

---

# Gaviota Coast Planning Advisory Committee

---

## **REVISED DRAFT MEETING MINUTES MEETING No. 34**

**Wednesday May 25, 2011  
Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium**

**Meeting Called to Order:** By Chair Kim Kimbell at 6:30 p.m.

### **1. Roll Call**

**GavPAC Members Present:** Baer, Boise-Cossart, Bowman, Feeney, Kimbell, McGinnis(arrived after roll at 6:40 p.m.), McKenna, McNabb, Tautrim, Van Leer

**GavPAC Members Absent:** Lloyd

**County Staff Present:**

Jeff Hunt, Long Range Planning Division Director

David Lackie, Long Range Planning Division Supervising Planner

Brian A. Tetley, Long Range Planning Division Senior Planner

Katie Haldeman, Long Range Planning Division Associate Planner

### **2. Administrative Briefings**

Chair Kimbell suggested the GavPAC could have a potluck BBQ. Once the GavPAC meeting schedule is finalized, they will set a date for the BBQ and determine logistics.

### **3. Public Comment:**

**Mike Lunsford:** Distributed a handout to the GavPAC on the history of efforts to try and establish a California Coastal Trail. He believes this is a good time to focus on the Trail, given the current pending projects (Las Varas, Paradiso del Mare, etc.) on the Gaviota Coast.

Chair Kimbell responded that the Committee plans to start discussion on the issue of trails on the Gaviota Coast at the next GavPAC meeting.

### **4. Meeting Minutes from May 11<sup>th</sup>, 2011**

**Deliberation:** None

**Public Comment:** None

**ACTION:** Bowman moved, seconded by Tautrim, and carried by a vote of 9-0 (McGinnis had not yet arrived) to approve the minutes without modifications.

### **5. Guest Speaker, Mr. Carlyle Johnston, Department of Public Works, Waste Conversion Technology Status Update**

Mr. Johnston provided follow up to his February 9<sup>th</sup>, 2011 presentation to the GavPAC on "Tajiguas Landfill and Its Future Plans to Expand Resource Recovery". In light of discussion on February 9<sup>th</sup>, the GavPAC took formal action to direct County Staff to develop policy to 1) Reduce the impact of the Tajiguas Landfill on the Gaviota Coast 2) Not expand the landfill capacity 3) Only accept Santa Barbara County waste.



Many programs have been implemented in California to divert waste from landfills since the passage of the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 - Assembly Bill (AB) 939, which created the Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) and set up a new mandate for local jurisdictions to meet goals related to waste diversion from landfills. Jurisdictions served by the Tajiguas Landfill divert more than 70 percent of their waste from the landfill. The proposed implementation of Conversion Technology at the landfill is a way of managing waste that is still being buried in the landfill, but it is not a replacement for existing or planned recycling programs.

The California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) has an Anaerobic Digestion Initiative to divert 50 percent of organics by 2020. A statewide programmatic EIR has been prepared for those facilities.

Three proposals for conversion technology were reviewed, and a preference for the Mustang Materials Recovery Facility (MRF), Anaerobic Digestion (AD), and Thermal Gasification Project was made because it could achieve the goals of the Conversion Technology Project. There are no plans to accept waste from out of the County and they are currently working with the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) and other vendors to reduce the cost of the project and associated air pollutant emissions.

Elected officials from the County and Cities of Santa Barbara and Goleta met in May to discuss the different proposals for conversion technology. The County will continue to solicit community and jurisdictional feedback on potential projects. CEQA analysis for the project is anticipated to begin in Fall 2011, with permitting and financial support secured by 2014.

**Deliberation:** Tautrim asked Mr. Johnston to explain waste characterization and when the last time a waste characterization was done. Materials representing a number of different communities are taken from waste hauling trucks and sorted by-hand and weighed. Baer inquired about the amount of truck traffic this project would generate. McKenna was concerned about ratepayers having to assume additional costs for this new technology. Chair Kimbell expressed concern about locating a MRF at Tajiguas, and that it could potentially generate more truck trips if it handled more recyclables.

**Public Comment:**

**Mike Lunsford:** A minute order from the Board of Supervisors in July of 1999 called for the closure of Tajiguas in 2014. Although there may be advantages to this process, should an industrial facility of this magnitude be located on the Gaviota Coast? Does the GavPAC want to extend the lifespan of the landfill by implementing this technology? Typically a MRF is located closer to the waste origination and not transported out to a remote location. The ratepayers will have to subsidize some of the costs for this new, expensive technology.

**6-8. Recreation & Trails Planning Deliberations**

**Staff Presentation:** Staff gave an overview of the Coastal Act and County policy applicable to public and private recreation. With the exception of Jalama County Park, all the parks within the Gaviota Coast Planning Area are managed by the State. Staff is seeking input from the GavPAC regarding guidance on appropriate recreational uses and agency to agency relationships. Issues related to public recreation generally arise from amenities, circulation patterns, and level of demand.

Richard Rozzelle, District Superintendent of the Channel Coast District of the California State Parks, which includes 14 parks, gave a presentation on State Parks management on the Gaviota Coast. Mr. Rozzelle stated that although State Parks operating budgets are dwindling and some parks with low revenue and visitation are shutting down, there are no slated closures in Santa Barbara County. For over 60 years State Parks has been



involved in managing State Parks on the Gaviota Coast, which includes over 250 campsites, over 430 day-use parking spots, and an annual visitation of over 400,000 visitors.

Visitors to the State Parks generally spend more than \$100 per person in the County on items such as food, fuel and lodging. Some of the goals of the Channel Coast District include creating formal pedestrian access between inland and coastal areas and across Highway 101. Access to the coast is important to protect but there are issues regarding safety of coastal access points. Highway 101 has narrowed down the already limited amount of area for recreation opportunities on the coastal terrace. At El Capitan State Beach, there are limited dry sandy beach areas for visitors during high season. State Parks is working with El Capitan Canyon Campground to formalize safer pedestrian movement from the inland areas to the coast. Refugio State Beach and El Capitan State Park have pedestrian access on the inland side of Highway 101, however no formalized pedestrian movement areas have been established.

When considering where to site new recreation facilities, the GavPAC should take into account access from the inland areas to the coast. Mr. Rozzelle does not support the development of campgrounds inland of Highway 101, due to safety issues associated with getting visitors to the beach. In addition, although it is important to protect and acknowledge informal coastal access points, Caltrans could at some point deem those areas a hazard, and the safety issues surrounding those access points should be taken into consideration and talked about with the County, UPRR, State Parks, and Caltrans.

State Parks created one General Plan for Gaviota State Park, El Capitan State Park, and Refugio State Beach in the 70's. Visitation usage has greatly increased and new acquisitions have been made since that plan was created and State Parks recognizes the need to update that Plan.

The Department and other resources agencies that are grantors for funding (DFG, FWS, etc) have informally classified Gaviota State Park as a "higher level" Park because it represents the central coast due to its healthy riparian corridor and trails that stretch from the coast to the ridgeline. Interest by grantors in Gaviota State Park could be utilized to our advantage for restoration activities. Two major State Parks' planning goals are to address the road and campground at Gaviota State Park, both of which impact the riparian corridor associated with Gaviota Creek and reduce the ability to restore estuarine habitat and riparian habitat currently occupied by the campground.

State Parks is committed to eliminating noxious and invasive weeds in their Parks as well.

Vertical access to the coast needs to be spread out along the coast to provide visitors beach access and because the amount of sandy beach area is limited, particularly at high tides.

New acquisitions for State Parks included area in El Capitan Canyon and Gaviota Village. Additional acquisitions are in the pipeline, but it will be difficult to do acquisitions new to the limited State Park operating budget. However, Mr. Rozzelle is committed to working with other Stakeholders to preserve open space and State Parks conduct natural resource management and exotic species eradication and are currently working on getting grant funding to do bridge restoration.

Visitation use has increased considerably since Parks in the planning area were first created.

**Deliberation:** McGinnis inquired about what State Parks is doing to remediate the non-native plants at El Capitan Canyon Cove. She inquired about whether more camping "loops" could be opened in the winter at El Capitan State Park to accommodate local



residents, who have to complete for campsites with tourists in the other months of the year. Bowman expressed the importance of creating the Interagency Council that could address recreation and public access issues.

McNabb reminded the GavPAC that the “La Sherpa” property on upper Refugio Road also serves private recreation needs. Staff explained that private recreation activities will further be discussed during the agricultural subcommittee meetings.

Bowman said that formalizing access for informal access points will need to provide adequate parking, restroom facilities, and safety considerations.

**Public Comment:**

**Mike Lunsford:** The County’s Agricultural Element was never adopted in the Coastal Zone.

Staff responded that they will further investigate Mr. Lunsford’s remarks, but that in general, Agricultural Element policies apply County-wide.

**Allyson Biskner:** Existing policies should be modernized to be more appropriate for the way the land is used and could potentially be used.

**Dan Falat:** Members of the public who access the ocean from informal access points along the coast are trespassing across Union Pacific Railroad property.

**Rich Rozzelle:** It is a slippery slope if the GavPAC wants to formalize coastal access points which are currently informal.

**Mike Lunsford:** Tajiguas and San Onofre are the current major informal access points. Could coordination with State Parks allow additional parking at these locations?

**Roger Himowitz:** Historical usage at El Capitan Canyon Campground was twice as great as is allowed now under their current CUP.

**Mike Lunsford:** Private recreational opportunities raise issues about maintaining the rural character of the Gaviota Coast. Private recreation also raises issues with zoning and spot zoning. Suggests we wait until we hear back from the Agricultural Subcommittee before finalizing direction.

**ACTION:** Boise-Cossart moved, seconded by Bowman, and carried by a vote of 10-0, to direct Staff to modify existing policy language so that the County 1) takes a more advisory and consultative approach in relation to State Parks and 2) looks at the feasibility of implementing existing policies.

**ACTION:** Tautrim moved, seconded by McNabb, and carried by a vote of 8-2, with Baer and Van Leer dissenting, to direct Staff to develop policy that will 1) Acknowledge and recognize that informal access points provide important public access to the coast.

**8. Long-Term GavPAC Meeting Schedule**

The GavPAC will have back to back weeks of meetings on Tuesday, June 7<sup>th</sup> and Wednesday June 15<sup>th</sup>, to continue discussions on recreation and trails.

**Adjournment** – 8:50 p.m.

