
Gaviota Coast Planning Advisory Committee

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES, MEETING #12

***Wednesday May 26, 2010
Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium***

Meeting Called to Order: By Michael Feeney at 6:33 p.m.

1. Roll Call

GavPAC Members Present: Baer, Boise-Cossart, Bowman, Feeney, McGinnis, McKenna, McNabb, Tautrim, Van Leer

GavPAC Members Absent: Kimbell, Lloyd

County Staff Present:

Vicki Parker, Office of Long Range Planning Deputy Director

David Lackie, Office of Long Range Planning Supervising Planner

Brian A. Tetley, Office of Long Range Planning Senior Planner

Katie London, Office of Long Range Planning Assistant Planner

2. Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda: None

3. Administrative Briefing

Public Comment:

Bill Giorgi: Stated that the agricultural community does not like final form of the Agricultural Permit Streamlining Project.

Deliberation: The Agricultural Permit Streamlining Project was approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors (BOS) on May 25th. The BOS requested a debriefing on the effectiveness of the project in two years. This ordinance becomes effective on approximately July 1, 2010. Chair Feeney asked if the adoption included the Attachment 3 on visual and biological resource standards. Feeney said Attachment 3 seemed to undermine the effectiveness of the streamlining efforts.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) approved a preliminary permit for a three year concept study of Pacific Gas and Electric's (PG&E) WaveConnect wave energy project off of Vandenberg Air Force Base.

4. Meeting Minutes from Meeting #11 on May 12, 2010

Public Comment: None

Deliberations: McGinnis requested the minutes be modified to reflect that during public comment, Caltrans stated if the GavPAC prioritizes wildlife corridor issues along the Highway 101 transportation corridor, it will likely have a greater opportunity to get funding or influence updates to the Caltrans Transportation Plan.

ACTION: McGinnis moved, seconded by Van Leer, and carried by a vote of 9-0 to approve the minutes with modification.



5. Presentation & Discussion of Coastal Commission (CCC) Suggested Modifications to County Land Use and Development Code

Public Comment:

Mark Chaconas: Asked how the CCC is defining “intensification” of agricultural uses.

Nathan Alley: Stated that homes greater than 3,000 square feet would still be appealable to the CCC under the proposed modifications.

Bill Giorgi: Asked whether or not the County has taken positions on the proposed modifications.

Brian Trautwein representing the Environmental Defense Center (EDC): The EDC agrees with the CCC staff’s suggested modifications to the County’s LUDC in support of the Coastal Act.

Deliberation: McGinnis presented CCC staff’s proposed modifications to the County’s LUDC pertinent to the Gaviota planning process. McGinnis stated that it is unclear what the CCC considers intensification of agricultural use. She said County staff made recommendations regarding the modifications to the County Planning Commission in its May 26th staff report. Staff explained that more outreach efforts would be conducted by the County prior to drafting a Board Letter (staff report) for the BOS hearing.

The GavPAC will consider a draft comment letter to the BOS regarding the proposed modifications to the LUDC at the next GavPAC meeting and the GavPAC Chair and Vice Chair will work with staff to finalize the letter prior to transmittal to the BOS prior to the July 6th BOS hearing.

6. Discuss Conceptual Planning Goals for Public Recreation

Public Comment:

Rich Rozzelle representing California State Parks: Repairing the trail/bike path between El Capitan and Refugio will take coordination from landowners including CalTrans, and the Railroad. Trails can prevent damage to sensitive resources by directing usage away from sensitive areas. Restricting the number of access points and creating more formal beach access parking lots can intensify impact to one or several sites as compared to numerous ‘informal sites’.

Deliberation: The GavPAC modified, added, and deleted items from the list of planning issues for Public Recreation (PR). Staff recorded modifications to planning issues in real-time, while projecting those modifications onto a large screen visible to all meeting attendees.

A summary of the combination, addition, or removal of planning issues from the planning worksheet is listed below. Other minor changes and comments were made that are not reflected in the minutes.

- PR-1a was changed from *Maximize Access to and Along the Coast and Maximize Public Recreational Opportunities* to *Provide Appropriate Access to and along the Coast and Provide Public Recreational Opportunities*. PR-1a also was amended to include: *Develop Improved Access to the Bill Wallace Trail* as a subset of the planning issue. State Parks added as stakeholder.
- PR-1b was changed from *Formalized & Safe Access for Various Coastal Uses* to *Safe Access for Various Informal Coastal Uses*. Add “informal access” concept to discussion. Add “maintenance costs” to the constraints.
- PR-2a was changed from *Increase the Number of Trails on Public & Private Land* to *Assess the Need and Feasibility of Trails on Public & Private Land*. Add



potential for overuse upon resources to tensions. Add CRAHTAC to stakeholders.

- PR-2c *Establishment of a Multi-Use Trail Between El Capitan and Gaviota State Parks* remains the same
- PR-2d *Maintain Multi-Use Trail Between El Capitan and Refugio State Parks*. Add “safety” and “sea level rise” tensions. Add Caltrans and Union Pacific Railroad to stakeholders.
- PR-3 *Improved & Safer Highway Access for Cyclists* remains the same
- PR-4 was combined with PR-1a
- PR-5 was changed to delete the parenthetical reference to Naples.
- PR-6 was changed from *Enhance Operations and Maintenance of State Parks* to *Better Coordination of Recreational Access Among Agencies*. Add impact upon cultural resource to tensions.
- The following were added to the list of planning issues:
 - *Private Recreational Uses (i.e., Equestrian Uses)*
 - *Illegal motorize access*

7. Long-Term Meeting Schedule Discussion

Public Comment:

Mark Chaconas: Stated that there appears to be better public attendance at GavPAC meetings when meetings are held in Las Cruces. He also stated that the original intent of this planning process was to have the GavPAC meetings held within the planning area.

Deliberation: Tautrim stated that there appears to be better public attendance at GavPAC meetings held in Las Cruces than those held at Brandon School in Goleta. Meetings will continue to be held at Vista de Las Cruces school from June 30th through September 1st.

8. Meeting Adjournment – 8:52 p.m.

