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1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report was prepared by Watershed Environmental, Inc. under contract to the City of Goleta to describe the existing biological resources located at 7952 Hollister Avenue (APN: 079-210-048), where a new fire station (Station 10) is proposed. Biological surveys were performed on June 24, 2016 and are described in this report. Potential impacts to biological resources resulting from construction and operation of the fire station are evaluated per the adopted City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (SBCO 1995) and the 2016 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Title 14 2009). The project site is located within the City of Goleta, near the western terminus of Hollister Avenue in the Coastal Zone (Figure 1). The parcel is 1.22 acres in size and is currently undeveloped (no structures), but historically had a gas station in the western portion of the property that was removed in 1993 (Attachment 1). After removal of the gas station, remedial work was performed to excavate and remove hydrocarbon-contaminated soils and extract hydrocarbon vapors from the soil. Upon completion of the remediation work, extensive soil sampling verified that clean-up efforts met state, federal, and local environmental health and safety standards.

The purposes of this report are to: 1) identify existing biological resources; 2) evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed project on biological resources; and 3) identify biological mitigation measures needed to ensure project consistency with the City’s biological resource protection policies and development standards, and avoid, reduce, and minimize potential biological impacts to acceptable (less-than-significant) levels.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The parcel is approximately 1.22 acres in size but development would also occur within a 0.30 acre Hollister Avenue easement on the south side of the parcel (Figure 2). A new single-story, approximately 13,000-sq.-ft. fire station facility is proposed at this location. The structure will contain 3 drive-through bays for fire trucks and storage of associated equipment, 4 bedrooms with individual bathrooms, a communal kitchen, a dining area, and an office for the fire station captain. Other facilities within this structure will include: a handicapped-accessible public restroom, a public entry lobby area, a laundry room with extractor units, a turnout storage area, a day room, a workout area, a conference/training room, an engineering workshop, a breathing apparatus repair and high-pressure bottle-filling workshop, a hose storage room, and an emergency generator room. Exterior facilities will include an above-ground fueling station, a hose drying tower, a flag pole, employee parking (8-10 spaces), public parking (4 spaces), yard hydrants, an exterior trash dumpster enclosure, and storage for lawn and gardening tools. The areas adjacent to the structure and exterior facilities will be landscaped with a mixture of ornamental and native vegetation.

3.0 SURVEY METHODS

Watershed Environmental, Inc. biologist Mark de la Garza and environmental analyst Melodee Hickman performed field surveys of the project site on June 24, 2016. Surveys consisted of walking the 1.52-acre study area. Field notes were used to
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Santa Barbara honeysuckle (*Lonicera subspicata var. subspicata*)
Status: CNPS List 1B

Approximately 25 Santa Barbara honeysuckle plants were found in 2005 growing in coastal sage scrub/grassland vegetation north of Calle Real and west of Cathedral Oaks Drive (Caltrans 2006). This stand is located approximately 575 ft. north of the proposed fire station on the north side of the Southern Pacific Railroad and 101 Freeway. This plant was not found in the study area during performance of the June 24, 2016 botanical survey and does not occur on the Fire Station 10 property.

Pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*)
Status: CDFG Sensitive Species, and Bureau of Land Management Sensitive Species

The old Hollister Avenue Bridge over the Union Pacific Railroad that was demolished in 2010 contained a colony of pallid bats and a maternity colony of Mexican free-tailed bats. The old bridge containing these bat colonies was located approximately 480 ft. east of the proposed fire station’s eastern parcel boundary. The 1.22-acre parcel where the fire station is proposed does not contain any suitable pallid bat roost or colony sites.

Monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*)
Status: Winter aggregation sites are listed by the CDFG as vulnerable to extirpation (S3).

There is a known monarch butterfly winter aggregation site in a grove of eucalyptus trees located approximately 720 ft. east of the proposed fire station parcel boundary. There is also a known winter aggregation site near Tecolote Creek 0.67 mi. west of the site and 5 other known aggregation sites on the Ellwood Mesa approximately 0.6-0.9 mi. southeast of the project site (refer to Figure 4). A small grove of bluegum eucalyptus trees in the southeast corner of the study area (refer to Figure 3) is not considered suitable to be used by monarch butterflies as a winter aggregation site because the grove is not large or dense enough to provide the required wind shelter.

Raptors (*Buteo sp., Falco sp., Elanus sp., Accipiter sp.*)
Status: Active raptor nest sites are protected by the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and by Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Code.

Historically, red-tailed hawks and red-shouldered hawks have constructed nests in the blue gum eucalyptus trees on and near the project site. Surveys for raptor nests were performed on June 24, 2016, but no nests were found within the study area or within 500 ft. of the project site.

### 6.0 POTENTIAL PROJECT EFFECTS TO BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

This section describes the potential short-term and long-term impacts to biological resources resulting from construction and operation of the new fire station. Short-term impacts are those associated with site preparation and construction. Long-term impacts are those that would persist after construction during operation of the facility.
The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that the potential effects of a project be evaluated by the lead agency responsible for issuing a permit. In this case, the City of Goleta is the lead agency. Factors are considered to have a “significant effect on the environment” if they cause a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in any of the existing physical conditions within the area affected by the project (CEQA Guidelines 15382).

To facilitate the CEQA environmental review of the project, we have provided a completed CEQA checklist for biological resources in Appendix A of this report. We have also classified biological impacts into the following categories:

a. beneficial
b. adverse, significant, and unavoidable
c. adverse, significant, but mitigatable
d. adverse, but less than significant
e. none, no impact

6.1 Wildlife

Impact 1. Wildlife Habitat Loss

The wildlife species observed and expected to occur in the project area are mostly commonly found, widespread species. Construction of the project will require clearing the site of all vegetation, including: 0.12 acre of coastal sage scrub, 0.11 acre coastal sage scrub/ruderal, 0.61 acre of eucalyptus woodland, 0.23 acre non-native grassland, 0.24 acre non-native grassland/ruderal, and 0.10 acre of ornamental landscape trees. None of the vegetation that will be removed is considered rare, threatened, or endangered. In fact, most of the vegetation that will be removed is non-native. The loss of this habitat caused by development will displace the wildlife that is currently residing there. Highly mobile species such as birds are expected to relocate to other areas, while less mobile species such as ground-dwelling small mammals, reptiles, and amphibians will likely be killed during the site development and construction phase of the project. Upon completion of construction, the undeveloped portions of the project site will be landscaped with a mixture of native and ornamental trees, native and non-native shrubs, and turf grass. This landscaping will provide wildlife habitat for many of the species that currently occupy the site.

The short- and long-term loss of 0.12 acre of coastal sage scrub, 0.11 acre coastal sage scrub/ruderal, 0.61 acre of eucalyptus woodland, 0.23 acre non-native grassland, 0.24 acre non-native grassland/ruderal, and 0.10 acre of ornamental landscape trees is considered adverse, but less than significant because these community types are common in the area, and are not considered high-quality wildlife habitat due to the isolated location of the site and dominance of non-native plant species.
Impact 2. Increased Noise and Light Wildlife Disturbance
Development of the proposed project will increase the already high human presence in the area. Heavy equipment operation and construction noise will cause short-term impacts. Long-term impacts will occur with increased human use and additional night lighting. The increased noise and light have the potential to reduce wildlife usage, particularly for nesting birds. However, given the project site proximity to Hollister Avenue, the 101 Freeway, the Southern Pacific Railroad, and Hollister/Cathedral Oaks Road, the increased noise and night lighting due to the project will be incrementally small.

The short- and long-term impacts of increased noise and light on wildlife are considered **adverse, but less than significant** because noise and night-lighting levels are already high and will only incrementally increase as a result of the project.

Impact 3. Nesting Bird Disturbance
Construction of the proposed project will require the permanent removal of approximately 0.61 acre of blue gum eucalyptus trees and 0.10 acre of ornamental landscape trees. Surveys were performed for active and inactive raptor nests within and adjacent to (within 500 ft. of) the project site, and none were found. However, the potential still exists for disturbance of active raptor nests and other bird nests in trees and shrubs within and adjacent to the project site should construction occur during the bird breeding season (February 1-August 15). Active raptor nest sites are protected by the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and by Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Code. In addition, the City’s Conservation Element Policy 8.4 requires protection of active and historical raptor nest sites when feasible.

In addition to the removal of eucalyptus and ornamental landscape trees, construction of the project will require removal of all shrub and grassland vegetation onsite. There is the potential for several different species of birds to be nesting in that vegetation onsite and adjacent to the project site.

Short-term impacts to nesting birds caused by removal of all vegetation onsite are considered **adverse, significant, but mitigatable**.

Long-term impacts to nesting birds are considered **none, no impact**.

6.2 Vegetation

Impact 4. Vegetation Removal
The majority of the vegetation in the study area is non-native. Of the 6 vegetation types identified and mapped, only the 0.12 acre of coastal sage scrub and 0.11 acre of coastal sage scrub/ruderal contains native plant species (refer to Impact 1). None of the native plant species occurring on the project site are considered sensitive, rare, threatened, or endangered. The majority of the 0.12 acre of coastal sage scrub vegetation on the project site is located in the westernmost portion of the project area and is isolated by Cathedral Oaks Road to the west, the Southern Pacific Railroad and 101 Freeway to the north, Hollister Avenue to the south, and the Hideaway Bungalows & Coastal Preserve to the east.

The City of Goleta Conservation Element Policy CE 1.2 identifies specific areas containing coastal sage scrub vegetation as a significant natural plant community
and as such has designated these areas as Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs). The coastal sage scrub vegetation occurring on the project site is not one of the areas identified as an ESHA by the City (City of Goleta 2006). Areas that are not designated by the City as ESHA are subject to the same protections, provided that they meet the City’s criteria to be classified as ESHA as stated in Conservation Element Policy CE 1.1. The criteria to be classified as ESHA are:

a. Any area in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem and that could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments.

b. Any area that includes habitat for species and plant communities recognized as threatened or endangered by the state or federal governments; plant communities recognized by the State of California (in the Terrestrial Natural Communities Inventory) as restricted in distribution and very threatened; and those habitat types of limited distribution recognized to be of particular habitat value, including wetlands, riparian vegetation, eucalyptus groves associated with monarch butterfly roosts, oak woodlands, and savannas.

c. Any area that has been previously designated as an ESHA by a competent authority.

The coastal sage scrub vegetation on the project site is dominated by coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis* var. *consanguinea*), California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), and coastal California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum* var. *fasciculatum*) this type of scrub vegetation is not considered “rare” or a “special community” by the State of California (CDFG 2010). It is not in our professional opinion considered to be “especially valuable” due to its small size, low diversity, and isolated location.

In addition to the policies described above, Conservation Element Policy CE 5.3 specifically protects coastal sage scrub and chaparral habitat and reads as follows:

a. For purposes of this policy, existing coastal sage scrub is defined as a drought-tolerant, Mediterranean habitat characterized by soft-leaved, shallow-rooted subshrubs such as California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), coyote bush (*Baccharis pilularis*), and California encelia (*Encelia californica*). It is found at lower elevations in both coastal and interior areas where moist maritime air penetrates inland. Chaparral is composed mainly of fire- and drought-adapted woody, evergreen shrubs and generally occupies hills and lower mountain slopes.

b. To the maximum extent feasible, development shall avoid impacts to coastal sage scrub and chaparral habitats that would destroy, isolate, interrupt, or cause a break in continuous habitat that would (1) disrupt associated bird and animal movement patterns and seed dispersal, and (2) increase erosion and sedimentation impacts to nearby creeks or drainages.

c. Impacts to coastal sage scrub and chaparral habitats shall be minimized by providing at least a 25-foot buffer restored with native species around the perimeter of the delineated habitat area.

d. Removal of nonnative and invasive exotic species shall be allowed; revegetation shall be with plants or seeds collected within the same watershed whenever feasible.
It is our interpretation that policy CE 5.3 does not apply to the coastal sage scrub vegetation present on the project site. This policy is intended to protect coastal sage scrub vegetation that is designated as ESHA and/or meets the City’s criteria to be classified as ESHA. The coastal sage scrub vegetation on the project site does not meet this criteria for the reasons described above.

Short-term impacts to vegetation caused by removal of 0.12 acre of coastal sage scrub vegetation and 0.11 acre of coastal sage scrub/ruderal vegetation are considered **adverse, but less than significant.**

Long-term impacts to vegetation caused by removal of coastal sage scrub vegetation are considered **adverse, but less than significant.**

### 6.3 Special-Status Species and Habitats

**Impact 5. Direct and Indirect Impacts to Sensitive Species**

Surveys for special status species were performed within and adjacent to the project area. No sensitive wildlife species, sensitive wildlife breeding habitat, or sensitive plants were found. However, there are a number of sensitive species observations in the project vicinity including: California red-legged frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*), pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*), red shouldered hawk (*Buteo lineatus*), and monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*). Refer to Figure 4 for location of these occurrence records. The project site is completely isolated from any undeveloped area and there is no wetland or aquatic habitat present in the project site or any hydrologic connection to any nearby aquatic habitat in Devereux Creek or the pond at Sandpiper Golf Course. The habitat present on the project site is severely degraded from past land use activities and is isolated and fragmented from any natural habitat. Sensitive wildlife and plant species were not found in the project site during performance of the June 24, 2016 field survey, nor are any sensitive plant or wildlife species (with the exception of raptor nests) expected to occur on the project site in the future.

Short- and long- term direct and indirect impacts to special status species, and habitats are considered to be **none, no impact.**
the project site is dominated by coyote brush \textit{(Baccharis pilularis var. consanguinea)}, California sagebrush \textit{(Artemisia californica)}, and coastal California buckwheat \textit{(Eriogonum fasciculatum var. fasciculatum)}. This type of scrub vegetation is not considered “rare” or a “special community” by the State of California (CDFG 2010). It is not in our professional opinion considered to be “especially valuable” due to its small size, low diversity, and isolated location.

\textbf{Policy CE 1.6 Protection of ESHAs}

We have concluded that the coastal sage scrub and other habitat types occurring on the project site do not meet the City’s ESHA designation criteria. Therefore, the ESHA protection standards contained in this policy do not apply.

\textbf{Policy CE 4.1—CE 4.6 Protection of Monarch Butterfly Habitat Areas}

The small grove of eucalyptus trees located in the eastern portion of the study area lacks the necessary characteristics to be used by monarch butterflies as autumnal and winter roost sites. Therefore, the monarch butterfly protection standards contained in CE policies 4.1 through CE 4.6 do not apply.

\textbf{Policy CE 5.1 Designation of ESHAs}

This policy designates native grasslands, coastal sage scrub, and chaparral habitats as ESHAs. The policy does not state whether or not these habitat types must meet the ESHA criteria contained in policy CE 1.1. The coastal sage scrub vegetation present in the project site does not meet the ESHA criteria, but this policy may still apply. \textit{The City must determine whether this policy applies to the sage scrub vegetation present on this project site.}

\textbf{Policy CE 5.3 Protection of Coastal Sage Scrub and Chaparral}

This policy states that it is in addition to the provisions of Policy CE 1 (the ESHA Designations and Policy), to the effect that “to the maximum extent feasible, development shall avoid impacts to coastal sage scrub and chaparral habitats” and that a 25-ft.-wide buffer area around the perimeter of the delineated habitat be restored with native species. This policy is similar to Policy 5.1 in that it does not clearly state if the policy is applicable to all coastal sage scrub and chaparral habitat regardless of their condition, size, or habitat functions, or if this policy only applies to those habitats that meet ESHA criteria contained in Policy CE 1.1. \textit{The City must determine whether this policy applies to the sage scrub vegetation present on this project site or if this policy is only applicable to sage scrub vegetation meeting the ESHA designation criteria.}

\textbf{CE 8.4 Raptor Nest Protection Policy}

The policy states that development shall be designed to provide a 100-ft. buffer around active and historical nest sites for protected species of raptors when feasible. There is the potential for raptors to construct nests in the eucalyptus trees and ornamental landscape trees present in and adjacent to the study area (refer to Figure 3 for location). Performance of nesting bird surveys prior to and during construction must occur to ensure project consistency with this condition and project compliance with state and federal laws protecting raptor and migratory bird nests.
8.0 RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

CEQA requires that feasible mitigation measures or alternatives be incorporated into the project description in order to avoid or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effect on the environment will occur. The actual incorporation of mitigation into the project description depends on the type of CEQA document prepared, and can consist of applicant-proposed mitigation and/or lead agency permit condition requirements. In either case, mitigation measures are required for impacts identified as significantly adverse.

The Goleta Fire Station No. 10 project analyzed in this report has the potential to cause adverse, significant, but mitigable short-term impacts to nesting birds. In order to ensure that project impacts are reduced to less than significant levels, the following mitigation measures are recommended:

Mitigation Measure 1. Wildlife Habitat Loss
Mitigation is not required because the short- and long-term impacts, while adverse, are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 2. Increased Noise and Light Wildlife Disturbance
Mitigation is not required because the short- and long-term impacts, while adverse, are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 3. Nesting Bird Disturbance
The following mitigation is recommended to ensure protection of breeding birds onsite and adjacent to the project site during the site preparation (i.e., vegetation clearing and grubbing) and construction phases of the project. Vegetation removal and tree trimming shall not occur during bird nesting season (February 1–August 15). If these activities must occur during this time, pre-construction breeding bird surveys shall be performed by a qualified, City-approved biologist. Nesting bird pre-construction surveys shall occur within the area to be disturbed and extend outward 500 ft. or to the property boundary. If any occupied bird nests or cavity roosts are found, the biologist shall determine an appropriate buffer zone that considers the bird species, nest location, nest height, existing pre-construction level of disturbance in the vicinity of the nest, and proposed construction activities. A buffer ranging in size from 100 ft. for nesting passerine species to 500 ft. for nesting raptors shall be determined and demarcated by the biologist with bright-orange construction fencing, flagging, construction lathe, or other means to mark the boundary, unless a smaller buffer is considered adequate based on the factors listed above (as approved by the City of Goleta).

Mitigation Measure 4. Vegetation Removal
Mitigation is not required because the short- and long-term impacts, while adverse, are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 5. Direct and Indirect Impacts to Sensitive Species
Mitigation is not required because the short- and long-term impacts to sensitive species are considered none, no impact.
9.0 CONCLUSIONS

Construction of the proposed Goleta Fire Station No. 10 is not expected to result in any short- or long-term adverse, significant, and unavoidable environmental impacts to biological resources. Biological impacts identified in this report include: wildlife habitat loss, increased noise and light wildlife disturbance, nesting bird disturbance, vegetation removal, and direct and indirect impacts to sensitive wildlife species. The short- and long-term project impacts to wildlife habitat loss, vegetation removal, and increased noise and light wildlife disturbance are considered adverse, but less than significant. Potential short-term impacts to nesting birds are considered to be adverse, significant, but mitigatable. Short- and long-term project impacts to sensitive wildlife species are considered to be none, no impact.
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Attachment 1. Photographs of Project Site
Photo 1. Goleta Fire Station No. 10
Project Site.

Photo 2, 3 & 4. Coastal Sage Scrub vegetation found in northwestern corner and center of project site.
Photo 5. Coastal Sage
Scrub/Ruderal vegetation found in southwestern edge of project site.

Photo 6. Disturbed/Bare Dirt strip found along eastern edge of project site.

Photo 7 & 8. Eucalyptus Woodland Trees with non-native grassland in foreground.
Photo 9, 10 & 11. Ornamental Landscape Trees found in project site.

Photo 12 & 13. Non-Native Grassland/Ruderal vegetation found in central and western portion of the project site.
Appendix A
California Environmental Quality Act
Checklist for Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix A (continued)
### California Environmental Quality Act Checklist for Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>