



City of Santa Barbara

Community Development Department

July 13, 2022

Response to Comments on Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Police Station Project

The Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was circulated for a 30-day public review period that began on May 13, 2022 and ended on June 12, 2022.

Comment letters received include three letters from the public, one letter from the Air Pollution Control District, and one letter from the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians. The Planning Commission also provided comments, which are reflected in the minutes of the public hearing held on June 2, 2022. In response to the comments received, staff have incorporated corrections or additional text in the Final MND. None of these changes introduce significant new information or affect the conclusions of the MND.

Response to the letters are provided below:

Air Pollution Control District dated June 8, 2022. The letter suggests corrections to the methodologies used for the estimated air pollutant emissions and evaluation of toxic air contaminants. The letter also noted that the smaller diesel emergency generator was not originally included in the emissions analysis. Dudek provided an updated memorandum (dated June 22, 2022) that provided the analysis to address comments from APCD.

Dudek also provided an updated Noise memorandum dated June 22, 2022 to evaluate the second generator. Following, revisions were made to the Final MND to incorporate the corrections and updated analysis within Section 3, *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions* and Section 11, *Noise*. The revisions serve as clarification and do not change the level of significance of any impact.

Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians dated June 23, 2022. The letter was received after the review period and did not have any comments on the adequacy of the Draft MND. Comments are noted and no revision to the Final MND is required.

Michael Jones dated June 5, 2022. The letter expresses support for the project. The comment letter is attached for the decision-makers' consideration and no revision to the Final MND is required.

Rich Untermann (undated). The letter expresses opposition to the project. The comments presented no substantial evidence to indicate that the Project would have a significant effect on the environment. The comment letter is attached for the decision-makers' consideration and no revision to the Final MND is required.

Paulina Conn dated May 30, 2022. The letter expresses opposition to the project. The comments presented no substantial evidence to indicate that the Project would have a significant effect on the environment. The comment letter is attached for the decision-makers' consideration and no revision to the Final MND is required.

Planning Commission Minutes

The comments presented no substantial evidence to indicate that the Project would have a significant effect on the environment. Some additions and clarifications were made to the Final MND in response to comments from the Planning Commission as indicated below:

- Information was added about the role of the Project Environmental Coordinator in the *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)* Section on page 86.
- Information was added about City staff contacting the Safe Parking Program staff to assist with finding alternative sites on pages 67 and 68 in Section 12, *Population and Housing*.
- Information was added about the time frame and process for assisting parking permit holders for the Cota Commuter Lot in the *Existing Land Use* Section on pages 6 and 7.
- Information was added to state that there is sufficient space in the native habitat area in Elings Park or along the newly constructed Las Positas Multiuse Path for the planting of replacement trees on page 33 in Section 4, *Biological Resources*.
- Information was added about the process of relocating the Farmer's Market in the *Existing Land Use* Section on pages 6 and 7.
- Clarification was added that the existing Police Station facilities are not part of the current project within the *Project Operations* Section on page 3.
- Information was added about the site selection process and a link to the City website was added to provide access to relevant information in the *Site Selection Process* Section on pages 3 and 4.
- Information was added about the Project being infill development and pursuant to the State CEQA Statute, the project's effects on aesthetics and parking, including visual character and scenic views, are not required to be analyzed and are not considered a significant effect on the environment in the *Infill Development* Section on pages 7 and 8, and in Section 1, *Aesthetics and Visual Resources*.
- Information was added about the estimated water use of the existing Police Station on page 71 in Section 13, *Public Services and Utilities*.
- Information was added about the consideration of changing Santa Barbara Street from one-way traffic to two-way traffic on page 77 in Section 15, *Transportation and Circulation*.
- Information was added about the Project providing battery storage on page 42 in Section 6, *Energy*.



air pollution control district
SANTA BARBARA COUNTY

June 8, 2022

Kathleen Kennedy
Community Development Department, Planning Division
City of Santa Barbara
630 Garden Street
Santa Barbara CA 93101

Sent Via Email: KKennedy@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Re: Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District Comments on the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Santa Barbara Police Station, PLN2020-00627

Dear Kathleen Kennedy,

The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (District) has reviewed the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the referenced project, which consists of demolition of an existing parking lot and construction of a new three-story, approximately 53-foot-high, approximately 64,000-square-foot Police Station building, and associated 37.5-foot-high, approximately 84,000-square-foot parking structure to accommodate 236 parking spaces (128 for Police Department fleet vehicles and 108 for employee vehicles). Each structure would also have a subterranean level. Eight additional vehicle surface parking spaces and four bicycle parking spaces would be provided for visitors. Grading includes 22,000 cubic yards of export. A 744-brake horsepower (BHP) Tier- 4 diesel-powered emergency generator and 229 BHP Tier-3 diesel-powered emergency generator are proposed. The subject property, a 1.61-acre parcel zoned M-C (Manufacturing-Commercial) and identified in the Assessor Parcel Map Book as APN 031-151-018, is located at 601 Santa Barbara Street in the City of Santa Barbara.

Air Pollution Control District staff offers the following comments on the Initial Study/Draft MND:

1. Section 3 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Impact Evaluation Guidelines, “Long-Term (Operational) Air Quality Impact Guidelines”, Page 19:

- a.) Please revise Guideline #8 to state the following: “*Not cause or contribute to a violation of any CAAQS or NAAQS (except ozone).*”
- b.) Guideline #11 is not one of APCD’s adopted thresholds of significance. Please remove this text from the listing of APCD’s adopted thresholds. The text in question would be better placed in the general discussion of air quality. Please relocate as appropriate.

2. Section 3 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Table 2 – Estimated Project Construction Emissions, Page 22:

- a.) The 25 ton/yr threshold for short-term pollutants should be applied to each pollutant separately (except CO), not all pollutants combined. This should also be corrected in the discussion on pages 19 and 20.

- b.) The District does not currently have quantitative thresholds of significance in place for short-term construction emissions; however the APCD uses 25 tons per year for ROC and NO_x as a guideline for determining the significance of construction impacts. Therefore, in Table 2, "APCD" should be removed from "APCD Total Emissions Threshold (tons/year)".
3. **Section 3 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, 3.b) Air Pollutant Emissions and Cumulative Impacts, "Long-Term (Operational) Emissions", Page 23 and 3.e-f) Greenhouse Gases, "Long-Term (Operational) Emissions", Page 27:** On Sheet A102, the project plans show a second emergency backup generator (a 229 BHP, Tier 3 engine) in addition to the 744 BHP emergency backup generator mentioned in the Air Quality/GHG Technical Memo. The discussion should be updated to include the installation and operation of two diesel generators. In addition, please update the criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions to include emissions from the 229 BHP, Tier 3 engine. Currently, only emissions from the 744 BHP, Tier 4 engine are included.
4. **Section 3 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, 3.c Sensitive Receptors, "Toxics Air Contaminants", Page 24-25:** The health risk from the 229 BHP, Tier 3 diesel generator engine is not included in the Health Risk Assessment (HRA) conducted for the project (only toxics emissions from the 744 BHP, Tier 4 engine have been modeled). The District has run preliminary health risk screenings for the proposed engines and determined that health risk is potentially significant based upon the conservative screenings. **The District highly recommends that the refined HRA completed for project operations be revised to include the 229 BHP, Tier 3 engine.** As part of District permit issuance, an evaluation of health risk will be required to demonstrate that the operation of project-related equipment does not cause a significant risk to the surrounding community and nearby sensitive receptors. The District will not issue a permit if an HRA shows that a significant health risk impact will occur. Therefore, we recommend that potential health risk from proposed equipment is addressed up front during the land use review process to ensure that project-related equipment will not result in a significant impact. If the revised refined HRA shows a significant health risk impact, mitigation should be proposed to reduce risk to below thresholds. Mitigation could include the use of cleaner equipment, reduction in maintenance and testing hours, and/or relocation of the equipment from its currently proposed location. The applicant should refer to the District's website at www.ourair.org/dice-atcm for more information on diesel engine permitting and contact William Sarraf, Supervisor of the District's Engineering Division, at SarrafW@sbcapcd.org or (805) 979-8312 with any questions.

If you or the project applicant have any questions regarding these comments, please feel free to contact me at (805) 979-8336 or via email at HamiltonT@sbcapcd.org.

Sincerely,

Ted Hamilton-Rolla

Ted Hamilton
Air Quality Specialist
Planning Division

cc: Brad Hess, Public Works Dept., City of Santa Barbara (Via Email)

David Harris, Engineering Division Manager (Via Email)
Charlotte Mountain, Air Quality Engineer III (Via Email)
Planning Chron File



Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians
Tribal Elders' Council

P.O. Box 517 ♦ Santa Ynez ♦ CA ♦ 93460

Phone: (805)688-7997 ♦ Fax: (805)688-9578 ♦ Email: elders@santaynezchumash.org

June 23, 2022

City of Santa Barbara, Planning Division
Attn: Kathleen Kennedy
P.O. Box 1990
Santa Barbara, CA 93102-1990

Att.: Kathleen Kennedy, Project Planner

Re: 601 Santa Barbara St (formally 119 E. Cota St.)

Dear Ms. Kennedy:

Thank you for contacting the Tribal Elders' Council for the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians.

At this time, the Elders' Council requests no further consultation on this project; however, we understand that as part of NHPA Section 106, we must be notified of the project.

Thank you for remembering that at one time our ancestors walked this sacred land.

Sincerely Yours,

Crystal Mendoza

Crystal Mendoza
Administrative Assistant | Cultural Resource Management
Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians | Tribal Hall
(805) 325-5537
cmendoza@santaynezchumash.org

From: [Michael Jones](#)
To: KKennedy@SantaBarbaraCA.gov
Subject: 601 Santa Barbara St. A Draft MITIGATED DECLARATION (MND)
Date: Sunday, June 05, 2022 4:59:36 PM

[You don't often get email from skippy87@icloud.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

EXTERNAL

This is the address of 517 Santa Barbara St. We are Native residents. Thank-You for this notice. We Agree to the Adoption Draft Project. We would be Pleased to have the Santa Barbara Police Department as our Neighbor. Thank-You very much, to each and everyone. The Jones Family-

Sent from my iPad

Santa Barbara Planning Commission
Re: Police Station EIR – Negative Declaration

Dear Planning Commission members

I am writing to oppose the Negative Declaration for the Police Station, believing there are many more environmentally friendly options. Here are some of the reasons:

The report skims every issue – no problems anywhere. How can you build almost three and a half acres of building (150,000 square feet) and not have any impacts – particular in this time of energy concerns, climate change, housing needs, and waste reduction.

The site is zoned for HOUSING PRIORTIY. Why give up a prime housing site for a use that can fit into many other buildings or places?

There are no “alternatives evaluated – a typical part of the EIR reports. There are many alternatives – reusing the existing Police Station; decentralizing with parts of the program house elsewhere (at lower costs) using the very popular Community Policing model, with sub stations in different neighbors, etc.

There is no precise measure of GHG created with the removal and replacement of mature tree with new sapling trees. These new trees will take at least 25 years to reach the same maturity, meanwhile all the carbon capture and storm water capture that mature trees preform will be lost.

The visual /aesthetic is inadequate – replacing what is probably Santa Barbara's most attractive parking lot with two over 50-foot-tall buildings in a major visual alteration – particular with contrasted with the small cottages in the adjacent. Neighborhood. There is no mention of visual offsets, just lots of words that obfuscate and suggest the preparers were at a loss to find offsets.

The number of constructions related trips to the site, and the carbon footprint is vastly under counted. Assuming 2200 vehicles amounts to only 3 per day over the 22-month construction period.

Excavating for the basement will require at least 233 trucks loads, resulting in substantial GHG for removal, transit, and trip returns. There is no mention of disposal sites – will it be in Ventura or Lompok, what is the distance traveled.

There will be dozens of cars and trucks necessary for the material delivery and trades trucks and worker vehicles to construct such a complicated building. How many GHG do they create, and what are the offsets?

There is no mention of using low carbon cement and steel – the two major construction materials in such an earthquake structure. There is no mention of an all-wood building – more common every day in a climate change, low carbon footprint.

There seems to be no attempt to reduce the size of the building through creative planning and architecture. Reducing is a prime method to lower GHG and reduce costs.

I am surprised that a Committee of the Parks and Recreation Department approved the destruction of the mature existing trees on City property. I have never heard - in my long career - of a unanimous vote by people who are charged to defend nature. (Time to get a new Parks Committee who will defend Parks purposes

There is no mention of alternative worker access during construction. Construction workers typically don't carpool, and so each job has dozens of cars and trucks - each driving long distances because of Santa Barbara's housing shortage. What is their GHG creation, what mitigation (i.e., buses carpools, MTD passes, tool lockers, etc.)

The effects of GHG emissions seems under counted. For instance, the environmental and carbon generated by demolishing the EXISTING Police Station and replacing it with another use should be counted in this EIR. What are the offsets? more trees, new solar facilities, etc.

Building a 275-car garage at this time of traffic congestion, and increased GHG alternative options, is inappropriate and environmentally unfriendly. Surely there can be creative use of the MTD, electric bikes carpooling, buses (think Cottage Hospital). What is the Carbon footprint, and what are the offsets?

Demolition of 390 cubic yards seems low. If the site was cleared by just one foot, it would amount to 2339 cubic yards of dirt, rubble, asphalt, or approximately 233 truck trips. That creates a substantial carbon footprint, and complicated traffic pattern, yet no description of offsets.

Storm Water management seem seriously under reported. While a 25-year storm may be the minimum requirements, in this time of climate change, there are more intense and complex storms. We need to calculate for something like a 50- or 100-year event.

The list of serious environment issues, and lack of mitigating measure goes on, but I will stop for now.

I believe this EIR should be sent back to the drafters and architects for a sharper look, and probably more change

I include copies of several letters I have sent to the City Manager, and most Council members over the years.

Sincerely,

Rich Untermann

Professor Emeritus
Urban Planning and Design
University of Washington
Seattle Washington

Eric Friedman, Councilmember
Santa Barbara, CA 03102

Sept 3, 2019

Re: Summary - 'Newer' Police Station

Dear Councilmember Friedman,

My interest in the Police Station are two fold: - I believe it is crazy, foolish, irresponsible –for Santa Barbara to spend \$100,000,000 (or more) on a Police Station; and, 'reusing' is now a central environmental watchword. This complex existing site requires finesse and skill to organize the program on the existing campus, and that will force far better judgments during the design course. Sounds crazy, but it is true! The architect can't just put a couple of large boxes on it and fill it with 72,000 feet of space and 250 cars –

In summary:

- The existing site is very close in size - about 1.45 acres, the new one 1.6 acres
- The existing building at 39,000 sq. ft. compared to the 'everything' new at 78,000 – is not that far apart.
 - Parking 250 cars takes more space than the entire Headquarters building! And is one of the areas for reducing cost, The parking is paired with the building floors – i.e. 14 foot ceiling, while normal parking is 8 or 9 foot ceiling height – again very expensive. Paired 14' ceiling might be OK for patrol cars, but it is excessive for most. The existing 9,000-foot lot could support 120-160 cars (half the program), while for civilians, visitors, etc. could park in the Granada lot which may show reduced use age over time. (Seattle bought an existing parking lot when it build their new Police Headquarters)
 - A couple of other options; the 4000 sq. ft. 'Community Room' – probably a nice thing, is 5.5% of the building, maybe \$5,225,000 in cost – because of the extraordinary earthquake costs.
 - Maybe Dispatch remains in the Granada – another reason to be near the existing Police Station.
 - The space for motorcycles officers, meter attendees, animal control, swat, etc. could be decentralized – or eliminated. I bet by the time this station is built, many cities across America will be using cell phones and embedded chips to monitor speed and parking – at much higher income for the city.
 - Housing subsidies or scheduling shifts so a bus could work for the police to reduce the parking need - if we put our minds to it, we can find a way.

Finally, costs! I don't know how much cushion the \$95 million includes, but my friends in the industry are expecting – given everything that is now occurring in our global world, substantial construction cost increases in the next few years – like 25

Staging – There are many ways to stage construction on this site – one is to build a new 44,000 sq.ft, structure in the space between existing buildings is and a new entry building in the open space on Fig could (4000 – 16,000 ft.) Once completed, the police could move in, and a parking structure constructed on Anapamu, and the existing Station gutted, reinforced and remodeled.

Eric, thanks for listening – like most citizens, I value the police, and want to treat them right. But right might not be a grand, new Palace –

I am happy to talk to you about this if you want, but know it is not a favorite unless the Farmers Market site is voided.

Regards,

Rich Untermann
805 886 3922 runtermann1@cox.net

Mr. Paul Casey, City Administrator
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

September 4, 2019

Re: 'Newer' Police Station

Dear Paul

For some time I have discussed the idea of remodeling the existing Police Station to different Councilmembers, and I thought it right to share that idea with you – in case the other options fall away. Many people think it is crazy, foolish, and irresponsible - for Santa Barbara to spend \$95,000,000 + on a new Police Station – when with some careful planning, good results might be possible for less, so I suggest the City look again at remodeling the existing Station. Please hear me out.

This idea started with a 1990 hospital remodel in Seattle that constructed a new, 60,000 square foot earthquake reinforced building in front of the old hospital (Pacific Medical Center), and then connected the two buildings. The old building got it's seismic requirements from leaning on the newer one, and resulted in 60,000 sq. ft. of new rentable space for the cost of what would normally be an invisible earthquake reinforcement project. Amazon rented it as their first headquarters

First, construct a new three-story building, plus basements in the large, handicap ramp space on Figurora Street (app. 7500 square feet of space). With a new building at the sidewalk grade, citizens could walk in directly for their Police services needs. Stairs and elevators would lead to a remodeled police building behind. The 'new' front building would meet the strigent earthquake proof requirements; the remodeled middle building would be connected to gain [part of] it's earthquake proofness from its new front building. And the extra space (up to 28,000 on three floors plus basement) could be used by the Police Department.

At the same time, construct a new Building in the middle vacant land

Second then replace the Anapamu building with a parking ramp, and remodel the existing Figueroa building. Though this complex site would require more finesse and skill to organize the program, that usually forces far better judgments during the design process. Sounds crazy, but it is true! The architect can't just put a couple of large boxes on it and fill it with 72,000 feet of space and 250 cars

Santa Barbara's Police station has a large, unused space in front (app. 48 feet deep by 135 feet or 7500 square feet) that is mostly handicap ramps leading to the service counters. A new three-story building, plus basements could be built in that area, with the public services at the sidewalk grade, so citizens could walk in directly. Stairs and elevators would lead to a remodeled police building behind. The 'new' front building would be the strong, earthquake proof building; the rear would be connected to gain from its strength. And the extra space (up to 28,000 on three floors plus basement) could be used by the Police Department.

There appears to be adequate room to stage a build/remodel while the police remain in their two buildings, then replace the Anapamu building with a parking ramp, and remodel the existing Figueroa building . Though this complex site would require more finesse and skill to organize the program, that usually forces far better judgments during the design process. Sounds crazy, but it is true! The architect can't just put a couple of large boxes on it and fill it with 72,000 feet of space and 250 cars –

There is an opportunity to review the New Police Station program, and redirect it to better serve the emerging ideas following this terrible incident in Minneapolis. You probably know that the current direction – a centralized, everything in one place is an old model, and that – community policing is very likely to be more the direction of the future police model.

That means all the headquarters really needs is office space for the Brass, and everything else can be elsewhere (or some of it there).

Asking why Firefighters are always loved, while Police aren't might be helpful, and why not try and get Police closer to the fire model. There are many ideas out there, and you probably know many of them, but I would:

1. Get police out of all traffic issues – it is the place that gets them in trouble – fear, profiling, I didn't do anything, etc. Most of the traffic issues will be able to be handled digitally when all cars have an identification tag on them – a time frame that is probably parallel with the Police station completion.
2. I would get police out of their uniform, into blazers, and keep the John Brown's away.
3. I would rent or buy a police store front office in all the neighborhoods – with identifiable officer faces, and make them an important part of the community on a daily basis. I would try to buy a small house for one officer to live in the neighborhood.
4. I would keep the police station where it is, as it is part of the justice system – courts, etc. With a reduced program there is plenty of room. Public parking is available in seldom filled nearby garages.
5. All the other services don't have to be at headquarters – and some of them are particularly difficult, like Evidence, the SWAT group and 911.

I enclose a copy of an earlier letter that I have worked on (since 2017) with previous Council members and the City Manager so you might understand my interests.

Thanks,

Rich Untermann

From: [Peter Conn](#)
To: [Community Development PC Secretary](#)
Subject: Police Station, Agenda Item iii. Environmental Hearing 5-2-2022
Date: Monday, May 30, 2022 8:54:46 PM

EXTERNAL

RE: iii. Environmental Hearing: Please deny the so called "mitigated" Negative Declaration of the EIR for the behemoth police station in the Eastside Latino neighborhood.

Changing the address from 119 E. Cota St. to 601 Santa Barbara St. does not change anything except the address.

Dear Planning Commission,

The Police Station can not possibly have a "mitigated" Negative Declaration for the EIR. Trees are destroyed; basements are dug in an area prone to flooding; acres of dirt are moved to some other location via thousands of dump truck trips; salt water intrusion might occur. Who knows what the water table is like during winter rains. Who knows the effect of all this digging on the water well monitoring station across the street (Cota) at Plaza Vera Cruz. Then there is the excessive height, views taken, location, community impact of all sorts and actual need.

Please deny the Police Station at the Cota St. location. Size, bulk, scale, displayed architectural attitude of "We are all powerful" is wrong for any society and certainly has never been that for Santa Barbara so why start now AFTER the George Floyd Black Lives Matter movement that began to sensitize everyone about how many police profile supposed crime perpetrators by skin color. And now you are unnecessarily putting a gigantic police edifice in the neighborhood of people of color.

Cota St. is the WRONG location. It is in the middle of the Latino community. How insensitive is that????!

There is a huge environmental impact by this construction project. A Negative Declaration for an EIR is not possible. What is going on??? These gigantic square box excessively tall buildings with basement can not possibly have a Negative Declaration on an EIR, mitigated or not. It is impossible. Why? Massive amounts of dirt will be excavated and moved to some location. Where? How? How much? There will be massive impacts of trucks, dust, perhaps even salt water intrusion. What is the effect? What is the environmental impact? The location is surrounded by flood plain. The Vera Cruz Park potable well water monitoring station is right HERE, across the street on Cota St. That alone ought to cause the need for an EIR. What is going on????????? Mature trees are being bulldozed. That must be a NO NO in this day and age of climate change. These trees sequester huge amounts of carbon and they cool the city. This giant police station design that covers the entire block with virtually no landscaping contributes so negatively to climate change and so negatively to people's physical and mental health it is an embarrassment that our city planners and leaders would even think that all this impact does not require an EIR. What is going on???????

The current Figueroa St. location is absolutely perfect for a police station that projects a humane and just spirit. It is hidden away. The Figueroa St. building is actually welcoming looking. It is close to the courts,

within true walking distance. It is above the flood plain so first responders will be unhampered by flooded streets surrounding their digs. Figure out how to build here. Figure out how to build a friendly looking police station. Build next to the current building. Find parking in a City lot for the vehicles if needed. No harm done if a City Lot is off limits for a year while a new police station is being built. After all the City plans to discontinue the Cota St. commuter lot, even two commuter lots if you include the Carrillo one for housing. Which all begs the question. Has this police station moving plan really been thought out well? I THINK NOT! It seems to be knee jerk, an easy solution - flat City owned land, build to the limit, needed or not. Don't think about size or location or impression on people who might need to go there. Sensitivity to the Latino community and neighborhood aesthetics don't matter. Is this institutional racism? It feels that way to me, a white female.

Please stop this fiasco now before more money is spent. Think about what you really need and design a beautiful , inviting police station not an "in-you-face" giant box that oozes contempt for society.

The current Figueroa St. Police Station is a beautiful building. If it needs to be taken apart because of asbestos, earthquake or whatever then let's redo what we have and use this spot.

Think, think think. Don't just react to the need. Think what kind of need and where and how large. Should we have substations so police get to know real people in real communities?

This imposing palace to authority is just plain WRONG. "Peace Officers" indeed. This Cota St. edifice is a statement of authoritarian power. There is nothing comforting or friendly or peace officer or "neighborhood" policing about it.

It is same ole, same ole, wrong attitude about and treatment of people.

Please say NO to this Police Station design in this location. Please ask the City to start over with a kinder, more compassionate, more up-to-date attitude for the buildings, needs, design and location. This proposal is all wrong.

Please cut our losses in treasure, sensitivity towards our majority minority community, and the architectural attitude that displays excessive power in a community that does not need this. This is the wrong building in the wrong place.

I believe the last City Council was too anxious to get something done now. Many people in the community communicated with Mr. Hess about how wrong this decision was but it fell on deaf ears. Of course this wrong decision caused the domino effect by the powers-that-be at the time deciding that the displaced Farmer's Market could go to De La Guerra Plaza. This in turn started the terrible and expensive decision to "redo" the Plaza into another heat island by taking up the lawn and expanding hardscape. The rightfully independent Farmers Market took their vegetables to Carrillo St, so the DLG Plaza makeover has also become a colossal waste of time and money.

Please reject this police station plan and location. Deny the "mitigated" Negative EIR Declaration. Demand a total EIR or better yet just deny the whole project.

Ask that the City reconsider their options and go back to the drawing boards.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Paulina Conn
805 682-5183

I grew up on the Westside, went to City schools and have lived in the area 60+ years.



City of Santa Barbara

PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

JUNE 2, 2022

1:00 P.M.
City Hall, Council Chambers
735 Anacapa Street; and
40612 Meadow Ln
Palm Desert, CA 92260

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Gabriel Escobedo, Chair
Roxana Bonderson, Vice Chair
John M. Baucke
Jay D. Higgins
Sheila Lodge
Devon Wardlow
Lesley Wiscomb

STAFF:

Tava Ostrenger, Assistant City Attorney
Allison DeBusk, Senior Planner
Gillian Fennessy, Commission Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Escobedo called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

Chair Gabriel Escobedo, Vice Chair Roxana Bonderson, Commissioners John M. Baucke, Jay D. Higgins, Sheila Lodge, Devon Wardlow, and Lesley Wiscomb

STAFF PRESENT

Tava Ostrenger, Assistant City Attorney
Allison DeBusk, Senior Planner
Kathleen Kennedy, Project Planner
Julia Pujo, Project Planner/ Environmental Analyst
Brad Hess, Principal Project Manager, Public Works
Janet Ahern, City TV Production Specialist
Gillian Fennessy, Commission Secretary

II. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

A. Requests for continuances, withdrawals, postponements, or addition of ex-agenda items:

No requests.

B. Announcements and appeals:

No announcements.

C. Review, consideration, and action on the following draft Planning Commission minutes and resolutions:

1. May 12, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes
2. Planning Commission Resolution No. 003-22
701 N. Milpas St
3. Planning Commission Resolution No. 004-22
25 Las Alturas Rd
4. May 19, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes
5. Planning Commission Resolution No. 005-22
3239 Cliff Dr.

MOTION: Wiscomb / Bonderson

Approve the minutes and resolutions as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 0

D. Comments from members of the public pertaining to items not on this agenda:

Public comment opened at 1:02 p.m., and the following individual spoke:

1. Steve Fort

Public comment closed at 1:03 p.m.

Written correspondence from Michael & Sandra Christenson was acknowledged.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL HEARING

ACTUAL TIME: 1:04 P.M.

DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (MND) PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING

601 SANTA BARBARA STREET (Formerly 119 E. Cota St.) (Police Station)

Assessor's Parcel Number: 031-151-018

Zoning Designation: M-C Zone

Application Number: PLN2020-00627

Applicant / Owner: City of Santa Barbara

The project consists of demolition of an existing parking lot (Cota Commuter Lot) and construction of a new three-story, approximately 53-foot-high, approximately 64,000-square-foot Police Station building, and associated 37.5-foot-high, approximately 84,000-square-foot parking structure to accommodate 236 parking spaces (128 for Police Department fleet vehicles

and 108 for employee vehicles). Eight additional surface parking spaces would be provided for visitors.

The purpose of the environmental hearing is to receive comments from the Planning Commission, interested agencies, and the public on the adequacy and completeness of the Draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the proposed project. Written comments on the Draft MND will be accepted through **June 12, 2022**.

No formal action on the development proposal or environmental document will take place at this hearing.

Kathleen Kennedy, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation. Julia Pujo, Project Planner/Environmental Analyst and Brad Hess, Principal Project Manager were available to answer questions.

Adam Poll, Air Quality Consultant, Dudek was available to answer questions. John Davis, Project Manager, Dudek was available remotely to answer questions.

Public comment opened at 1:24 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Written correspondence from Rich Untermann and Paulina Conn was acknowledged.

Commissioner comments:

Commissioner Wiscomb:

- Staff has done great job on the MND. It is very thorough.
- The document is complete and easy to read in terms of explanation for the mitigation measures and why they are implemented.
- All of the studies that have been done and the studies that are required prior to construction speak to more than an adequate analysis.
- The Project Environmental Coordinator (PEC) will play a key role in the project as it moves through construction. The PEC will be proactive to assure appropriate mitigation measures are being used as the construction progresses. There may be changes throughout the construction process, so it is important that the PEC duties be included in the MND.
- Appreciates the short-term, construction-related mitigation measures because things will probably change, but also appreciates the long-term operational mitigation measures as they were very thoughtful to the neighbors and the surrounding community.
- Would like to be clearer about the precise timing and process related to the Safe Parking Program. Would like the participants of the Safe Parking Program to be notified with ample time and a further study of locations be completed so it doesn't become an issue in the future. Would like Staff to provide this information in the MND and how it will be handled as we get closer to 2024 construction.
- The relocation of vehicles that currently park in the Cota Commuter Lot could be clearer by addressing the process and timing, and including the following:
 - A future survey to determine where the participants go after they park, when it is closer to construction.
 - Analysis of the reassignment of the potential places participants could go.
 - Is there adequate parking available at the alternative lots? Do not know because the survey hasn't been done yet.

- Perhaps a future analysis of impacts to traffic by relocation of vehicles to another parking lot and if queuing up would create a traffic impact.
- Tree replacements should be clearer in documenting that the replacement areas, Las Positas Multi-Use Path and Elings Park, have sufficient areas to accommodate the additional trees.
- The process of relocating the Farmers Market could be clearer.
- Recommends that the project description states that this does not include the existing Police Station so that the public understands that it is not part of this project, and that the potential future uses of the existing Police Station will be defined under a separate project while this project is being constructed.

Commissioner Baucke:

- Believes this is a very thorough document and commends Staff for their diligence.
- Agrees with Commissioner Wiscomb's comments.
- Would like the MND to include reference to the site selection process and associated CEQA documentation. All of the documentation on the site selection process should be part of the record for this MND because the public has raised issues about the site selection process and alternatives.
- Would like to include some background on the existing police station and what its future may or may not be.
- As feedback to the Architectural Board of Review, he has concerns regarding the blank façade of the tower included on the plans.

Commissioner Higgins:

- Would like the visual resources section of the MND to be approached like the biological section in terms of overcompensating. Would like to include a discussion in the MND that visual resources are not considered a significant impact under CEQA because of State law and not because the design review board found it compatible. Compatibility is not necessarily a way to address impact.
- Believes that this is going to be a large building in context of the surrounding buildings and would like better forewarning to the public about the height and size.
- Would like to see improved water use disclosure including an explanation of how the numbers were arrived at, for instance, the institutional usage rate.
- Would like to include information about how much water current police station uses.

Commissioner Lodge:

- Agrees with Commissioners Wiscomb and Baucke about thoroughness of the analysis.
- The mitigation measures are appropriate.
- Believes that the current police station building is inadequate because it is holding more people than it was designed to hold and it is spread out over three other buildings.
- Believes this project is essential and is glad that the proposed building will contain all police services.
- Recalls that the decision to relocate the Farmers Market to Carrillo and State was made by the Santa Barbara Certified Farmers Market Association.

Commissioner Wardlow:

- Agrees with fellow Commissioners.
- Agrees with the idea this project will be and already has been scrutinized by the public, but it is something that is needed.

- The analysis is adequate and appreciates it.
- The mitigation measures are appropriate, but would like to see more notice to the public.
- Community engagement with the surrounding businesses and educating people on the impacts, specifically traffic, is important, especially regarding construction.
- Would like to ensure that the Farmers Market is properly relocated prior to construction.

Commissioner Bonderson:

- Agrees that the document is thorough.
- The mitigation measures are appropriate.
- Parking analysis related to the relocation of commuter parking from the Cota Street Lot to other lots should be completed and provided in the MND.
- The explanation regarding traffic was adequate for today's conversation but a more formal study and formal decision with regard to traffic, both during construction and possibly in the future, after construction is completed on Santa Barbara Street, needs to be documented.
- Important to make this document as detailed as possible.
- Commends Staff for their hard work and appreciates the time and attention spent on it.

Chair Escobedo:

- Agrees with Commissioner Wiscomb's comments.
- In regard to the Safe Parking Program, would like to make sure that there is adequate noticing and a planning process that occurs more than a few months before construction.
- Would like to make sure there is a conversation with the participants in the Safe Parking Program.
- Supports the suggestion made by Commissioner Higgins which was to outline State law that refers to infill development and visual resources.
- Would like to avoid using diesel generators as much as possible, instead would like to rely on battery storage first to delay the usage of diesel generators.
- The analysis is amazing and the document is well written.
- The mitigation measures are appropriate.
- No specific edits.
- In the future, it would be beneficial to have a document of this size further in advance.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

ACTUAL TIME: 2:40 P.M.

A. Committee and Liaison Reports:

1. Staff Hearing Officer Liaison Report

No report.

2. Other Committee and Liaison Reports

- a. Commissioner Wiscomb announced the upcoming Plaza De La Guerra Working Group meeting on June 3, 2022.
- b. Commissioner Lodge reported on the May 25, 2022 meeting of Historic Landmarks Commission.
- c. Commissioner Bonderson reported on the April 18, 2022 and May 2, 2022 meetings of Architectural Board of Review.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Escobedo adjourned the meeting at 2:57 p.m.

Submitted by,

Gillian Fennessy, Commission Secretary