would substantially obstruct views of important physical attributes throughout the Burton Ranch Specific Plan property.

ES-7 *Mitigation Measure* for **TRANS-1.3**:

Improvements to the existing circulation network (TRANS-1.2a through TRANS-1.2d) and contribution of transportation mitigation fees (TRANS-1.2e and TRANS-1.2f) would reduce project specific daily traffic impacts on the transportation system. In addition, adherence to mitigation measure TRANS-1.5~~1~~1a~~,~~ and TRANS-1.1c, requiring an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans and Santa Barbara County, respectively, would further reduce impacts on transportation and circulation.

ES-10 *Mitigation Measure* **BIO-1.1b**:

Native habitats not affected by clearing, grubbing, grading, and construction activities, including areas designated as open space (Land Use Area 7) and the adjacent BMER (along the northern boundary of the property) shall be protected during project construction and occupancy~~by a preservation buffer~~.

At a minimum, a 100-foot buffer between the BMER on the northern project boundary and any activities associated with project development, prohibiting vegetation removal, ground disturbance, human access, fire management, or other actions associated with construction or occupancy of the project, site shall be required. ~~In addition, any areas within this 100-foot protection buffer that are currently disturbed, such as access corridors, shall be revegetated to prevent any further degradation or invasion by non-native plant species and shall protect the adjacent BMER.~~

Page *Revision*

ES-10 *Mitigation Measure* **BIO-1.1b**, Inserted between the first and second paragraph:

The boundary of open space Land Use Area 7 located within 50-feet of any future ground disturbances shall be temporarily fenced (i.e., with plastic construction or chain link fence) throughout all vegetation clearing, grubbing, grading, and construction activities. All personnel, equipment, and ground disturbances including grading for buildings, roads, easements, utilities, staging areas, and vegetation removal shall be prohibited within the open space area.

ES-11 *Mitigation Measure* **BIO-1.1c**, second paragraph deleted:

~~The Burton Ranch Specific Plan applicants and landowners of Plan Unit 1 and 2 have acquired a 102-acre property north of the project site for the purpose of meeting mitigation requirements. The Purisima mitigation site connects two parcels within the existing BMER and supports 88.3 acres of high quality Burton Mesa chaparral habitat. Acquisition of the Purisima mitigation site's 88.3 acres would adequately mitigate for the direct loss and fragmentation of 79 acres of Burton Mesa chaparral on the Burton Ranch Specific Plan site, providing an excess of 9.3 acres preserved.~~

ES-11 *Mitigation Measure* **BIO-1.1d**:

a. A map depicting the location of the project site relative to the off-site Burton Mesa chaparral mitigation site.

ES-12 *Mitigation Measure* **BIO-1.1d**:

Renamed to *Mitigation Measure* **BIO-1.2.**

ES-21 *Mitigation Measure* **GEO-1a.1:**

a. Intercept drains shall be installed north of the most northerly residential units in Land Use Area ~~4~~ 3 and 5 to prevent upslope surface water from seeping into near-surface soils. (*4 changed to 3*)

ES-23 *Mitigation Measure* **GEO-2.1,** 2nd sentence:

A complete list of recommendations is provided in Appendices E ~~1~~ 2 and F, however, the following recommendations are directly associated with differential settlement and slope failure and include:

ES-25 *Mitigation Measure* **HYDRO/WQ-1,** 5th sentence:

An encroachment permit shall be obtained from Caltrans prior to construction of the culvert under State Highway 1.

Page *Revision*

ES-28 *Mitigation Measure* **NOISE-2b:**

A City-qualified noise consultant shall submit noise attenuation evaluations for residential unit building plans ~~proposed structures~~ within 300 feet of State Highway 1 and 185 feet of Harris Grade Road…

ES-30 *Mitigation Measure* **PS-2.2.2b:**

The applicant shall prepare a fire vegetation maintenance plan ~~that includes~~incorporating either Option 1 (including a, b, and c), 2, or 3 ~~the following~~:

1a. A mosaic fuel break with a minimum 100-foot width from all residential and educational structures in lieu of a traditional fire break that shall be implemented as an interface between residential development and open space along Land Use Area 7 and the northern project boundary in Land Use Areas ~~4~~ 3 and 5. (*4 changed to 3*)

1b. Within the mosaic fuel break, all flammable vegetation shall be removed within a minimum of 30-feet of structures.

1c. Adjacent islands of native vegetation within 30 to 100 feet of structures shall be retained, surrounded by intervening low-flammable, drought-tolerant vegetation. The intervening planted areas shall be periodically irrigated, mowed, or cleared.

2. Establish a 300-foot buffer area between project development and the BMER to ensure additional protection of the habitat and reduce the impact on Burton Mesa chaparral (see Figure 4.3-2). Alternatively, to minimize the loss of Burton Mesa chaparral, the 300-foot buffer could be averaged across the northern boundary of the property (this would include the 100-foot minimum buffer at the northeast corner of the site, greater than 100-foot buffer at the northern boundary, and all of Land Use Area 7, as depicted in Figure 4.3-2).

3. Construct an internal non-collector roadway parallel to and directly south of the solid wall (see Figure 4.3-3). The paved roadway would act as a firebreak that would minimize the amount of area requiring vegetation clearance and maintenance south of the wall.

ES-30 *Mitigation Measure* **PS-6.2:**

A development fee of ~~$454~~ 488 per single family dwelling unit and ~~$423~~ 455 per multi-family unit,…

ES-31 *Mitigation Measure* **REC-1:**

A development fee of ~~$6,876.00~~ 7,391.00 per single family dwelling unit and ~~$6,418.00~~ 6,899.00 per multi-family unit,…

Page *Revision*

ES-33 *Mitigation Measure* **TRANS-1.2f:**

A development fee of $3,926 per single family dwelling unit and $2,756 per multi-family unit including traffic signal, street improvement, and bikeway impact fees, subject to change based on the Lompoc Impact Fee Study Report,...

ES-35 *Mitigation Measure* **TRANS-3.2d**, 2nd sentence:

In the event that an agreement is reached between the applicant and the Lompoc Unified School District but the school is not built by residential project buildout, the applicant shall provide funds sufficient to complete these improvements. ~~The applicant shall be responsible for funding the intersection improvement.~~

ES-44 **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Cumulative Impacts,** 2nd paragraph:

The project's removal of native habitats (i.e., approximately ~~115~~ 103 acres of the 149-acre project site), would represent a substantial contribution to this cumulative impact, as well as a net loss of habitat, and would therefore be significant.

ES-45 **HYDROLOGY(WATER QUANTITY) Cumulative Impacts,** 4th and 5th sentences:

The proposed Burton Ranch Specific Plan and MHCSD service area development buildout would increase overdraft in the Lompoc Upland Area basin to 1,833- 1,842 AFY (existing overdraft of 906 AFY + estimated project demand of 189-198 AFY +Northern Lompoc Area buildout of 381 AFY + Mission Hills Community Service District additional projected growth of 357 AFY). This would decrease the availability of regional water supplies to approximately 92-93 years (170,000 AFY/1,833- 1,842 AFY).

In the absence of any supplemental water source, the amount of water for homes and farms in ~~101~~ approximately 92-93 years would be severely limited and the quality of this water would be extremely poor.

2.0 *Project Description*

Page *Revision*

2-13 **Land Use Area 5,** 2nd sentence:

If the Lompoc Unified School District were to decline to accept the school site, or acceptable terms would not be agreed to between the property owner and the school district, this would be planned as part of Land Use Area 3. ~~4.~~ (*4 changed to 3*)

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Page *Revision*

4.0-2 **Land Use Area 5,** -1st sentence:

Approximately 12 acres, ~~1-2~~ 2-3 DU/acre.

4.1 Aesthetics

Page *Revision*

4.1-15 **Impact AES-1,** 3rd paragraph:

As shown in Figure 2-3, the remaining ~~8~~ 10 acres of undeveloped open space in Land Use Area 7 and ~~3.3~~ 2 to 3 acres of park in Land Use Area 6 would preserve areas containing the site's important visual resources.

4.1-19 **Impact AES-2,** 2nd sentence:

As shown in Figure 2-3, ~~8~~ 10 acres of undeveloped open space would be preserved in Land Use Area 7, and 2 to 3 ~~3.3~~ acres of parkland would be sited in Land Use Area 6.

4.1-31 **Policy 2.5,** 2nd sentence:

The small drainage swale supporting seasonal wetland vegetation in Land Use Area 1, the ~~3.3~~ 2- to 3-acre Land Use Area 6 that incorporates a stand of oak trees in a passive park, and the ~~8~~ 10-acre Land Use Area 7 that is highly constrained by steep topography, erosive slopes,...

4.2 Air Quality

Page *Revision*

4.2-17 **Impact AQ-2.1,** 2nd paragraph, last sentence:

As a result, project traffic associated with this project would result in *adverse, but less than significant* (Class III) impacts on the NAAQS and CAAQS for CO.

4.3 Biological Resources

Page *Revision*

4.3-21 **Table 4.3-4**, Total Acres column:

Habitat	*Plan Unit*								*Total Acres*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Burton Mesa Chaparral	5	74			1	2.5	1.5	9	93
Mature Phase	5	56			1			*9*	~~70~~ 71.0
Coast Live Oak Phase		9.5							~~9~~ 9.5
Black Sage Phase		5							5
Goldenbush Phase		3.5							~~3~~ 3.5

Page *Revision*

4.3.-24 *Mitigation Measure* **BIO-1.1b,** 1st paragraph:

Native habitats not affected by clearing, grubbing, grading, and construction activities, including areas designated as open space (Land Use Area 7) and the adjacent BMER (along the northern boundary of the property) shall be protected during project construction and occupancy~~by a preservation buffer~~.

At a minimum, a 100-foot buffer between the BMER on the northern project boundary and any activities associated with project development, prohibiting vegetation removal, ground disturbance, human access, fire management, or other actions associated with construction or occupancy of the project, site shall be required. ~~In addition, any areas within this 100-foot protection buffer that are currently disturbed, such as access corridors, shall be revegetated to prevent any further degradation or invasion by non-native plant species and shall protect the adjacent BMER.~~

4.3-25 *Mitigation Measure* **BIO-1.1b,** 3rd paragraph:

In order to avoid ~~allow~~ additional indirect impacts on native habitat south of the solid wall, one of the following (a, b, or c) is required:

4.3-26 *Mitigation Measure* **BIO-1.1b,** 4th paragraph, 2nd sentence:

Added to Land Use Area 7, the total preserved Burton Mesa chaparral on site would be approximately 14 acres, and the residual loss of Burton Mesa chaparral habitat would be 79 acres~~)~~.

Page *Revision*

4.3-26 *Mitigation Measure* **BIO-1.1b,** 4th paragraph, last sentence:

Therefore, when an average preservation buffer extending from the northern project boundary across the entire project site is determined, the width of the buffer extending over Land Use Area ~~4~~ 3 and 5 can be less than 300 feet. (*4 changed to 3*)

4.3-35 2nd Paragraph:

Burton Ranch Specific Plan buildout impacts (taking into account the preservation of 10 acres ~~as originally proposed without Specific Plan revisions to~~of Land Use Area 7 and 4 acres for the 100-foot buffer on the northern project site boundary adjacent to the BMER) and Purisima mitigation site habitat comparison is summarized below.

4.3-36 *Mitigation Measure* **BIO-1.1d***:*

Rename to *Mitigation Measure* **BIO-1.2.**

4.3-43 **Impact BIO-2.1,** 3rd paragraph, 6th through 8th sentences:

San Luis Obispo wallflower was found in four locations in the northwest part of the site in Plan Unit 2. Two locations are ~~along~~ adjacent to the Specific Plan boundary fence line, just south of ~~and within the adjacent to~~ the ~~existing~~ BMER. The locations would be ~~and~~ within the recommended 100-foot wide ~~protection~~ buffer ~~adjacent~~ between the BMER and project development activity as identified in mitigation measure BIO-1.1b. The other two San Luis Obispo wallflower locations appear to be within areas that would be disturbed by the proposed development.

4.5 Geology and Soils

Page *Revision*

4.5-5 *Mitigation Measure* **GEO-1a.1:**

a. Intercept drains shall be installed north of the most northerly residential units in Land Use Area ~~4~~ 3 and 5 to prevent upslope surface water from seeping into near-surface soils that could enhance the potential for liquefaction. (*4 changed to 3*)

4.5-10 **Impact GEO-2,** 2nd sentence:

Although this area would be maintained in open space, increased impervious surfaces would be created on adjacent topography in Land Use Areas ~~2~~ 3 and 4.

4.5-11 *Mitigation Measure* **GEO-2.1,** 2nd sentence:

A complete list of recommendations is provided in Appendices E ~~1~~ -2 and F, however, the following recommendations…

4.7 *Hydrology and Water Quantity*

Page *Revision*

4.7-7, *Mitigation Measure* **HYDRO/WQ-1,** 5th paragraph:

An encroachment permit shall be obtained from Caltrans prior to construction of the culvert under State Highway 1.

4.7-8 *Mitigation Measure* **HYDRO/WQ-1, Timing:**

Preliminary grading plans shall be submitted with tentative maps. Preliminary grading plans and tentative maps shall be reviewed by the Community Development Department, Public Works Department, Caltrans (for improvements under State Highway 1), and Development Review Board prior to tentative map approval by the Planning Commission. Final grading plans shall be submitted concurrently with the Parcel Map or Final Map and Public Improvement Plans. Parcel Maps and Public Improvement Plans shall be reviewed by the Community Development Department, Public Works Department, and Caltrans (for improvements under State Highway 1) prior to approval of the Parcel Map by the Planning Commission. Final Maps and Public Improvement Plans shall be reviewed by the Community Development Department, Public Works Department, and Caltrans where applicable prior to Final Map approval by the City Council. Final grading plans and/or Public Improvement Plans shall be submitted for review and approval prior to issuance of grading permits. An encroachment permit shall be obtained from Caltrans for construction of the culvert under State Highway 1 prior to issuance of grading permits for any phase of development.

4.7-12 **Impact HYDRO/WQ-3,** 1st paragraph, last sentence:

The Burton Ranch Specific Plan area water demand has been estimated between 194 AFY (without a school) and 203 AFY (with a school) ~~at 204.15 AFY~~ (see Appendix E-1, Table E-2).

4.7-14 **Impact HYDRO/WQ-4:**

Burton Ranch Specific Plan buildout would result in an estimated net new consumptive use of between ~~204.15~~ 194 AFY (without a school) and 203 AFY (with a school) (see Appendix E-1, Table E-2).

The retrofitting program would reduce the net new consumptive use by an estimated average 5.43 AFY (see Appendix E-1). The residual net new consumptive use would be between 189 AFY (without a school) and 198 AFY (with a school) ~~198.72~~ AFY. The estimated Burton Ranch Specific Plan mitigated project water demand of 198.72 AFY would impact the safe yield of the Lompoc Upland Area and current overdraft. This demand would increase the overdraft of the Lompoc Upland Area to between approximately 1,095 and 1,104 ~~1,105~~ AFY (906 AFY + ~~199~~ 189 AFY without a school; 906 AFY + 198 AFY with a school).

Based on this calculation and the annual pumpage of the Lompoc Upland Area in 2001, regional water supplies would last for approximately 186 years (170,000 AFY available storage/906 AFY overdraft = 186 years). The additional estimated project water demand would reduce this available supply to approximately 154 to 155 years (170,000 AFY/1,095 to 1,104 ~~1,105~~ AFY.

Page *Revision*

4.7-17 ***Residual Impact* HYDRO/WQ-4:** Revise as follows:

The residual impact (i.e., mitigated project water demand) of between 189 AFY (without a school) and 198 AFY (with a school) ~~198.72 AFY~~ would be further partially offset by Measures HYDRO/WQ-4.2 and HYDRO/WQ-4.3,...

4.7-24 ***Water Quantity* Cumulative Impacts,** 1st paragraph, 5th and 6th sentences:

The proposed Burton Ranch Specific Plan and reasonable future development identified in Table 1 would increase overdraft in the Lompoc Upland Area basin to 1,476 to 1,485 AFY (906 + 189 + 381 AFY without school; and 906 + 198 +381 AFY with school) ~~1,486 AFY (906 + 199 + 381 AFY)~~. This would decrease the availability of regional water supplies to approximately 114 to 115 years (170,000 AFY/~~1,486~~ 1,476 AFY; 170,000 AFY/1,485 AFY).

4.7-24 ***Water Quantity* Cumulative Impacts,** 2nd paragraph, last sentence:

Therefore, the 20-year buildout within the MHCSD service area and cumulative demand on the Lompoc Upland Area basin water supply would be 357 AFY greater ~~that~~ than what is estimated based on the list of projects in Table 3-1 (425 AFY- 68 AFY).

4.7-25 ***Water Quantity* Cumulative Impacts,** 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence; 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence:

Using these assumptions, the proposed Burton Ranch Specific Plan and MHCSD service area development buildout would increase overdraft in the Lompoc Upland Area basin to between 1,833 and 1,842 AFY (906 + 189 [without school] - 198 [with school] + 381 + 357 AFY)~~1,843 AFY (906 + 199 + 381 + 357 AFY)~~. This would decrease the availability of regional water supplies to approximately 92 to 93 years -(170,000 AFY/1,833 - 1,842 ~~1,843~~ AFY).

In the absence of any supplemental water source, the amount of water for homes and farms in 92 to ~~114~~ 93 years would be severely limited and the quality of this water would be extremely poor.

4.8 Land Use

Page *Revision*

4.8-4 **Impact LU-1**, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence:.

The ~~8~~ 10 acres of undeveloped open space in Land Use Area 7 would represent approximately ~~5~~ 7 percent of the site.

4.10 Public Services

Page *Revision*

4.10-9 **Impact PS-2.2.2**, 1st paragraph, 1st through 4th sentences:

Although build-out of the Burton Ranch Specific Plan area would result in all of the Burton Mesa chaparral within Land Use Area 2 and much of it in Land Use Area 3, 4, and 5 to be removed, the flammable vegetation would be preserved in Land Use Area 7. The chaparral in Land Use Area 5 would be completely removed if the 12 acres were developed as a school. Development in Land Use Areas ~~4~~ 3 and 5 would be adjacent to the ~~BMMA~~ BMER. (*4 changed to 3*)

4.10-10 *Mitigation Measure* **PS-2.2.2b:**

The applicant shall prepare a fire vegetation maintenance plan ~~that includes~~incorporating either Option 1 (including a, b, and c), 2, or 3 ~~the following~~:

1a. A mosaic fuel break with a minimum 100-foot width from all residential and educational structures in lieu of a traditional fire break that shall be implemented as an interface between residential development and open space along Land Use Area 7 and the northern project boundary in Land Use Areas ~~4~~ 3 and 5. (*4 changed to 3*)

1b. Within the mosaic fuel break, all flammable vegetation shall be removed within a minimum of 30-feet of structures.

1c. Adjacent islands of native vegetation within 30 to 100 feet of structures shall be retained, surrounded by intervening low-flammable, drought-tolerant vegetation. The intervening planted areas shall be periodically irrigated, mowed, or cleared.

2. Establish a 300-foot buffer area between project development and the BMER to ensure additional protection of the habitat and reduce the impact on Burton Mesa chaparral (see Figure 4.3-2). Alternatively, to minimize the loss of Burton Mesa chaparral, the 300-foot buffer could be averaged across the northern boundary of the property (this would include the 100-foot minimum buffer at the

northeast corner of the site, greater than 100-foot buffer at the northern boundary, and all of Land Use Area 7, as depicted in Figure 4.3-2).

3. Construct an internal non-collector roadway parallel to and directly south of the solid wall (see Figure 4.3-3). The paved roadway would act as a firebreak that would minimize the amount of area requiring vegetation clearance and maintenance south of the wall.

4.12 Transportation and Circulation

Page *Revision*

4.12-38 *Mitigation Measures* for **TRANS-1.3**:

Improvements to the existing circulation network (TRANS-1.2a through TRANS-1.2d) and contribution of transportation mitigation fees (TRANS-1.2e and TRANS-1.2f) would reduce project specific daily traffic impacts on the transportation system. In addition, adherence to mitigation measure TRANS-1.~~5~~1a~~,~~ and TRANS-1.1c, requiring an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans and Santa Barbara County, respectively, would further reduce impacts on transportation and circulation.

4.12-43 **Impact TRANS-2**, paragraph 4, 1st sentence:

"H" Street/Central Avenue: The "H" Street/Central Avenue intersection is currently operating at LOS ~~B~~ A during the morning peak hour, and LOS D during the evening peak hour, as shown in Table 4.12-5a.

4.12-58 *Mitigation Measure* **TRANS-3.1, Plan Requirements:** 1st sentence:

Plan Requirements: Revised project site internal street design specifications, including roundabouts and sidewalk widths, and the roundabout public education program shall be included in the Burton Ranch's ~~Specific Plan~~ Circulation and Infrastructure Plan.

4.13 Utilities

Page *Revision*

4.13-5 **Impact UTIL-1.1**, 2nd paragraph:

The proposed project would result in an estimated net new consumptive water use of between 194 AFY (without a school) and 203 AFY (with a school) ~~204.15 AFY~~ (see Appendix E-1, Table E-2). The MHCSD has formalized a water conservation toilet-retrofit program to offset water demand of new development within the District. The program requires that project applicants provide funding sufficient to retrofit three existing homes within the boundaries of MHCSD for every one new home proposed (personal communication, John Lewis 2002). The savings on MHCSD produced water from retrofitting three toilets within the MHCSD service area to low flush toilets would

be between 3.57 to 7.28 AFY, depending on the size of the toilet retrofitted (either 3.5 gallons/flush or 5.5 gallons/flush). Assuming an equal number of toilets with 3.5 and 5.5 gallon/flush capacities to be retrofitted, the average produced MHCSD domestic water savings would be 5.43 AFY. This would reduce the overall demand on MHCSD domestic water treatment to ~~198.72~~ between 188.84 AFY (without a school) and 197.54 AFY (with a school).

5.0 Alternatives

Page	*Revision*

5-5 **No Project Alternative, Transportation and Circulation:**

Residential buildout under the No Project Alternative, estimated to be 685 units, would be greater than the proposed project, and would include the school site. Assuming that the same percentage of multi-family units would be constructed under this scenario as for the proposed project (approximately 17%, when the low range of units for Land Use Area 1 is used), ~~Short~~ short-term impacts during construction would be similar to the proposed project, though the number of single family houses would be increased from approximately 397 to ~~482~~ 571.

6.0 Other CEQA Concerns

Page	*Revision*

6-3 *Access Improvements,* first paragraph, last sentence:

The sole access point at Street "A" on State Highway 1 would be opposite the Allan Hancock College entrance at an existing traffic signal.