





Final

Environmental Impact Report City of Goleta Fire Station 10

SCH No. 2017081066



Lead Agency: City of Goleta Neighborhood Services and Public Safety Department 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B Goleta, California 93117





September 2018



STATE CLEARINGHOUSE No. 2017081066

CITY OF GOLETA FIRE STATION NO. 10 FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

PREPARED BY:

City of Goleta
Neighborhood Services and Public Safety Department
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B Goleta, CA 93117
Vytautas "Vyto" Adomaitis, Director
Contact: Laura Bridley, AICP, Project Planning Consultant
805.961-7555; 805-896-2153

WITH ASSISTANCE FROM:

Amec Foster Wheeler, Environment & Infrastructure, Inc. 104 West Anapamu Street, Suite 204-A Santa Barbara, CA 93101 Contact: David Stone 805.962.0992 X229

September 2018





City of Goleta Fire Station No. 10
Final Environmental Impact Report
September 2018
Prepared by the City of Goleta
Neighborhood Services and Public Safety Department, Goleta, CA.
With assistance from Amec Foster Wheeler, Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.

ERRATA #2 TO THE FIRE STATION 10 FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT DATED SEPTEMBER 2018 SCH# 2017081066

FOR CASES 17-069-GPA-RZ-DP

The City of Goleta has prepared this Errata sheet to clarify and correct information in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Fire Station 10 Project. This Errata sheet includes minor edits to the FEIR for the Project and does not contain significant new information that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect.

These minor corrections to the FEIR merely clarify information stated therein. The City has reviewed the information in this Errata sheet and has determined that it does not change any of the findings or conclusions of the FEIR and does not constitute "significant new information" pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

In conformance with Section 15121 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the FEIR and technical appendices, together this the Errata, are intended to serve as documents that will generally inform and clarify for the the decision-makers and the public the environmental effects of the Project. This Errata, combined with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and Responses to Comments, comprise the Final EIR.

Revisions to the Final EIR are shown below as excerpts from the EIR text. Added or modified text is underlined (<u>example</u>), while deleted text will have a strikeout (<u>example</u>) through the text.

Page ES-3: Executive Summary; Landscaping description. Sentences two and three of paragraph 3 on this page should read (note strikeout text and underlined corrected text): "Screening vegetation along the northern and eastern property boundary, including a large 24- to 36- 48-inch box specimen Monterey cypress, Coast live oaks, and New Zealand Christmas Arbutus marina (Marina strawberry) trees, would achieve a height of between 30 to 80 50 feet and would in part replace 56 trees to be removed. The linear arrangement of large screen trees would be complemented by native and drought-tolerant shrubs reaching 12 to 20 an average of 10 feet high."

Page 2-26: Paragraph 2.6.5, paragraph one (top), last sentence to be revised:

One (1) 36-inch box coast live oak, five (5) 24-inch box coast live oak, and nineteen (19) lemonade berry bushes would be planted along the eastern-northern project boundary.

Page 4.1-16: Paragraph 2 to be revised:

The proposed Project would also add a number of specimen trees to the site, including a prominent coast live oak at the site entrance to the south. According to the preliminary revised landscape plan (see Figure 2-11) a variety of vegetation would be provided along the northern and eastern property boundary including: three (3) 24- to 36- to 48-inch box specimen native Monterey cypress; three (3) five (5) 48-inch box native coast live oak; nine (9) six (6) 36-inch box native coast live oak (six of which would be multi-trunk); and fourteen (14) 24-inch box Arbutus marina (Marina strawberry) trees. The plantings would achieve heights of between 25 feet (Arbutus marina), 30 to 50 feet (coast live oak and 40-60 feet) (Sam Maphis, ASLA, personal communication 2018). Thirty- three (33) five (35) native lemonade berry bushes would be planted between the specimen trees and achieve a height of 10 feet. One Monterey cypress (in the northeastern Project site corner), one (1) 36-inch box coast live oak, four (4) Arbutus marina trees, and sixteen (16) lemonade berry bushes would be planted along the eastern project boundary. Five (5) 36-inch box coast live oak, one (1) multi-trunk 36-48-inch box coast live oak, and nineteen lemonade berry bushes would be planted along the northern project boundary. One (1) 36-inch box coast live oak, five (5) 24-inch box coast live oak, and nineteen (19) lemonade berry bushes would be planted along the eastern project boundary. along the northern and eastern property boundary would include large 24- to 36-inch box specimen Monterey cypress, Coast live oak, and New Zealand Christmas trees, which would achieve a height of between 30 to 80 feet. The linear arrangement of large screen trees would be complimented by native and drought-tolerant shrubs reaching 12 to 20 feet high. The landscaping rising above the 6-foot high concrete block wall would provide a visual separation between the fire station institutional uses and The Hideaway residential development to the east, and southerly views from US 101 and residential neighborhoods to the north. As a result of this landscaping, the proposed Project seven prominent trees would be preserved on-site and the loss of scenic trees would be offset by the planting of dozens of trees of different variety throughout the site.

Page 7-30, 7-31: Response to Comment chapter, comment E-2: The corrected text, as listed in correction for Page 2.6.5, is also made to last sentence of top paragraph, p. 7-31:

One (1) 36-inch box coast live oak, five (5) 24-inch box coast live oak, and nineteen (19) lemonade berry bushes would be planted along the eastern-northern project boundary.

Page 7-36, 7-37: Response to Comment chapter, comment F-7: The corrected text, as listed in correction for Page 2.6.5, is also made to last sentence of bottom of p. 7-36, top of p. 7-37:

One (1) 36-inch box coast live oak, five (5) 24-inch box coast live oak, and nineteen (19) lemonade berry bushes would be planted along the eastern-northern project boundary.

Page 7-45: Response to Comment chapter, comment G-2: The corrected text, as listed in correction for Page 2.6.5, is also made to the last sentence of top paragraph at top of P. 7-45:

One (1) 36-inch box coast live oak, five (5) 24-inch box coast live oak, and nineteen (19) lemonade berry bushes would be planted along the eastern-northern project boundary.

Page 7-50: Response to Comment chapter, comment G-8: The corrected text, as listed

in correction for Page 2.6.5, is also made to the last sentence of the paragraph 5 of this page:

One (1) 36-inch box coast live oak, five (5) 24-inch box coast live oak, and nineteen (19) lemonade berry bushes would be planted along the eastern-northern project boundary.

- Page 7-51: Response to Comment chapter, comment G-9: The first sentence of this paragraph should read (note strikeout text and underlined corrected text): The proposed Project does not includes a separate concrete masonry wall fence (wrought iron or otherwise) along the eastern boundary adjacent to The Hideaway residential site.
- Page 7-53: Response to Comment chapter, comment G-13: The corrected text, as listed in correction for Page 2.6.5, is also made to the last sentence of paragraph 3 of this page:

One (1) 36-inch box coast live oak, five (5) 24-inch box coast live oak, and nineteen (19) lemonade berry bushes would be planted along the eastern-northern project boundary.

Page 7-60: Response to Comment chapter, comment G-23: The corrected text, as listed in correction for Page 2.6.5, is also made to the last sentence of paragraph 3 of this page:

One (1) 36-inch box coast live oak, five (5) 24-inch box coast live oak, and nineteen (19) lemonade berry bushes would be planted along the eastern-northern project boundary.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| SEC ⁻ | <u> </u> | | | PAGE |
|------------------|---------------------|----------------|---|------|
| EXE | CUTIVI | E SUMMA | ARY | ES-1 |
| 1.0 | INTRODUCTION | | | 1-1 |
| | 1.1 | | mental Impact Report Background | |
| | 1.2 | | e and Legal Authority | |
| | 1.3 | | ope and Content | |
| | 1.4 | | Responsible, and Trustee Agencies | |
| | 1.5 | | mental Review Process | |
| | 1.6 | Public (| Outreach | 1-7 |
| 2.0 | PROJECT DESCRIPTION | | | 2-1 |
| | 2.1 | Introduc | ction | 2-1 |
| | 2.2 | Project | Applicant | 2-1 |
| | 2.3 | | Objectives | |
| | 2.4 | | Location and Overview | |
| | 2.5 | | nding Land Uses and Zoning Designations | |
| | 2.6 | • | Description | |
| | | 2.6.1 | Construction | |
| | | 2.6.2 | Proposed Operations | |
| | | 2.6.3 | Architecture | |
| | | 2.6.4 | Stormwater Drainage and Utilities | |
| | | 2.6.5 | Landscaping | |
| | | 2.6.6 | Access | |
| | | 2.6.7 | Lighting | |
| | | 2.6.8 2.6.9 | Utilities | |
| | 2.7 | | Project Sustainable Design Featuresed Approvals | |
| 3.0 | | • | OJECTS | |
| | | | | |
| 4.0 | | _ | ITAL IMPACT ANALYSIS | |
| | 4.1 | | tics/Visual Resources | |
| | | 4.1.1 | Existing Setting | |
| | | 4.1.2 4.1.3 | Regulatory Setting | |
| | | 4.1.3 4.1.4 | Impact Analysis Cumulative Impacts | |
| | 4.2 | | cal Resources | |
| | 4.2 | 4.2.1 | Existing Setting | |
| | | 4.2.2 | Regulatory Setting | |
| | | 4.2.3 | Impact Analysis | |
| | | 4.2.4 | Cumulative Impacts | |
| | 4.3 | | I Resources | |
| | | 4.3.1 | Existing Setting | |
| | | 4.3.2 | Regulatory Setting | |
| | | 4.3.3 | Impact Analysis | |
| | | | | |

Table of Contents Final EIR

| SEC1 | ΓΙΟΝ | | | PAGE |
|------|------|--|--|----------------------------|
| | | 4.3.4 | Cumulative Impacts | 4.3-11 |
| | 4.4 | Geology | y and Soils | 4.4-1 |
| | | 4.4.1 | Existing Setting | |
| | | 4.4.2 | Regulatory Setting | 4.4-5 |
| | | 4.4.3 | Impact Analysis | 4.4-8 |
| | | 4.4.4 | Cumulative Impacts | |
| | 4.5 | Hazards | s and Hazardous Materials | |
| | | 4.5.1 | Existing Setting | 4.5-1 |
| | | 4.5.2 | Regulatory Setting | |
| | | 4.5.3 | Impact Analysis | |
| | | 4.5.4 | Cumulative Impacts | |
| | 4.6 | The state of the s | | 4.6-1 |
| | | 4.6.1 | Existing Setting | |
| | | 4.6.2 | Regulatory Setting | |
| | | 4.6.3 | Impact Analysis | |
| | | 4.6.4 | Cumulative Impacts | |
| | 4.7 | NOISE | • | |
| | ••• | 4.7.1 | Existing Setting | |
| | | 4.7.2 | Regulatory Setting | |
| | | 4.7.3 | Impact Analysis | |
| | | 4.7.4 | Cumulative Impacts | |
| | 4.8 | | Services | |
| | 1.0 | 4.8.1 | Existing Setting | |
| | | 4.8.2 | Regulatory Setting | |
| | | 4.8.3 | Impact Analysis | |
| | | 4.8.4 | Cumulative Impacts | |
| | 4.9 | _ | ortation/Circulation | |
| | т.5 | 4.9.1 | Existing Setting | |
| | | 4.9.2 | Regulatory Setting | |
| | | 4.9.3 | Impact Analysis | |
| | | 4.9.3 | Cumulative Impacts | |
| | 4.10 | 1.0.1 | an Significant Issues | |
| | 4.10 | 4.10.1 | Resources with No Potential to Be Adversely | 4. 10-1 |
| | | 4.10.1 | Affected | 4 10 1 |
| | | 4 10 2 | Resources with Potentially Less Than Significant | 4. 10-1 |
| | | 4.10.2 | Impacts | <i>4</i> 10 ₋ 2 |
| | | | • | |
| 5.0 | ALTE | | S | |
| | 5.1 | | ction | |
| | 5.2 | Range | of Alternatives Considered | |
| | | 5.2.1 | , , | 5-2 |
| | | 5.2.2 | Minimize Potentially Significant Environmental | |
| | | | Impacts | |
| | 5.3 | No Proj | ect Alternative | 5-6 |
| | 5.4 | Alternat | ive Location | 5-9 |
| | 5.5 | Environ | mentally Superior Alternative | 5-10 |
| | | | | |

Table of Contents Final EIR

| SEC | ΓΙΟΝ | | PAGE |
|-----|------------|--|-------------------|
| 6.0 | 6.1 | 6.1.1 Population and Economic Growth | 6-1 6-1 6-1 |
| | 6.2 6.3 | - 9 | 6-2 6-3 |
| 7.0 | DRA | FT EIR COMMENTS AND RESPONSES | 7-1 |
| 8.0 | PREI | PARERS OF THE EIR | 8-1 |
| 9.0 | PERS | SONS/AGENCIES CONSULTED AND REFERENCES | 9-1 |
| | 9.1 9.2 | 9 | |
| | | LIST OF APPENDICES | |

| Appendix A | Notice of Preparation |
|------------|--|
| Appendix B | Initial Study |
| Appendix C | Biological Resources |
| Appendix D | Cultural Resources |
| Appendix E | Geology and Soils |
| Appendix F | Hazards and Hazardous Materials |
| Appendix G | Transportation |
| Appendix H | Air Quality and GHG |
| Appendix I | Hydrology and Drainage |
| Appendix J | Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan |

List of Figures Final EIR

LIST OF FIGURES

| NUMBER | <u>Title</u> | PAGE |
|---------------|---|------|
| Figure 2-1. | Regional Location and Project Vicinity | 2-2 |
| Figure 2-2. | City of Goleta Fire Station 5-Minute Response Zones | |
| Figure 2-3. | Project Site Location | 2-7 |
| Figure 2-4. | Existing City of Goleta GP/CLUP Land Use and Zoning | |
| | Ordinance Designations | |
| Figure 2-5a. | Site Improvement Plan (northern portion) | 2-11 |
| Figure 2-5b. | Site Improvement Plan (southern portion) | 2-13 |
| Figure 2-6. | Retaining Wall Plan | 2-15 |
| Figure 2-7. | Tree Removal Plan | 2-17 |
| Figure 2-8. | Site Plan | 2-21 |
| Figure 2-9. | Floor Plan | 2-23 |
| Figure 2-10. | Architectural Elevations | 2-29 |
| Figure 2-11. | Landscape Plan | 2-31 |
| Figure 2-12. | Utilities Plan | 2-33 |
| Figure 3-1. | Related Projects for Cumulative Impact Analysis | |
| Figure 4.1-1. | Public View Corridors | |
| Figure 4.1-2. | Existing and Proposed Views from Hollister Avenue Lookii | ng |
| | Northeast | _ |
| Figure 4.1-3. | Existing and Proposed Views from Hollister Avenue Looking | ng |
| | Northwest | |
| Figure 4.1-4. | View of the Project Site from Cathedral Oaks Overpass | |
| Figure 4.1-5. | View of the Project Site from Calle Real, Looking Southwe | |
| Figure 4.2-1. | Existing Community / Habitat Types | |
| Figure 4.2-2. | Sensitive Species and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat i | |
| | Project Vicinity | |
| Figure 4.9-1. | Western Apparatus Driveway Sight Distance | |
| Figure 4.9-2. | East Public Driveway Sight Distance | |
| Figure 5-1. | Project Alternative Sites | 5-5 |

Final EIR List of Tables

LIST OF TABLES

| NUMBER | TITLE | PAGE |
|------------------------------|--|----------|
| Table ES-1. | Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts | |
| Table 1-1. | NOP Scoping Comments Received | |
| Table 2-1. | Project Site Characteristics | |
| Table 2-2. | Fire Station 10 Community Training Room Activity | |
| Table 3-1. | Related Projects for Cumulative Impact Analysis | |
| Table 3-2. | Total Related Project Development | |
| Table 4.2-1. | Project Site Vegetation and Land Covers | |
| Table 4.6-1. | Consistency with Policies in the Goleta GP/CLUP | |
| Table 4.6-2. | Consistency with Polices of the California Coastal Act | |
| Table 4.7-1. | Sound Levels of Typical Noise Sources and Noise | |
| T-1-1- 470 | Environments | |
| Table 4.7-2. Table 4.7-3. | Goleta Noise and Land Use Compatibility Criteria Significance of Changes in Operational Roadway Noise | 4.7-6 |
| | Exposure | |
| Table 4.9-1. | Existing Roadway Operations | |
| Table 4.9-2. | Existing Intersection LOS | |
| Table 4.9-3. | Significant Changes in LOS or Evaluating Project Impacts | 4.9-5 |
| Table 4.9-4. | Project Trip Generation | |
| Table 4.9-5. | Project Trip Distribution Percentages | |
| Table 4.9-6. | Existing and Existing + Project Roadway Operations | 4.9-7 |
| Table 4.9-7. | Existing Intersection Operations and Project-Added Traffic AM Peak Hour | |
| Table 4.9-8. | Existing Intersection Operations and Project-Added Traffic PM Peak Hour | |
| Table 4.9-9. | Cumulative + Project Roadway Operations | |
| Table 4.9-10. | Cumulative + Project Intersection Operations - AM Peak | 1.0 10 |
| | Hour | 4.9-16 |
| Table 4.9-11. | Cumulative + Project Intersection Operations - PM Peak | |
| T | Hour | 4.9-16 |
| Table 4.10-1. | Current Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards | |
| Table 4.10-2. | Total Estimated Daily Construction Emissions | |
| Table 4.10-3. | Total Estimated Daily Operation Emissions | .4.10-13 |
| Table 4.10-4. | Maximum daily Estimated Emissions for Emergency | |
| T | Generator | |
| Table 4.10-5. | Estimated Project Electricity and Natural Gas Demands | |
| Table 4.10-6. | Estimated Construction Fuel Demand | |
| Table 4.10-7. | Estimated Operational Fuel Consumption | |
| Table 4.10-8. | SLOAPCD GHG Significance Determination Criteria | |
| | Estimated Construction GHG Emissions | |
| | Estimated Operational GHG Emissions | |
| | Total Project GHG Emissions | |
| Table 4.10-12. | Project Consistency with Applicable CAP Measures | .4.10-39 |

List of Tables Final EIR

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

| NUMBER | <u>Title</u> | PAGE |
|----------------|--|---------|
| Table 4.10-13. | Existing Site Estimated Storm Water Runoff | 4.10-41 |
| Table 4.10-14. | Current and Project Water Supply/Demand for GWD | 4.10-52 |
| Table 4.10-15. | Proposed Project Water Demand | 4.10-61 |
| Table 4.10-16. | Estimated Cumulative Water Demand | 4.10-64 |
| Table 4.10-17. | Estimated Cumulative Wastewater Generation | 4.10-65 |
| Table 5-1. | Proposed Project and Alternatives Impact Comparison. | 5-12 |