CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
SOUTH CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
89 SOUTH CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 200
VENTURA, CA 93001-2801
VOICE (805) 585-1800
FAX (805) 641-1732

Th14a

Filed:	2/21/20
180th Day:	10/18/20
Staff:	M. Kubran-V
Staff Report:	8/20/20
Hearing Date:	9/10/20

STAFF REPORT: REGULAR CALENDAR

Application No.:	**4-18-1261**
Applicant:	**City of Goleta**
Agent:	Laura Bridley, AICP, City Contract Planner
Location:	7952 Hollister Avenue, City of Goleta, Santa Barbara County
Project Description:	Construction of an 11,600 sq. ft. one-story fire station with three drive-through bays and associated apparatus, a 1,250 gallon above-ground fuel tank, 16 parking spaces, removal and replacement of 69 non-native trees, installation of drought tolerant landscaping, new sidewalk, extension of the westbound Class II bicycle lane on Hollister Ave., and 3,400 cu. yds. of grading, including 1,100 cu. yds. of cut and 2,300 cu. yds. of fill on a vacant parcel.
Staff Recommendation:	Approval with conditions.

SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Commission staff recommends that the Commission **approve** coastal development permit application 4-18-1261 with six (6) special conditions requiring the applicant to

develop the following plans or surveys: (1) Tree Replacement Planting Plan, (2) Plans Conforming to Engineer's Recommendations, (3) Final Landscape Plans, (4) Sensitive Species Surveys, (5) Interim Erosion Control Plan and Construction Responsibilities, (6) Post-construction Water Quality Plan.

The City of Goleta proposes to construct an 11,600 sq. ft. one-story fire station on a vacant 1.22-acre parcel located at 7952 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-075) and on a 0.30-acre right-of-way easement adjacent to the parcel (Exhibit 2). In addition to the new fire station, the proposed project includes accessory structures, such as a 1,250-gallon above-ground fuel tank, parking spaces for employees and members of the public, an access driveway and turnaround area, on-site landscaping, a water retention basin, and frontage improvements, including new sidewalks and a Class II bicycle lane. The project also includes 3,400 cubic yards of grading (1,100 cubic yards of cut and 2,300 cubic yards of fill). The proposed development is intended to enable the Santa Barbara County Fire Department to improve fire protection services in the City by reducing emergency response times and reducing the population to firefighter ratio in the western Goleta area.

The proposed undeveloped project site contains 83 non-native trees. Eight of the existing trees are proposed to be retained. Sixty-nine trees, as well as the remaining vegetation, are proposed to be removed. Six of the existing trees have been identified as dead by the City's arborist, and therefore, are not proposed to be replaced. At least one known historic raptor nest has been documented on site, and most of the existing trees are eucalyptus, which, despite being non-native, are an important component of the visual character of the western Goleta area and can be an important coastal resource when they serve as raptor nesting/roosting sites. The City is proposing to replace 69 of the removed trees at a mitigation ratio of 1:1. It is not feasible to replace all of the removed trees on site; 33 of the replacement trees are proposed to be planted on-site, and 36 replacement trees are proposed to be planted at a site on City-owned property within the Coastal Zone.

The primary coastal resource issues of concern relate to potential adverse impacts to habitat and visual resources on site, as well as adjacent environmentally sensitive habitat areas and water quality. Thus, special conditions are recommended in order to find the project consistent with Coastal Act policies. Specifically, Special Condition One (1) requires the City to submit a final tree replacement plan to ensure that the proposed replacement trees consist of primarily native species and a range of container sizes in order to replace the raptor habitat lost on site. Special Condition One (1) also requires the identification of the offsite tree replacement area that is located within the Coastal Zone on City-owned property that is protected as open-space in perpetuity. Furthermore, Special Condition Three (3) requires the City to submit a final landscape plan that includes the locations and species of the proposed on-site replacement trees and prohibits the use of invasive species. Due to the documented use of the site by raptors, as well as sensitive species habitat within the vicinity of the site, Special Condition Four (4) requires sensitive species surveys, including nesting bird surveys, prior to the commencement of construction. Lastly, to ensure that the project is

consistent with the water quality protection provisions of the Coastal Act, Special Conditions Five (5) and Six (6) require the submittal of an interim erosion control plan and a post-construction water quality plan.

The Commission has not yet certified a Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the City of Goleta. Thus, the proposed project is subject to the Commission's coastal development permit jurisdiction, and the standard of review for this project is the Chapter Three policies of the Coastal Act. As conditioned, the proposed project is consistent with all applicable Chapter Three policies of the Coastal Act. Therefore, Staff recommends that the Commission **approve** CDP No. 4-18-1261. The **motion** and **resolution** to adopt the staff recommendation of approval of the permit can be found on **page 5**.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

EXHIBITS

I. MOTION AND RESOLUTION

Motion:

I move that the Commission approve Coastal Development Permit 4-18-1261 subject to conditions set forth in the staff recommendation.

Staff Recommendation of Approval:

Staff recommends a **YES** vote on the foregoing motion. Passage of this motion will result in approval of the permit as conditioned and adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by affirmative vote of a majority of Commissioners present.

Resolution to Approve the Permit:

The Commission hereby approves the Coastal Development Permit for the proposed project and adopts the findings set forth below on grounds that the development as conditioned will be in conformity with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act and will not prejudice the ability of the local government having jurisdiction over the area to prepare a Local Coastal Program conforming to the provisions of Chapter 3. Approval of the permit complies with the California Environmental Quality Act because either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the development on the environment, or 2) there are no further feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts of the development on the environment.

II. STANDARD CONDITIONS

1. **Notice of Receipt and Acknowledgment**. The permit is not valid and development shall not commence until a copy of the permit, signed by the permittee or authorized agent, acknowledging receipt of the permit and acceptance of the terms and conditions, is returned to the Commission office.

2. **Expiration**. If development has not commenced, the permit will expire two years from the date on which the Commission voted on the application. Development shall be pursued in a diligent manner and completed in a reasonable period of time. Application for extension of the permit must be made prior to the expiration date.

3. **Interpretation**. Any questions of intent or interpretation of any condition will be resolved by the Executive Director or the Commission.

4. **Assignment**. The permit may be assigned to any qualified person, provided assignee files with the Commission an affidavit accepting all terms and conditions of the permit.

5. Terms and Conditions Run with the Land. These terms and conditions shall be perpetual, and it is the intention of the Commission and the permittee to bind all future owners and possessors of the subject property to the terms and conditions.

III. SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. Tree Replacement Planting Plan

Prior to the issuance of the coastal development permit, the applicant shall submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, a final tree replacement plan, prepared by a licensed landscape architect, arborist, or a qualified resource specialist, that is consistent with the following requirements:

a. Any trees to be retained on-site shall be clearly delineated on all site plans and on-site with fencing or survey flags. Any tree that must be removed shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio. On-site replacement trees shall consist of primarily native tree species. Off-site replacement trees shall consist of entirely native species. Replacement trees shall include a range of container-sizes.

b. The tree replacement planting plan shall identify all on and off-site replacement tree locations, species, container-sizes, and planting specifications. The off-site tree replacement location shall be identified in the tree replacement planting plan and shall be located on City-owned property that is protected in perpetuity as open space, and that is located within the Coastal Zone.

c. Replacement trees planted on-site shall be planted concurrently or immediately after completion of construction activities.

d. Off-site replacement trees shall be planted concurrently with construction of the approved development. A report documenting the “as built” condition of the off-site replacement trees shall be submitted within 30 days of completion of the off-site tree replacement activities. The report shall describe the site preparation, timing of planting, plant locations, maintenance timing and techniques, and report any problems in the implementation of the tree replacement activities and their resolution. The report shall include an updated map of the replacement tree locations and photographs of the “as built” trees.

e. The Tree Replacement Planting Plan shall include a detailed monitoring program with specific performance standards to ensure that the replacement planting program is successful. The monitoring plan shall be implemented for a minimum of five years and an annual monitoring report shall be submitted for review and approval of the Executive Director for each of the five years. If monitoring indicates the replacement trees are not in conformance with, or have failed to meet, the performance standards specified in the monitoring program approved pursuant to this permit, the applicant shall submit a revised or supplemental planting plan for the review and approval of the Executive Director

and implement the approved version of the plan. The revised planting plan shall specify measures to remediate those portions of the original plan that have failed or are not in conformance with the original approved plan.

2. Plans Conforming to Engineer's Recommendations

By acceptance of this permit, the applicant agrees to comply with the recommendations contained in all of the plans and reports prepared by the registered engineer that are referenced as Substantive File Documents. These recommendations, including those concerning geology, best management practices (BMPs), and drainage shall be incorporated into all final design and construction plans, which must be reviewed and approved by a registered engineer prior to commencement of development.

The final plans approved by the engineer shall be in substantial conformance with the plans approved by the Commission relative to construction, grading, and drainage. Any substantial changes in the proposed development approved by the Commission that may be required by the consultant shall require an amendment(s) to the permit or a new coastal development permit(s).

3. Final Landscape Plan

Prior to the issuance of the coastal development permit, the applicant shall submit two (2) sets of final landscape plans, prepared by a licensed landscape architect or a qualified resource specialist, for review and approval by the Executive Director. The plans shall incorporate the following criteria:

a. All areas disturbed by the development shall be re-vegetated and maintained in perpetuity to protect and prevent erosion. To minimize the need for irrigation, all landscaping shall consist primarily of native/drought resistant plants. No plant species listed as problematic and/or invasive by the California Native Plant Society, California Invasive Plant Council, or by the State of California shall be employed or allowed to naturalize or persist on the site. No plant species listed as a 'noxious weed' by the State of California or the U.S. Federal Government shall be utilized or maintained within the property.

b. Plantings shall be maintained in good growing condition throughout the life of the development and, whenever necessary, shall be replaced with new plant materials to ensure continued compliance with applicable landscape requirements.

c. Rodenticides containing any anticoagulant compounds (including, but not limited to, Warfarin, Brodifacoum, Bromadiolone or Diphacinone) shall not be used.

The Permittee shall undertake development in accordance with the final approved plan. Any proposed changes to the approved final plan shall be reported to the Executive Director. Any substantial changes to the approved final plan shall require an amendment(s) to the permit or a new coastal development permit(s).

4. Sensitive Species Surveys

For any construction activities, the applicant shall retain the services of a qualified biologist or environmental resources specialist (hereinafter, "environmental resources specialist") to conduct sensitive species surveys (including birds and other terrestrial species). At least 30 calendar days prior to commencement of any construction activities, the applicant shall submit the name and qualifications of the environmental resources specialist, for the review and approval of the Executive Director. The applicant shall have the environmental resources specialist ensure that all project construction and operations are carried out consistent with the following:

a. The environmental resources specialist shall conduct surveys no more than two weeks prior to the approved construction activities to detect any active sensitive species, reproductive behavior, and active nests within 500 feet of the project site. Follow-up surveys must be conducted 3 calendar days prior to the initiation of construction, and nest surveys must continue on a monthly basis throughout the nesting season or until the project is completed, whichever comes first.

b. In the event that any sensitive species are present in or adjacent to the construction area but do not exhibit reproductive behavior and are not within the estimated breeding/reproductive cycle of the subject species, the environmental resources specialist shall implement a resource avoidance program with sufficient buffer areas to ensure adverse impacts to such resources are avoided. The applicant shall also immediately notify the Executive Director of the presence of such sensitive species and which of the above actions are being taken. If the presence of any such species requires review by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and/or the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, then no development activities shall be allowed to continue until any such review and authorizations to proceed are received, subject to the approval of the Executive Director.

c. If an active nest of a federally or state-listed threatened or endangered species, bird species of special concern, or any species of raptor is found, the applicant shall notify the appropriate State and Federal agencies within 24 hours and shall develop an appropriate action specific to each incident. The applicant shall notify the California Coastal Commission in writing by e-mail or facsimile within 24 hours and consult with the Commission regarding the determinations of State and Federal agencies.

d. If an active nest of any federally or state-listed threatened or endangered species, species of special concern, or any species of raptor is found within 300 feet of construction activities (500 feet for raptors), the applicant shall retain the services of an environmental resources specialist with experience conducting bird and noise surveys, to monitor bird behavior and construction noise levels. The environmental resources specialist shall be present at all relevant construction meetings and during all significant construction activities (those with

potential noise impacts) to ensure that nesting birds are not disturbed by construction related noise. The environmental resources specialist shall monitor birds and noise every day at the beginning of the project and during all periods of significant construction activities. Construction activities may occur only if construction noise levels are at or below a peak of 65 dB at the nest(s) site. If construction noise exceeds a peak level of 65 dB at the nest(s) site, sound mitigation measures such as sound shields, blankets around smaller equipment, mixing concrete batches off-site, use of mufflers, and minimizing the use of back-up alarms shall be employed. If these sound mitigation measures do not reduce noise levels, construction within 300 feet (500 feet for raptors) of the nesting trees/areas shall cease and shall not recommence until either new sound mitigation can be employed or nesting is complete.

e. The environmental resources specialist shall be present during all tree removal activities. The environmental resources specialist shall require the applicant to cease work should any breach in permit compliance occur, or if any unforeseen sensitive habitat issues arise. If significant impacts or damage occur to sensitive habitats or to wildlife species, the applicant shall be required to submit a supplemental program to adequately mitigate such impacts. The supplemental program shall be submitted to the Executive Director for review and approval.

f. For the purpose of this special condition, “sensitive species” shall be taken to mean any special-status wildlife species. Special-status species are species listed as Endangered, Threatened, or Rare under the federal or state Endangered Species Acts, Candidate Species, California Fully Protected Species, and, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15380(d), all other species tracked by the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), which are considered by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to be those species of greatest conservation concern, and locally important species including raptors, herons, and songbirds.

5. Interim Erosion Control Plans and Construction Responsibilities

Prior to the issuance of the coastal development permit, the applicant shall submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, an Interim Erosion Control and Construction Best Management Practices plan, prepared by a qualified, licensed professional. The qualified, licensed professional shall certify in writing that the Interim Erosion Control and Construction Best Management Practices plan is in conformance with the following requirements:

a. Erosion Control Plan

1. The plan shall delineate the areas to be disturbed by grading or construction activities and shall include any staging and stockpile areas. Any natural areas on the site to be retained shall be clearly delineated on the plan and on-site with fencing or survey flags.

2. The plan shall include a narrative report describing all temporary run-off and erosion control measures to be used during construction.

3. The plan shall identify and delineate on a site or grading plan the locations of all temporary erosion control measures.

4. The plan shall specify that grading shall take place only during the dry season (April 1 – October 31). This period may be extended for a limited period of time if the situation warrants such a limited extension, if approved by the Executive Director. The applicant shall install or construct temporary sediment basins (including debris basins, desilting basins, or silt traps), temporary drains and swales, sand bag barriers, silt fencing, and shall stabilize any stockpiled fill with geofabric covers or other appropriate cover, install geotextiles or mats on all cut or fill slopes, and close and stabilize open trenches as soon as possible. Basins shall be sized to handle not less than a 10-year, 6-hour duration rainfall intensity event.

5. Implementation of the erosion control measures shall be required on the project site prior to or concurrent with the initial grading operations and maintained throughout the development process to minimize erosion and sediment from runoff waters during construction. All sediment should be retained on-site, unless removed to an appropriate, approved dumping location either outside of the coastal zone or within the coastal zone to a site permitted to receive fill.

6. The plan shall also include temporary erosion control measures should grading or site preparation cease for a period of more than 30 days, including but not limited to: stabilization of all stockpiled fill, access roads, disturbed soils, cut and fill slopes with geotextiles and/or mats, sand bag barriers, silt fencing; and temporary drains, swales, and sediment basins. The plans shall also specify that all disturbed areas shall be seeded with native grass species and include the technical specifications for seeding the disturbed areas. These temporary erosion control measures shall be monitored and maintained until grading or construction operations resume.

7. All temporary construction related erosion control materials shall be comprised of bio-degradable materials (natural fiber, not photo-degradable plastics), free of weeds, and must be removed when permanent erosion control measures are in place. Bio-degradable erosion control materials may be left in place if they have been incorporated into the permanent landscaping design.

b. Construction Best Management Practices

1. No demolition or construction materials, debris, or waste shall be placed or stored where it may enter sensitive habitat, receiving waters, or a storm drain, or be subject to wave, wind, rain, or other erosion and dispersion.

2. No demolition or construction equipment, materials, or activity shall be placed in, or occur in, any location that would result in impacts to environmentally sensitive habitat areas, streams, wetlands, or their buffers.

3. Any and all debris resulting from demolition or construction activities shall be removed from the project site within 24 hours of completion of the project.

4. Demolition or construction debris and sediment shall be removed from work areas each day that demolition or construction occurs to prevent the accumulation of sediment and other debris that may be discharged into coastal waters.

5. All trash and debris shall be disposed in the proper trash and recycling receptacles at the end of every construction day.

6. The applicant shall provide adequate disposal facilities for solid waste, including excess concrete, produced during demolition or construction.

7. Debris shall be disposed of at a permitted disposal site or recycled at a permitted recycling facility. If the disposal site is located in the coastal zone, a coastal development permit or an amendment to this permit shall be required before disposal can take place unless the Executive Director determines that no amendment or new permit is legally required.

8. All stockpiles and construction materials shall be covered and enclosed on all sides. Such materials shall be located as far away as possible from drain inlets and any waterway and shall not be stored in contact with the soil.

9. Machinery and equipment shall be maintained and washed in confined areas specifically designed to control runoff. Thinners or solvents shall not be discharged into sanitary or storm sewer systems.

10. The discharge of any hazardous materials into any receiving waters shall be prohibited.

11. Spill prevention and control measures shall be implemented to ensure the proper handling and storage of petroleum products and other construction materials. Measures shall include a designated fueling and vehicle maintenance area with appropriate berms and protection to prevent any spillage of gasoline or related petroleum products or contact with runoff. The area shall be located as far away from the receiving waters and storm drain inlets as possible.

12. Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Good Housekeeping Practices (GHPs) designed to prevent spillage and/or runoff of demolition or construction-related materials, and to contain sediment or contaminants associated with demolition or construction activity, shall be implemented prior to the onset of such activity.

13. All structural BMPs shall be maintained in a functional condition throughout the duration of construction activity.

The final Interim Erosion Control and Construction Best Management Practices plan shall be in conformance with the site/development plans approved by the Coastal Commission. Any changes to the Coastal Commission approved site/development plans required by a qualified, licensed professional in order to comply with this condition shall be reported to the Executive Director. No changes to the Coastal Commission approved final site/development plans shall occur without an amendment to the coastal development permit, unless the Executive Director determines that no amendment is legally required.

6. Post Construction Water Quality Plan

Prior to issuance of the coastal development permit, the applicant shall submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, two (2) copies of a final Water Quality Plan for the post-construction project site, prepared by a licensed civil engineer or qualified licensed professional. The plan shall include detailed drainage and runoff control plans with supporting calculations, including a site plan, drawn to scale, that shows the development footprint, runoff flow directions, relevant drainage and water quality features, impervious surfaces, permeable pavements, and landscaped areas. The licensed civil engineer or qualified licensed professional shall certify in writing that the final Water Quality Plan is in substantial conformance with the following minimum requirements:

a. The plan shall demonstrate the use of distributed small-scale controls or integrated Best Management Practices (BMPs) that serve to minimize alterations to the natural pre-development hydrologic characteristics and conditions of the site, and effectively address pollutants of concern.

b. Post-development peak runoff rate and average volume from the site shall be maintained at levels similar to pre-development conditions.

c. Selected BMPs shall consist, or primarily consist, of site design elements and/or landscape-based systems or features that serve to maintain site permeability, avoid directly connected impervious area and/or retain, infiltrate, or filter runoff from rooftops, driveways and other hardscape areas, where feasible. Examples of such features include, but are not limited to, porous pavement, pavers, vegetated swales, infiltration trenches, and cisterns.

d. Landscaping materials shall consist primarily of native or other low-maintenance plant selections which have low water and chemical treatment demands. An efficient irrigation system design based on hydrozones and utilizing drop emitters or micro-sprays or other efficient design shall be utilized for any landscaping requiring water application.

e. Runoff shall be discharged from the developed site in a non-erosive manner. Energy dissipating measures shall be installed at the terminus of outflow drains where necessary. The consulting engineer shall provide plan details and cross sections for any rock rip-rap and/or other energy dissipating devices or structures associated with the drainage system. The drainage plans shall specify, the location, dimensions, cubic yards or rock, etc. for the velocity reducing structure with the supporting calculations showing the sizing requirements and how the device meets those sizing requirements. The engineer shall certify that the design of the device minimizes the amount of rock and/or other hardscape necessary to meet the sizing requirements.

f. Unless specifically prohibited by conditions as documented in a detailed site analysis certified by a licensed engineer, runoff from the development, up to and including the 85th percentile, 24-hour runoff event, shall be infiltrated on site.

g. All structural BMPs shall be operated, monitored, and maintained in accordance with manufacturer's specifications where applicable, or in accordance with well recognized technical specifications appropriate to the BMP for the life of the project and at a minimum, all structural BMPs shall be inspected, cleaned-out, and where necessary, repaired prior to the onset of the storm season (October 15th each year) and at regular intervals as necessary between October 15th and April 15th of each year. Debris and other water pollutants removed from structural BMPs during clean-out shall be contained and disposed of in a proper manner.

h. Final drainage plans shall be approved by the project consulting geotechnical engineer.

i. Should any of the project's surface or subsurface drainage/filtration structures or other BMPs fail or result in increased erosion, the applicant/landowner or successor-in-interest shall be responsible for any necessary repairs to the drainage/filtration system or BMPs and restoration of the eroded area. Should repairs or restoration become necessary, prior to the commencement of such repair or restoration work, the applicant shall submit a repair and restoration plan to the Executive Director to determine if an amendment or new coastal development permit is required to authorize such work.

The final Water Quality Plan shall be in conformance with the site/development plans approved by the Coastal Commission. Any changes to the Coastal Commission approved site/development plans required by a qualified, licensed professional in order to comply with this condition shall be reported to the Executive Director. No changes to

the Coastal Commission approved final site/development plans shall occur without an amendment to the coastal development permit, unless the Executive Director determines that no amendment is legally required.

IV. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS

A. Project Description and Background

The City of Goleta is proposing to construct an 11,600 sq. ft. one-story fire station, 544 sq. ft. of accessory structures, including a hose drying rack, trash enclosure, generator, 1,250-gallon bifurcated above-ground fuel tank, nine employee parking spaces, seven public parking spaces, an access driveway, turnaround area, on-site landscaping and water retention basin, and frontage improvements, including new sidewalks and a bicycle lane on a vacant 1.22-acre parcel located at 7952 Hollister Avenue (APN 079-210-075) and a 0.30-acre right-of-way easement adjacent to the parcel (Exhibit 3). The proposed fire station building includes a reception area, four bedrooms with individual bathrooms for on-duty personnel, training and operational areas, and a 30-person capacity community/training room to conduct trainings and meetings. The project also includes 3,400 cubic yards of grading (1,100 cubic yards of cut and 2,300 cubic yards of fill).

The proposed project site is located on the western end of the City of Goleta (Exhibit 1). A gasoline station previously occupied the subject site and was demolished in 1993. The project site is bordered by the Union Pacific Railroad tracks to the north, Cathedral Oaks Road to the west, Hollister Avenue to the south, and the “Hideaway” residential development to the east (Exhibit 2). The undeveloped parcel contains a small amount of coastal sage scrub, non-native grasses, and 83 non-native trees. Eight of the existing trees are proposed to be retained and the rest of the vegetation, including six trees that have been identified as dead by the City’s arborist and 69 other trees, are proposed to be removed (Exhibit 4). The City is proposing to replace the 69 removed trees at a mitigation ratio of 1:1. Preliminary construction, including grading and site preparation, would occur over approximately four months. Construction of the fire station facility would subsequently occur over approximately 12 to 14 months.

The City of Goleta does not have its own fire department and instead relies on the Santa Barbara County Fire Department (SBCFD), which would occupy the new fire station once built. SBCFD determined the need for a fire station in the western Goleta area during the 1980’s due to high response times and population growth in this area of the County. Fire service in western Goleta is currently provided by County Fire Station 11, which is located on Storke Road approximately two miles from the proposed project site. Per the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards, the best practices standard for a fire service response time is five minutes. Fire Station 11 does not meet the 5-minute response time standard for areas of western Goleta (Exhibit 5). Additionally, the acceptable maximum population to firefighter ratio, according to NFPA, is 4,000 people to 1 firefighter. Currently, Fire Station 11 serves a population of 22,469,

which leads to a population to firefighter ratio of approximately 7,200:1, exceeding the NFPA standard.

The proposed development is intended to enable SBCFD to improve fire protection services in the City and surrounding unincorporated areas by reducing emergency response times for fires, accidents, and emergency medical calls, meeting the NFPA 5-minute response time for fire service throughout western Goleta (Exhibit 6), and reducing the population to firefighter ratio to less than 4000:1 in the western Goleta area. The proposed project would also enhance water rescue capabilities by SBCFD in western Goleta, because the project has been designed to accommodate storage of specialized equipment used for water rescues, such as jet skis, a 4-wheel drive pickup truck outfitted with water rescue equipment, and an inflatable work boat with a motor to attend to open water rescue calls.

B. Biological Resources and Water Quality

Section 30231 of the Coastal Act states:

> The biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes appropriate to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and for the protection of human health shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of waste water discharges and entrainment, controlling runoff, preventing depletion of ground water supplies and substantial interference with surface water flow, encouraging waste water reclamation, maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, and minimizing alteration of natural streams.

Section 30240 of the Coastal Act states:

> (a) Environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses dependent on those resources shall be allowed within those areas.
>
> (b) Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas and parks and recreation areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade those areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of those habitat and recreation areas.

Section 30231 of the Coastal Act requires that a certain minimum level of biological productivity and quality of coastal waters be maintained and protected through measures such as controlling runoff, preventing depletion of groundwater supplies, and maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats. Section 30240(b) of the Coastal Act requires development adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHA) to be sited and designed to prevent impacts that would significantly degrade the ESHA.

The project site consists of a vacant approximately 1.22-acre parcel and a 0.30-acre easement along Hollister Avenue. Vegetation on the project site includes 83 non-native trees, which include 73 eucalyptus trees, four Monterey cypress, three olive, and three carrot wood trees. Approximately, 0.12-acre of coastal sage scrub and 0.11-acre of coastal sage scrub/ruderal habitat also occur on site. The remaining acreage contains non-native grasses and the subject trees. A biological assessment of the site, which included nesting bird surveys, as well as winter raptor surveys, completed by Watershed Environmental, Inc., in May, June, and December 2019 and January 2020, did not identify any state or federally listed species, or active nests on the project site. Additionally, a tree assessment was conducted in July 2019 by the City's arborist, which concluded that six eucalyptus trees were dead, 74 trees were in fair, poor, or very poor condition, and only three trees were in good condition. Due to the small size and isolated nature of the on-site coastal sage scrub as well as the fact that the stands of trees on site are entirely non-native and include several dead trees and trees in poor condition, the vegetation on site is not determined to be especially valuable and is not expected to provide habitat for any listed or special-status species, and thus does not constitute environmentally sensitive habitat area (ESHA).

Construction of the proposed project would remove most of the site's vegetation, including the six dead eucalyptus trees and 69 other existing trees. Eight existing trees, including the four Monterey cypress and four eucalyptus trees are proposed to be retained. Although the project site has not been identified as ESHA, as described above, raptor species, including red-tailed hawks and red-shouldered hawks, have historically been observed and have constructed nests within the stands of eucalyptus trees on the project site, including at least one raptor nest, which still exists and has been documented to host multiple pairs of raptors since at least 2010. Thus, raptor nesting and roosting habitat would be impacted by the proposed project. Therefore, as a component of the subject project, the City proposes to replace each of the removed trees at a 1:1 ratio, primarily with native species both on the project site and at an off-site location. Of the 69 trees to be removed, 33 would be replaced on-site as part of the project's landscaping, and the remaining 36 trees are proposed to be planted off-site on City owned property within the Coastal Zone.

The proposed on-site replacement tree species include coast live oak, Monterey cypress, and Arbutus marina, while the off-site replacement trees will consist entirely of native species. The on-site replacement trees are proposed to consist of a mix of large 24-, 36-, and 48-inch box specimen trees, in order to minimize the temporal impacts associated with the loss of mature trees and the time it would take for smaller sized, immature replacement trees to become fully grown. All off-site replacement trees will also consist of a range of container sizes.

As described above, the City has proposed to incorporate both existing and replacement trees into the landscaping on the project site. The City has submitted a preliminary landscape plan for the proposed project site; however, to ensure that the final plan depicts all proposed landscaping as well as the correct number, location, and

species of all on-site replacement trees, **Special Condition Three (3)** is necessary to require the City to submit a final landscape plan.

The City has also proposed to plant replacement trees at an off-site location within the Coastal Zone of the City. It is likely that this proposed planting will occur within or immediately adjacent to Ellwood Mesa, which is an approximately 650-acre open space area managed by multiple agencies. Although the City proposes to replace 36 of the removed trees from the project site at an off-site location within the City, the Commission finds it necessary to require **Special Condition One (1)** to ensure that the exact location of the replacement trees is identified and require submittal of a final tree replacement plan**. Special Condition One (1)** also requires all off-site replacement trees to consist of native species and requires that the plan describe planting specifications as well as standards for five-year monitoring to ensure that the replacement tree plantings are successful.

While state and federally listed species have not been recorded on site, the federally endangered California red-legged frog has been observed in a plunge pool below the Highway 101 Devereux Creek culvert approximately 480 feet from the site, as well as within ponds on the Sandpiper Golf Course, and within Tecolote Creek and Bell Canyon approximately 0.5 mile west of the project site. Additionally, a monarch butterfly roosting/aggregation site within a eucalyptus grove is located on the adjacent property approximately 720 feet east of the project site. The adjacent property also contains wetland habitat located approximately 675 feet from the project site and adjacent to Devereux Creek, which bisects the adjacent Hideaway residential development. Due to the project site's proximity to observances of a listed species and adjacent sensitive habitat areas, as well as the historic use of the site by raptors, there is a potential for sensitive species to be impacted during demolition and construction of the project. Therefore, in order to ensure that the project does not significantly degrade adjacent ESHA, consistent with Section 30240(b), the Commission finds it necessary to incorporate **Special Condition Four (4)**, which requires the applicant to conduct sensitive species surveys, including nesting bird surveys, within a 500-foot radius of the project site. Additionally, **Special Condition Three (3)** is necessary to require that invasive species and noxious weeds are not allowed to be planted or allowed to persist on site in order prevent such species from migrating offsite and naturalizing in adjacent habitat.

In addition to direct impacts on site and on any adjacent ESHA, the Commission recognizes that new development has the potential to adversely impact coastal water quality and biological productivity of coastal waters through the removal of vegetation, which increases runoff, erosion, and sedimentation, and the introduction of pollutants typically associated with development into adjacent and downstream waterways and wetlands. These impacts have the potential to reduce the biological productivity and quality of coastal waters, streams, and wetlands, reduce optimum populations of marine organisms, and may contribute to adverse impacts on human health. The proposed project will significantly increase the impervious area of the subject site, which in turn decreases the site's infiltrative function and capacity. Reduction in permeable land leads

to an increase in the volume and velocity of stormwater runoff that can be expected to leave the site. Further, pollutants commonly found in runoff associated with the site's proposed use include petroleum hydrocarbons, such as oil and grease from vehicles, heavy metals, and synthetic organic chemicals found in cleaning products.

The impervious surfaces within the proposed development would drain to either a permeable paver parking lot or a bioretention basin, thereby decreasing stormwater runoff and allowing pollutants in the runoff to be captured in the soil and vegetation on site. Even though the proposed project includes features to reduce runoff from the site, the application of appropriate design standards for sizing post-construction structural Best Management Practices is critical to the successful function of removing pollutants from stormwater. For design purposes, with case-by-case considerations, post-construction structural BMPs (or suites of BMPs) should be designed to treat, infiltrate, or filter the amount of stormwater runoff produced by all storms up to and including the 85th percentile, 24-hour storm event for volume-based BMPs, and/or the 85th percentile, 1-hour storm event, with an appropriate safety factor (i.e., 2 or greater), for flow-based BMPs. The Commission finds that sizing post-construction structural BMPs to accommodate (infiltrate, filter, or treat) the runoff from the 85th percentile storm runoff event, in this case, is equivalent to sizing BMPs based on the point of diminishing returns, i.e. the BMP capacity beyond which further increases in capacity produce proportionately smaller, if not insignificant, increases in pollutants removal and hence water quality protection. Therefore, the Commission requires the selected post-construction structural BMPs be sized based on design criteria specified in **Special Condition Six (6)** and finds this will ensure the proposed development will be designed to minimize adverse impacts to coastal resources, in a manner consistent with Section 30231 of the Coastal Act.

The City has estimated that it will take over one year to complete the project once vegetation removal is initiated. Therefore, interim erosion control measures implemented during construction and post-construction landscaping will serve to minimize the potential for adverse impacts to water quality as a result of runoff and erosion during construction and in the post-development stage. Thus, the Commission finds that it is necessary to impose **Special Condition Five (5)** to require an interim erosion control plan and implementation of construction Best Management Practices in order to ensure that the proposed development will not adversely impact water quality or coastal resources.

Thus, for the reasons described above, the proposed project, as conditioned, will not result in significant adverse impacts to adjacent habitat or coastal waters. Therefore, the Commission finds that the proposed project, as conditioned, is consistent with Coastal Act Sections 30231 and 30240.

C. Scenic and Visual Resources

Section 30251 of the Coastal Act states:

> The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas. New development in highly scenic areas such as those designated in the California Coastline Preservation and Recreation Plan prepared by the Department of Parks and Recreation and by local government shall be subordinate to the character of its setting.

Coastal Act Section 30251 requires development to be sited and designed to protect views of scenic areas, minimize alteration of landforms, and be visually compatible with the surrounding area. The proposed project site is publicly visible from Hollister Avenue and Cathedral Oaks Road. The Pacific Ocean is visible from the site, and intermittent views of the Santa Ynez Mountains can be seen through the trees on the site from Hollister Avenue. Due to a difference in elevation, the proposed project would not block views to the ocean from either the Union Pacific Railroad or Highway 101 north of the site. Further, trees within the Union Pacific Railroad and Highway 101 rights-of-way would continue to partially block views of the Santa Ynez Mountains from Hollister Avenue even once the proposed structure is constructed. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a significant effect on scenic views.

The undeveloped site contains low-lying brush and stands of non-native trees. A majority of the 83 trees on site are mature eucalyptus, which are an important component of the visual character of the western Goleta area and an important coastal resource when they serve as raptor nesting/roosting sites. The City is proposing to remove 69 of the subject site's existing trees and to plant new trees, both on-site and off-site, at a 1:1 replacement ratio in order to mitigate for the loss of the biologic and scenic resources that the eucalyptus and other trees on site provide. The Commission finds it necessary to require the applicant to prepare and implement a tree replacement planting plan as detailed in **Special Condition One (1)** to ensure that all removed trees are replaced at a 1:1 ratio either on-site or on City property within the Coastal Zone.

The City is proposing to retain the four existing Monterey cypress and four of the existing eucalyptus trees on the subject site. These trees are located in the southwest corner of the project site and would be incorporated into the proposed landscaping. Additionally, all of the replacement trees on site are proposed to be large 24-, 36-, or 48-inch box specimen trees in order to mitigate the temporal impacts to scenic resources associated with the loss of mature trees and the time it would take for immature replacement trees to become fully grown. To further mitigate any visual impacts as a result of the removal of the on-site vegetation, **Special Condition One (1)** also requires monitoring of the replacement trees for five years to ensure that they

become established, and **Special Condition Three (3)** requires all landscaping on site to be maintained in good growing condition and be replaced whenever necessary throughout the life of the development.

The proposed fire station is a one-story, 32-foot tall structure that would be located in the center of the subject site. With its barn-like and ranch house features, the architectural style of the proposed building is considered to be Modern Western. This is reflective of the early vernacular forms of architecture of the Goleta Valley and compatible with the surrounding area. The proposed structure's mass and scale would also be compatible with the adjacent development, including nearby residential development.

Although the project would change the visual character of the site itself, the proposed site is suitable for development since it is within an existing developed area and the proposed project has been designed to mitigate visual impacts. Therefore, for the reasons described above, the proposed project, as conditioned, will not result in a significant adverse impact to scenic public views or the character of the surrounding area. Thus, the Commission finds that, as conditioned, the proposed development is consistent with Section 30251 of the Coastal Act.

D. New Development, Hazards, and Geologic Stability

Section 30250 of the Coastal Act, in relevant part, states:

> (a) New residential, commercial, or industrial development, except as otherwise provided in this division, shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it or, where such areas are not able to accommodate it, in other areas with adequate public services and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources…

Section 30253 of the Coastal Act, in relevant part, states:

> New development shall do all of the following:
>
> (a) Minimize risks to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood, and fire hazard.
>
> (b) Assure stability and structural integrity, and neither create nor contribute significantly to erosion, geologic instability, or destruction of the site or surrounding area or in any way require the construction of protective devices that would substantially alter natural landforms along bluffs and cliffs.
>
> (c) Be consistent with requirements imposed by an air pollution control district or the State Air Resources Board as to each particular development.

(d) Minimize energy consumption and vehicle miles traveled.

Section 30250(a) of the Coastal Act requires new development to be located in close proximity to existing developed areas that are able to accommodate the new development and where the proposed development will not have a significant adverse impact, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources. Section 30253 of the Coastal Act mandates that new development shall minimize risks to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood, and fire hazard, and assure stability and structural integrity of the development without creating or contributing to erosion, instability, or destruction of the site or surrounding area or require protective devices that would substantially alter natural landforms along bluffs and cliffs. Section 30253 also requires development to be consistent with State Air Resources Board requirements and minimize energy consumption and vehicle miles traveled.

The land uses surrounding the proposed project site include residential development, the Sandpiper Golf Course, railroad and highway transportation corridors, and adjacent roads. Other nearby land uses include the Bacara Resort & Spa, an elementary school, the Ellwood Mesa Open Space, and the Ellwood Onshore Oil and Gas Facility. Although the proposed project site is undeveloped, the site is located in an existing developed area, and the objective of the proposed fire station is to serve the existing surrounding development and the people that reside and work in the surrounding neighborhoods.

The City analyzed five alternative locations, including four sites outside of the Coastal Zone, for the proposed fire station. The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed project states that fire stations must be readily visible and accessible to the public, i.e., they must front a street, rather than be accessed through a shared driveway. The EIR eliminated three of the alternative sites from further analysis, because one of the sites can only be accessed through a shared driveway and the other two sites are at the end of a cul-de-sac and not immediately adjacent to a main thoroughfare. The fourth site was determined to not be a feasible location, because it does not have an existing Goleta Water District meter, and due to a Goleta Water District voter-mandated prohibition on new connections, new development on that site would not have the ability to obtain a new connection. The fifth alternative location that was analyzed is located adjacent to Hollister Avenue within the Ellwood Mesa Open Space area, which was originally identified for a fire station when a plan for development of the Ellwood Mesa was proposed. That site has remained in open space; thus, a fire station at that alternative site was determined to be infeasible as it would result in the loss of designated open space. Thus, the EIR concluded that of the alternative locations analyzed, the proposed project site was the most appropriate location for the new fire station.

The proposed fire station design intends to meet the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver standards, which incorporates various resource-efficient project design features to reduce water and energy consumption, as well as air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions associated with operation of the project. The proposed landscaping includes drought-tolerant trees, shrubs, and groundcovers.

Recycled water would be used for landscape irrigation. The project also includes a bicycle parking area and a meandering pedestrian sidewalk along Hollister Avenue, which will extend the existing sidewalk east from the adjacent residential development. It also includes an extension of the existing Class II westbound bicycle lane on Hollister Avenue between the Hideaway residential development and Cathedral Oaks Road. These design components are consistent with the requirements of Section 30253 to minimize energy consumption and vehicle miles traveled by designing the proposed structure to reduce energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions and enhancing the facilities for alternative transportation in this area of the City.

The proposed project includes 3,400 cubic yards of grading, consisting of 1,100 cubic yards of cut and 2,300 cubic yards of fill. The proposed cut would be balanced on site, and 1,200 cubic yards would be imported. An existing 35-foot high cut slope runs along the northern boundary of the project site, and at the base of the slope is the Union Pacific Railroad. The proposed project includes installation of a soldier pile concrete wall to stabilize this slope. The proposed soldier pile wall would be supported by 24-inch filler piles and 36-inch concrete reinforced piles and would be approximately 300 feet in length. The piles would be completely underground, and a 36-inch tall exposed beam would sit on top of the piles and run the length of the northern property boundary. A 4-foot 3-inch tall retaining wall would be constructed on top of a portion of the soldier pile wall and would be backfilled to construct approximately 10 feet of usable flat site area. A 6-foot tall privacy wall would then be constructed on top of the soldier pile/retaining wall. This portion of the project would be visible from the Union Pacific Railroad adjacent to the northern boundary of the project site.

The submitted geotechnical report concludes that the project site is suitable for the proposed project based on the evaluation of the site's geology and soils. The report contains recommendations to be incorporated into the project plans to ensure the stability and geologic safety of the proposed project and the project site. As such, **Special Condition Two (2)** requires the applicant to comply with the recommendations contained in the applicable reports, to incorporate those recommendations into all final design and construction plans, and to obtain the project engineer's approval of those plans prior to the commencement of construction.

Additionally, to minimize erosion and ensure stability of the project site, **Special Condition Five (5)** requires that the project must include adequate drainage and erosion control measures during construction, and **Special Condition Six (6)** requires the development to include post-construction drainage and water quality measures. In order to achieve these goals, **Special Conditions 5 and 6** require the applicant to submit an interim erosion control plan and a post-construction water quality plan certified by the project engineer. Further, the Commission finds that, for the project to ensure stability and avoid contributing significantly to erosion, all disturbed undeveloped areas of the subject site must be landscaped to stabilize disturbed soils and reduce erosion resulting from the proposed project. Thus, **Special Condition Three (3)** is required to ensure a final landscape plan is submitted that is consistent with the approved project.

Therefore, the Commission finds that the proposed project, as conditioned, is consistent with Coastal Act Sections 30250 and 30253.

E. Land Use and Local Coastal Program Development/Prejudice

Section 30604 of the Coastal Act states in part that a coastal development permit shall be granted if the Commission finds that the development will not prejudice the local government's ability to prepare a Local Coastal Program (LCP) in conformity with the applicable resource protection policies of the Coastal Act. More specifically, Section 30604(a) of the Coastal Act states:

> (a) Prior to certification of the local coastal program, a coastal development permit shall be issued if the issuing agency, or the commission on appeal, finds that the proposed development is in conformity with the provisions of Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 30200) of this division and that the permitted development will not prejudice the ability of the local government to prepare a local program that is in conformity with the provisions of Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 30200).

Prior to the incorporation of the City of Goleta, the project site was subject to the certified LCP for the County of Santa Barbara. The City of Goleta incorporated in 2002, and therefore the site is no longer in the permit jurisdiction of the County. In 2013, the Commission awarded an LCP grant to the City to develop an LCP for the portions of the City within the Coastal Zone. However, development of the LCP stalled in 2016. Although the City has recently indicated that it will be resuming the process of developing an LCP, the City has not yet completed, nor has the Commission certified, a new LCP for the City. Therefore, the proposed project requires a coastal development permit from the Commission and the standard of review for this project is the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act.

Although the City does not yet have a certified LCP, it has adopted a General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan and New Zoning Ordinance, which provide the standard of review for the City's review of projects located outside of the Coastal Zone. Although these documents are not the applicable standard of review for the Coastal Commission's review of projects in the Coastal Zone, land use and zoning designations were identified for parcels in the Coastal Zone (including the subject property), and the City staff have indicated that they intend to use these designations as the basis of their LCP. Prior to 2018, the subject site had a land use designation of Visitor Serving Commercial (C-VS) and a zoning designation of Limited Commercial (C-1), which was carried over from the Santa Barbara County LCP. However, in anticipation of the development of a fire station on the subject site, the City changed the site's land use designation to Public/Quasi-Public (PS) and rezoned the site to Public-Institutional (P-I), as the City's Visitor Serving Commercial land use designation and Limited Commercial zoning designation would only allow for uses such as eating and drinking establishments, retail uses, financial institutions, transient lodging services, and various other commercial services, but not the development of a fire station.

LCPs establish the allowable types, locations, and intensities of development in the coastal zone to achieve statewide resource management goals while providing for local community planning and development objectives. In this case, the subject site is one of the few remaining vacant parcels located within the City, and because the site was previously identified as a location that could accommodate visitor serving development, it is necessary to ensure that approval of the proposed development would not prejudice the City's ability to prepare an LCP in conformity with the resource protection policies of the Coastal Act. As such, the City prepared an analysis that examined visitor serving uses within the City, which indicates that approximately 80 percent of land located within the Coastal Zone of the City is dedicated to visitor-serving, recreational, and open space uses. Additionally, the subject site is on the far western end of the City, is not located near any other commercial uses, and is much smaller than typical sites developed for overnight accommodations or other types of visitor-serving recreational uses. Further, as described in more detail above, the City analyzed alternative locations for the proposed fire station but determined that the subject site was the only feasible location that would meet the project objectives.

Thus, given the amount of existing visitor serving, recreation, and open space uses within the City, as well as the project site's somewhat isolated location and relatively small size, a visitor serving use would not be appropriate at the project site. As such, while the land use designation and zoning changes occurred prior to certification of the City's LCP, the land use and zoning changes do not prejudice the LCP. This is because the site characteristics would remain the same, and thus the same conclusion, that the site is not necessary to ensure the availability of visitor serving development, would be found even if the City's LCP was certified prior to proposal of the subject project. Therefore, the Commission finds that approval of the proposed development would not prejudice the City's ability to prepare a Local Coastal Program for this area consistent with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act, as required by Section 30604(a).

F. California Environmental Quality Act

Section 13096 of the Commission's administrative regulations requires Commission approval of a coastal development permit application to be supported by a finding showing the application, as modified by any conditions of approval, to be consistent with any applicable requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). Section 21080.5(d)(2)(A) of CEQA prohibits approval of a proposed development if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts that the activity may have on the environment.

The Commission incorporates its findings on Coastal Act consistency at this point as if set forth in full. These findings address and respond to any public comments regarding potential significant adverse environmental effects of the project that were received prior to preparation of the staff report. As discussed in detail above, the proposed project, as conditioned, is consistent with the policies of the Coastal Act. Feasible mitigation measures, which will minimize all adverse environmental effects, have been required as

special conditions. **Special Conditions One (1) through Six (6)** are required to assure the project's consistency with Section 13096 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations. As conditioned, there are no feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available, beyond those required, which would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts that the activity may have on the environment. Therefore, the Commission finds that the proposed project, as conditioned to mitigate the identified impacts, can be found to be consistent with the requirements of the Coastal Act to conform to CEQA.

APPENDIX A – Substantive File Documents

City of Goleta Fire Station 10, Final Environmental Impact Report, SCH No. 2017081066, September 2018.

Biological Assessment for Goleta Fire Station No. 10, prepared by Watershed Environmental, Inc., July 19, 2019.

Tree Assessment and Associated Survey Map for Proposed Fire Station 10, prepared by Robert Muraoka, July 2019.

Geotechnical Exploration for Proposed City of Goleta Fire Station No. 10, prepared by Leighton Consulting, Inc., February 21, 2017.