



Planning and Development Department
Long Range Planning Division
Transmittal Memorandum

DATE: January 5, 2011

TO: GavPAC Members

FROM: David Lackie, Supervising Planner
Brian Tetley, Planner

CC: Supervisor Doreen Farr, 3rd Supervisorial District

SUBJECT: GavPAC Meeting No. 25

The items listed below have been included as part of the meeting materials for GavPAC Meeting No. 25, to be held Wednesday January 12, 2011, 6:30 p.m. in the Vista de Las Cruces School auditorium:

1. **Meeting Agenda:** Meeting No. 25 Agenda for natural resources and open space (Attachment 1).
2. **Draft Meeting Minutes:** Staff has provided draft meeting minutes from the December 15, 2010 GavPAC meeting for review and approval (Attachment 2).
3. **Discussion Outline:** Chair Kimbell has prepared an outline to guide Committee deliberations on natural resources and open space. This outline was utilized during meeting 24. Staff has attached a revised outline in this packet with direction to staff noted on the two areas resolved at the last meeting (control of invasive plants and restoration) add an added item regarding cultural resources (Attachment 3).
4. **Updated To-Do List** (Attachment 4).
5. **Long-Term Schedule** (Attachment 5).

In addition to this packet, please bring the GavPAC documents binder with you to the meeting.

All GavPAC materials are also available for download from the following webpage:

<http://longrange.sbcountyplanning.org/planareas/gaviota/gaviota.php>

Resources Stewardship & Open Space Planning Deliberations (Agenda Item Nos. 6-8)

This meeting continues the deliberative phase focusing on natural resource and open space issues with an emphasis on the County's existing policy framework and the unique characteristics of the Gaviota Coast Plan Area. This discussion will result in a more refined list of planning issue priorities that are important to the committee and are within the reach of local land use policy. The attached revised outline (Attachment 3) describes the remaining natural resources policy issues with which to make recommendations to staff.

Attachments:

1. Meeting 25 Agenda
2. Draft Meeting Minutes
3. Revised Discussion outline for the upcoming Meeting 25
4. To-Do List
5. Long-Term Schedule



Notice of Public Meeting

Gaviota Coast Planning Advisory Committee (GavPAC) Meeting No. 25

Note: This agenda lists discussion topics for the GavPAC meetings on:

Wednesday, January 12, 2011 – 6:30 p.m.

Attendees: GavPAC Members, County Staff, and Public Participants
Please review: Meeting Materials Packet for Meeting on 01/12/11
Please bring: Meeting Materials Packet for Meeting on 01/12/11
Location: Vista de Las Cruces School - Auditorium, 9467 San Julian Rd, Gaviota, CA 93117

Agenda Item	Discussion Topics
CALL TO ORDER	
1	Pledge of Allegiance & Roll Call
2	Public Comment <i>The Public Comment period is set aside to allow public testimony on items not on today's agenda. The time allocated to each speaker will be set at the discretion of the Chair.</i>
3	Administrative Briefings <i>Staff updates regarding local or other legislative activities, local planning decisions, or other updates of interest to the Committee.</i>
4	Meeting Minutes Review and Approval
5	Discussion of Coastal Commission Land Use Development Code Certification Process
RESOURCES STEWARDSHIP & OPEN SPACE PLANNING DELIBERATIONS:	
6	Discussion of Existing Resources & Open Space Policy
7	Consideration of Resources & Open Space Preferences for the Gaviota Coast
8	Consideration of Resources & Open Space Planning Tools
9	Discussion of Long-Term Meeting Schedule
Adjourn	

Questions or comments about the Gaviota Coast Plan may be directed to Brian A. Tetley at 805-884-6848 or btetley@co.santa-barbara.ca.us and further information may be obtained on the following web site: <http://longrange.sbcountyplanning.org/planareas/gaviota/gaviota.php>

Writings that are a public record under Government Code § 54957.5(a) and that relate to an agenda item of a regular meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee that are distributed to a majority of all of the members of the Planning Advisory Committee less than 72 hours prior to that meeting shall be available for public inspection at Santa Barbara County Office of Long Range Planning 30 E. Figueroa Street, Santa Barbara, CA, and also on the County's website at <http://longrange.sbcountyplanning.org/>

Attendance and participation by the public is invited and encouraged. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Hearing Support Staff (805) 568-2000. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the Hearing Support Staff to make reasonable accommodations.

Gaviota Coast Planning Advisory Committee

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES MEETING No. 24

***Wednesday December 15, 2010
Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium***

Meeting No. 24 Called to Order: By Chair Kimbell at 6:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call

GavPAC Members Present: Baer (arrived after roll at 6:32), Boise-Cossart, Bowman, Feeney, Kimbell, Lloyd (arrived after roll at 6:32), McKenna, McNabb, Tautrim, Van Leer

GavPAC Members Absent: McGinnis

County Staff Present:

Brian Tetley, Long Range Planning Division Senior Planner

Joyce Gerber, Development Review Division Planner and County Archeologist

Katie Haldeman, Long Range Planning Division Assistant Planner

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

3. Administrative Briefings

Staff: Staff continues to monitor the County's Land Use and Development Code (LUDC) certification process. The Board of Supervisors (BOS) agreed at the December 7th, 2010 hearing to continue deliberations on the proposed modifications until January 18th, 2011; no public comments were made on this item at the BOS hearing. Staff reconfigured the Committee's tables to form an arc, as suggested during public comment at the previous Committee meeting. Staff asked for the Committee's feedback on the new setup.

Deliberations: Chair Kimbell remarked that the new table setup is a great improvement, as now it is easier for him to see everyone.

Public Comment: None

4. Meeting Minutes from Meeting No. 23 on December 1, 2010

Deliberations: Tautrim remarked that he had typographical corrections to the minutes, but did not have those corrections with him.

ACTION: Bowman moved, seconded by Van Leer and carried by a vote of 10-0 to approve the minutes without modifications.

5. Discussion of Existing Resources & Open Space Policy

Presentation by Joyce Gerber, Planner and County Archaeologist: Gerber described the historical presence of the Chumash Native Americans in the Plan Area. Chumash previously lived in the Plan Area for approximately 10,000 years. The presence of darker soil, particularly near the coast, and chipped rocks, can sometimes be indicative of the presence of archeological artifacts. Areas of potential cultural resources sensitivity include riparian corridors, especially near the coast, flat coastal plains, and ridgetop areas near the coast.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is the over-arching law governing the guidance and determination of significant cultural resources. County thresholds mirror



CEQA statues; County cultural resources thresholds were crafted in the 1980's and are currently undergoing a revision which will be available in draft form for the GavPAC to review in Spring 2011.

The County's Comprehensive General Plan and Coastal Land Use Plan also provide strong policy language for resource protection. Planning and Development Department Director Glenn Russell has advanced degrees in Anthropology and Archaeology and will be assisting with updating the thresholds. The County will be taking a similar approach to cultural resource thresholds as San Diego County did for their recently updated guidelines.

State Law requires that a project shall avoid impacts to cultural resources. Impacts can be avoided either through dedication of an easement, open space, or by capping a site with sterile soil prior to building. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) require specific mitigation if a project will affect a cultural resource.

Other County community and area plans stated that cultural resources shall be protected and preserved, or protected to the maximum extent feasible.

Existing policies and laws are strong and no glaring holes in cultural resource regulations exist. To address cultural resources, the GavPAC could add development standards to existing policy or refine existing policy so that it is tailored specifically to the plan area.

Deliberation: Prior to the presentation, Chair Kimbell conveyed to presenter that the Committee is interested in hearing about any deficiencies in County policies or State laws and if there are unique cultural resource issues in the plan area that need special treatment. Tautrim asked if 'cultural resources' only refers to Chumash and pre-historic sites. Gerber responded that standing structures and linear features are also cultural resources. Feeney remarked on the inefficacy of some existing cultural resource policies in County community plans. Gerber remarked that policies are strengthened by having development standards. Lloyd asked for further explanation of what determines the significance of a cultural resource and Gerber responded that significance can be determined by something being 'one of a kind', associated with an important person, or if the resource answers a specific anthropological question. Feeney referenced the Gaviota Study Group Report when suggesting offsite restoration or creation of a cultural center as possible mitigation for cultural resources impacts. Gerber responded that such a concept would be appropriate to address cumulative impacts. The use of in-lieu fees, similar those applied for traffic impacts, is a concept that may be used in the County in the future.

Public Comment: None

Presentation – “Accelerating Restoration Projects on Private Lands with Partners in Restoration (PIR) Permit Coordination Program” by Erik Schmidt:

Sustainable Conservation is a non-profit organization working to accelerate voluntary restoration programs on private land by providing technical and financial assistance to landowners and by developing programmatic permits for restoration projects. Projects include erosion control and habitat restoration on rural and/or farm lands. PIR has coordinated programmatic permitting to reduce the burden of obtaining permits from multiple agencies. The programmatic approach also reduces the burden on the permit issuing agencies and therefore can be seen as a beneficial approach to the permit process from the perspective of both the applicant and the agencies involved.

Many of California's riparian forests are impacted by sedimentation, which affects riparian dependent birds, steelhead, sensitive plant species and others. After restoration, perennial stream flow can return and sediment loads in waterways can be reduced.



Santa Cruz and Marin County have successfully used the programmatic approach for permitting restoration projects. Santa Cruz County has a strong Resource Conservation District (RCD) with 15-20 employees that work closely with local landowners. Over six years, the County has done 58 restoration projects and leveraged \$4.5 million in grant money. This programmatic permit process is applicable in the Coastal Zone and inland areas. Marin County has a smaller RCD and more agricultural land than Santa Cruz County, but also has had success with implementing restoration projects.

A project's beneficial contribution to the watershed can be measured by the reduction in total maximum daily loads (TMDL) into a waterway.

Of the 13 types of work covered under a PIR programmatic permit, only seven of those are routinely done, and most of the projects fall into four different types of work.

PIR is looking to transition to a Statewide or Regional Programmatic Approach that would cover the entire state or multiple counties, and ultimately include statewide CEQA guidelines for programmatic protection. PIR is also looking into providing safe harbor agreements for landowners who create sensitive species habitat as a result of restoration programs.

Deliberation: Baer remarked that unpermitted beneficial projects occur on private land. Bowman asked how the PIR representatives see the GavPAC fitting in with their work and the programmatic permitting process. Schmidt responded that pilot projects could be done to build government and public trust as well as support for restoration projects. Kimbell asked Schmidt how the County can help implement a safe harbor agreement.

Public Comment:

Lee-Ann French: What is the status of the programmatic permitting program for Santa Barbara County? Lisa Thompson responded that the programmatic permit will be in place for the inland areas of the County pending a biological opinion from the US Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS). In order to implement this program in the Coastal Zone the County would have to get a consistency determination with the California Coastal Commission (CCC). Schmidt mentioned that the CCC approved the programmatic approach in Santa Cruz County a while ago, and things at the CCC and Coastal Act interpretations have since changed. However, the CCC has not had issues with renewing the program in the coastal zone in such areas. Also, there may be regional differences in attitude of CCC staff that affect acceptance of such programs.

Nancy Siepel: How do you deal with State listed species (i.e. California Tiger Salamander) in regards to getting approval of a programmatic permit? Thompson responded that they engaged the California Department of Fish & Game (DFG) and USFWS early on in the process.

Rachel Tierney: What is the timeline for completing these restoration projects? Schmidt responded that Sustainable Conservation has noticed that permitting projects individually usually requires three years to plan, permit, and complete, and that about one project per year per county will be accomplished. With the programmatic approach about five projects a year are completed and projects are planned and implemented in less than year.

Brian Trautwein: There are a number of NRCS "practices" which would have been included under the programmatic permit with which the Environmental Defense Center (EDC) did not think could be considered beneficial, such as use of rip-rap in stream banks and stream bank armoring. EDC will dialog with PIR and the RCD to work on coming to a consensus on the types of practices that would fall under the programmatic permit.



Eva Turenchalk: Were there any concerns at the CCC level about renewing the programmatic permit for Santa Cruz and Marin Counties? Schmidt responded that he was not aware of any concerns. Turenchalk commented that with Santa Barbara's programmatic permitting proposal, there is the ability to pull out specific projects for individual permitting, if decision makers feel that certain projects need a higher level of scrutiny. Community concerns have historically slowed down the programmatic permitting effort in Santa Barbara County.

Eva Turenchalk: What if you create environmentally sensitive habitat area (ESHA) (i.e. for native grasses) and then a landowner later wants to use that land for agriculture or grazing operations? Schmidt responded that he has not seen that issue arise. The County could process an umbrella Coastal Development Permit with a hearing (CDP-H), to cover beneficial restoration projects.

6. Consideration of Resource Stewardship & Open Space (RSOS) Preferences for the Gaviota Coast

Deliberation: McNabb mentioned that there can be conflicts between fire prevention and restoration efforts that use native plants. Tautrim wants to work with the EDC to discern best practices for restoration projects. Lloyd remarked that coordination should be done with all stakeholders, not just EDC. McNabb said that programmatic permitting should consider covering public lands (i.e. Forest Service land). Feeney wants projects to be looked at on a watershed-wide basis. McKenna remarked that this deliberation and the creation of a recommendation to Staff has been productive.

Chair Kimbell asked for input from the Committee regarding invasive plants. Feeney thinks it will be difficult to tackle the issue of preventing invasive plants. Tautrim supports a policy addressing education to landowners on invasive species. Feeney remarked that resistant landowners can be an obstacle to eradicating invasive plants. Staff said that invasive species policies have come into play in community plans, as well as at the project level, but that invasive plants are not addressed in current policy with respect to roadways.

Tautrim stated that we have to admit that there can be short-term negative impacts as part of a restoration project, but the long-term benefits will outweigh those short-term impacts. Van Leer stated that projects allowed under a programmatic permit shall have some flexibility regarding the types of restoration practices that can be used, keeping in mind that the projects shall always implement legitimately beneficial practices. Lloyd stated that he agrees with Turenchalk's suggestion of the County processing an umbrella CDP-H. Kimbell replied that the direction to Staff to develop a programmatic permit was intended to be implemented County-wide.

Public Comment:

Anne Coates representing the RCD: Commented that it can be easier to obtain grant money for education if there are existing local policies which support education and outreach.

Chris Schaeffer: Will supply Staff with Caltrans' policies on invasive species. Caltrans does non-native/invasive plant eradication in its rights of way. Caltrans architects look to the community for input on the palette of landscaping plants to use for a project.

ACTION: Boise-Cossart moved, seconded by Lloyd and carried by a vote of 10-0 to recommend the following policy direction to Staff:

Develop a mechanism to implement a County-wide programmatic permit for habitat restoration projects, including the development of a safe harbor mechanism at the State,



Federal, and County level to protect landowners (landowners doing restoration and neighboring landowners) from the effect of restoring endangered species habitat and ESHA.

Deliberation: Lloyd does not want the County to chase frivolous grant money just to satisfy a policy directive. Van Leer suggested having a voluntary mitigation measure that involves removal of invasive or noxious species, which could be used to offset impacts from development.

Nancy Siepel: There is an executive order for Caltrans to avoid the introduction of invasive species during a project. When doing environmental review, Caltrans starts with that order and then brings it down to the project level. She can provide a copy of that order to the Committee.

Brian Trautwein representing the EDC: May want to consider recommending to the BOS a policy stating that the County shall apply for grants for restoration projects. The California Native Plant Society List of Species could be used as a reference for what plant species are appropriate for use in landscaping plans.

Anne Coates: The top 30, highest priority, invasive or noxious plants, have been determined by a cadre of biologists in the County. David Chang, of the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, would have a list of appropriate species for use in landscaping palettes and plans.

ACTION: Lloyd moved, seconded by McNabb and carried by a vote of 10-0 to recommend the following policy direction to Staff:

The County shall apply for grants to assist landowners in removing invasive or noxious species.

Landscape plans and palettes in the Plan area shall not include invasive or noxious plants.

7. Consideration of RSOS Planning Tools

Deliberation: See Item 6.

8. Discussion of LUDC Certification Process

Deliberation: Discussed during the Administrative Briefing item.

9. Discussion of Long Term Meeting Schedule

Deliberation: The next GavPAC meeting will be January 12th, 2011 at the same location (Vista de Las Cruces School auditorium).

Public Comment: None

Meeting Adjournment – 8:55 p.m.



GAVPAC
OUTLINE OF DISCUSSION
ON
RESOURCES
(updated 01/05/11)

In order to focus and structure our discussion on Resources, I request that you re-read the Gaviota Study Group Report section on Stewarding the Land and Resources (attached) and consider the following as ideas and subject areas for us to direct staff in developing policies on this subject:

1. **Watershed Planning:** Develop a watershed planning policy utilizing the principles enunciated in the Study Group Report. Key elements include:

- Watershed planning is voluntary.
- Incentives should be provided which reward landowners for doing a watershed plan, ie it should act as a master plan or development agreement which allows ministerial approval of improvements within designated areas on the plan.
- Landowners involved in watershed planning should be provided government technical assistance at no cost, and there should be no fees charged by the government for processing them.

2. **Control of Invasive Plants:** The County, the Cachuma RCD and the USDA NRCS should provide assistance to landowners to remove and control invasive species. In the case of an emergency, such as the citing of a new and highly contagious species, the County should have the right to enter private property, after notice, and remove the species.

GavPAC recommendation to Staff made during Meeting No. 24:

- a) *The County shall apply for grants to assist landowners in removing invasive or noxious species.*
- b) *Landscape plans and palettes in the Plan area shall not include invasive or noxious plants.*

3. **Restoration:** Implement the permit streamlining system in place in other coastal Counties for NRCS single stop permitting of defined restoration projects. Develop and implement strong policies protecting landowners from adverse effects of restoration. Consider a list of priority restoration projects to recommend for a pilot project to demonstrate how the new policies could work to protect property owners.

GavPAC recommendation to Staff made during Meeting No. 24:

- a) *Develop a mechanism to implement a County-wide programmatic permit for habitat restoration projects, including the development of a safe harbor mechanism at the State, Federal, and County level to protect landowners (landowners doing restoration and neighboring landowners) from the effect of restoring endangered species habitat and ESHA.*

4. **Wildlife corridors:** Consider adoption of a policy which protects riparian corridors and other major and mapped wildlife corridors consistent with the right of property owners to develop their property.
5. **Interagency Council:** Develop a policy to establish an interagency council on the model of the Monterey County council which will consist of all public agencies with jurisdiction or property in Gaviota and which will review and comment on any significant agency project planned for the Gaviota area in light of County policies which protect the natural resources.
6. **ESHA:** How is ESHA determined? Does the current County mapping continue and how is it updated? Can we exclude from official ESHA areas restored by landowners? How can we deal with the CCC definition which seems to embrace practically all the land in Gaviota? Why must grasslands with at least 10% native grass be considered ESHA? What is the setback from ESHA? How do we deal with ESHA in trying to facilitate agriculture?
7. **Cultural Resources:** Develop development standards that support existing policy protecting archaeological and historical resources. Also encourage potential development of a community cultural center on the coast.

To Do List

GavPAC

Items for Staff to Provide the GavPAC:		Completed	Notes
Meeting 2			
1	Comprehensive Plan excerpts pertaining to Gaviota	07/21/10	Presented by issue area
2	Any available updated habitat mapping	01/06/10	Latest publicly-available biological mapping presented at GavPAC Mtg.
3	Breakdown of acreage, and maps where applicable, for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ownership (i.e., federal, state, local or private, for purposes of understanding GavPAC purview) • Areas within and outside of the coastal zone (including breakout of acreage in productive agriculture) 	12/02/09	Presented at GavPAC meeting
4	Map of existing uses vs. land use or zoning designations		Pending
5	Depict Agricultural Preserve lands	01/20/10	Map presented at GavPAC meeting
6	Verification of acreage in Recreation category; numbers look too small	12/02/09	Presented at GavPAC meeting
7	Re-format of website so that PAC information and materials are easier to find	12/03/09	Website revised
Meetings 3&4			
8	Describe the Ordinance 661 consistency rezone process	01/06/10	Presented at GavPAC meeting
9	Provide status update on NRCS permit coordination/ag. permit streamlining project	01/20/10	Status update available at GavPAC meeting
10	Provide data/maps depicting lands actually farmed or grazed in comparison to ag. designated land		Pending
11	Determine if the County owns beachfront on Tajiguas or Baron Ranch	01/20/10	The County does not own beach front in these areas
Meeting 5			
12	Provide a list of policy challenges in processing DevRev projects on the Gaviota coast		Pending
Meeting 8			
13	Request Counsel Opinion on Trails Liability & Indemnity Issues	05/19/10	Counsel opinion received by staff. Issues to be discussed during GavPAC Mtg. 12
14	Draft "White Paper" on Trails & Indemnity Issues		These issues to be addressed in the transmittal memo. and attachments currently planned for Mtg. 24

To Do List

GavPAC

Meeting 10			
15	Prepare a reasonable estimate of existing house sizes on the Gaviota Coast	11/10/10	Requested by McKenna. Attached to Visual Resources Subcommittee packet for Mtg. 1
Meeting 11			
16	Include existing policy and ordinance references with issue area worksheets	05/26/10	Requested by Feeney Incorporated into issue area worksheets
17	Include specific policy and ordinance citations with issue area worksheets	05/26/10	Requested by Tautrim Incorporated into issue area worksheets
18	Define community-scale energy and distinguish from industrial scale		Requested by Tautrim Will be provided prior to deliberative meeting on energy issues
19	Provide summary of existing energy facility abandonment policies		Requested by Tautrim Will be provided prior to deliberative meeting on energy issues
20	Check into any existing Fire Dept. standards for agricultural lands	05/26/10	Requested by McNabb No such standards found
Meetings 14 & 15			
21	Provide a list of the NRCS permit coordination program 18 practices	8/2/10	Requested by Van Leer Provided in Mtg. 16 packet
Meeting 16			
22	Provide the original boundary principles accompanied by a detailed aerial map for 'split' parcels		Requested by McGinnis Maps provided in Mtg. 19 packet
Meetings 17 & 18			
23	Provide a summary of the County's rural area policy approach and the CBAR's methodology for project review		Requested by Kimbell
Meeting 22			
24	Investigate what Ventura County is doing regarding the wildlife corridor issue	11/24/10	Requested by Boise-Cossart Excerpt of Ventura County Document provided as part of Mtg. 23 packet
25	Coordinate with County Counsel when updating the LCP to ensure consistency with the Bolsa Chica Decision. Determine whether or not that Case results		Requested by Kimbell/Lloyd

To Do List

GavPAC

	in a landowner taking. The Case reaffirms that you cannot intrude on ESHA buffers in the coastal zone, even if offsetting impacts with mitigation. Local policy allows for intrusion and mitigation in inland areas.		
26	Include the "To Do List", as it relates to Resource Stewardship and Open Space (RSOS), in the packet for Meeting 23 and on an ongoing basis	11/24/10	Requested by Baer Provided as part of the Mtg. 23 packet
Meeting 23			
27	Research ordinances, and document Monterey inter-agency advisory committee outcomes in support of a potential similar process for Gaviota	Pending	
28	Research Elkhorn Slough watershed mitigation and restoration process	Pending	MOU provided for Mtg. 24 packet
Meeting 24			
29	Present GavPAC with County's Draft Cultural Resources Guidelines when the draft becomes available (Spring '11)	Pending	Requested by Lloyd
Ideas/Issues/Concepts to Discuss:		Completed	Notes
Meeting 2			
1	Possibility of re-designating National Forest to something other than Agriculture (perhaps Recreation)		Discuss during future Land Use discussion
Meetings 3&4			
2	Reduction of permit processing barriers to restoration projects		See RSOS-5 <i>Support Landowner Stewardship of Natural Resources</i> ; RSOS-7 <i>Encourage Habitat Restoration Projects</i>
3	Camino Cielo fire safety and trespassing issues		See TEI-11 <i>Consider Additional Fire Protection Services West of Winchester Canyon</i> ; REC-2a <i>Assess Need and Feasibility of Trails on Public & Private Land</i>
4	Possibility of reinstatement of USFS fire station at the top of Refugio Road		See TEI-11 <i>Consider Additional Fire Protection Services West of Winchester Canyon</i>
5	Baron Ranch and trail opportunities		See REC-2a <i>Assess Need and Feasibility of Trails on Public & Private Land</i>
6	Methods to mitigate off-trail trespass: Poison Oak/Elderberry buffers, chain link fencing no good		See REC-1b <i>Safe access for various informal coastal uses</i> ; REC-2a <i>Assess Need and</i>

To Do List

GavPAC

			<i>Feasibility of Trails on Public & Private Land</i>
7	Methods to orchestrate trail exactions vs. piecemeal assemblage		REC-2a <i>Assess Need and Feasibility of Trails on Public & Private Land</i>
8	Potential for redesignation of El Cap to State Park rather than State Beach		See REC-5 <i>Better coordination of recreational access among agencies</i>
9	Scenic designation for U.S. 101		See Packet from GavPAC Meeting No. 8
10	Potential climate change issues and adaptation measures for U.S. 101		See TEI-1 <i>Recommend a Set of Safety Improvements to Transportation Corridor Operations</i>
11	Surface water volume and quality impacts from U.S. 101		
12	U.S. 101 and UP trespass and parking safety concerns		See REC-1b <i>Safe access for various informal coastal uses</i>
13	Methods to reduce barriers to individual renewable energy projects on ag. land (solar, wind)		See TEI-4 <i>Consider Community & Large Scaled Renewable Energy Production</i>
14	Ways to provide trail connectivity as part of the CalTrans Arroyo Quemada bridge replacement project		See REC-2b <i>Development of a California Coastal Trail (CCT)</i>
15	Repairs to El Cap-Refugio Bike Trail?		See REC-2d <i>Maintain Multi-Use Trail Between El Capitan and Refugio State Parks</i>
Meeting 5			
16	Investigate ways to incentivize ecologically beneficial land management practices, including 'safe harbor' agreements		See RSOS-7 <i>Consider Habitat Restoration Projects</i>
Meeting 11			
17	Look at possibility of partial abandonment of an energy facility and conversion to renewable energy generation		



Gaviota Coast Plan GavPAC Meeting Schedule

Meeting Dates and Discussion Topics

[Meeting dates, times, and locations are subject to change]

December 22, 2010

Meeting/ Workshop Type	Date and Time	Location	Discussion Topics
GavPAC Meeting #29	Wednesday, March 9, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Transportation, Energy, & Infrastructure II/Land Use I
GavPAC Meeting #28	Wednesday, February 23, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Transportation, Energy, & Infrastructure I
GavPAC Meeting #27	Wednesday, February 9, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Public Recreation II
GavPAC Meeting #26	Wednesday, January 26 15, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Public Recreation I
GavPAC Meeting #25	Wednesday, January 12 15, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Resources Stewardship & Open Space IV
GavPAC Meeting #24 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, December 15, 2010 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Resources Stewardship & Open Space III
GavPAC Meeting #23 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, December 1, 2010 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Resources Stewardship & Open Space II
GavPAC Meeting #22 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, November 10, 2010 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Resources Stewardship & Open Space I
GavPAC Meeting #21 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, October 27, 2010 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Agriculture II
GavPAC Meeting #20 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, October 13, 2010 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Agriculture I
GavPAC Meeting #19	Wednesday,	Vista de Las	Plan Boundary Discussion

Meeting/ Workshop Type	Date and Time	Location	Discussion Topics
COMPLETED	September 29, 2010 6:30 p.m.	Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Visual Resources III
GavPAC Meeting #18 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, September 15, 2010 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Visual Resources II
GavPAC Meeting #17 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, September 1, 2010 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Visual Resources I
GavPAC Meeting #16 ***COMPLETED***	Monday, August 9, 2010 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Plan Boundary Discussion Discussion of Guiding Principles and Subcommittee Report
GavPAC Meeting #15 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, July 21, 2010 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Discussion of Issue Area Priorities for Planning Goal Development Strategy Discussion for Policy Issue Area Deliberations

GavPAC Meeting #14 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, June 30, 2010 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Presentation of Potential Options to Facilitate Restoration Projects: Ms. Turenchalk Discussion of Issue Area Priorities for Planning Goal Development
GavPAC Meeting #13 ***COMPLETED***	Monday, June 21, 2010 6:30 p.m.	Goleta Union School District Board Hearing Room	Discussion of Coastal Commission Suggested Modifications to County Land Use and Development Code
GavPAC Meeting #12 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, May 26, 2010 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Presentation & Discussion of Coastal Commission Suggested Modifications to County Land Use and Development Code Discussion of Issue Area Priorities for Planning Goal Development
GavPAC Meeting #11 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, May 12, 2010 6:30 p.m.	Brandon School Auditorium	Discussion of Issue Area Priorities for Planning Goal Development
GavPAC Meeting #10 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, April 21, 2010 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Requested Topic Presentations Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Coordination and Beneficial Projects Process Agricultural Permit Process Streamlining Project Coastal Commission Land Use and Development Code (LUDC) Certification Process
GavPAC Meeting #9 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, April 7, 2010 6:30 p.m.	Brandon School Auditorium	Post-Workshop Strategy Session Summary of Information Gathered from Workshop Identification of Issue Area Priorities for Planning Goal Development Long Term Meeting Schedule
GavPAC Workshop #1 ***COMPLETED***	Saturday, March 20, 2010 9:00 a.m.	Goleta School District Board Hearing Room	Public Workshop Saturday Public Workshop (Round table format with topic area discussions hosted and facilitated by GavPAC members)
GavPAC Meeting #8 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, March 3, 2010 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Visual Resources Visual Resources Policies Development & Project Review Challenges County Riding and Hiking Trails Advisory Committee Presentation Public Workshop Format & Topics Discussion, Public Workshop Format (GavPAC roles and responsibilities, table topic questions, public workshop objectives)
GavPAC Meeting #7 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday Feb. 17, 2010 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Plan Area Boundary Discussion Public Workshop Format & Topics Discussion, Public Workshop Format (GavPAC roles and responsibilities, table topic questions, public workshop objectives)
GavPAC Meeting #6 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, Feb. 10, 2010 6:30p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Agricultural Resources and Heritage Land Use Policies Supporting Agriculture Agricultural Statistics for Plan Area Agricultural Preserve Program Panel Discussion: Challenges and Opportunities for Gaviota's Rural Agricultural Heritage

GavPAC Meeting #5 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, Jan. 6, 2010 6:30p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	<p align="center">Overview of Watershed Planning, Ecology & Biological Diversity of Gaviota Coast Watershed</p> <p align="center">(planning, floodplains, riparian corridors, Coastal Zone planning) Ecological/Biological Resources (Gaviota coast diversity, Environmentally Sensitive Habitat areas, endangered and indicator species)</p> <p align="center">Applicable Zoning Ordinances – Relationship To Comprehensive Plan</p>
GavPAC Meeting #4 ***COMPLETED***	Monday, Dec. 7, 2009 6:32 p.m.- 9:05 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	<p align="center">Overview of Zoning Ordinances, Current Projects, and Energy Facilities (cont.)</p> <p align="center">Summary of Land Use and Plan Area Statistics Overview of Public Recreation and Access Recreation, Trails and Public Access (State Parks Department Presentation)</p>
GavPAC Meeting #3 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, Dec. 2, 2009 6:33 p.m.- 9:07 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	<p align="center">Overview of Zoning Ordinances, Current Projects, and Energy Facilities</p> <p align="center">Energy Facilities and Applicable Policies (Energy Division presentation) Current Development Projects and Trends (Development Review Division – South Presentation)</p>
GavPAC Meeting #2 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, Nov. 18, 2009 6:37 p.m.- 8:58 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	<p align="center">Overview of the Comprehensive Plan and LCP</p> <p align="center">Election of Vice-Chair & Recording Secretary Role, Function and Structure of County Comprehensive Plan and Local Coastal Plan Review of Land Use Designations and Overlays within Plan Area</p>
GavPAC Meeting #1 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, Nov. 4, 2009 6:42 p.m.- 9:05 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	<p align="center">GavPAC Kickoff Meeting</p> <p align="center">GavPAC Empaneled and Oath of Office Administered Open Meeting Law Discussion GavPac Acceptance of GPAC Guidelines and GavPAC Ground Rules Future Meetings Scheduled</p>

