

**Community Plan Update  
Goleta Vision Committee  
March 11, 2006 9:00 am – 3:30 pm**

Location: Vieja Valley School  
434 Nogal Drive

**Final Workshop Summary**

---

<b>Attending:</b>	James Richard	John McInnes;
Ted Adams	Tim Schmidt	Derek Johnson
Michael Brown		George Amoon
Oscar Carmona		Rosie Dyste
Tish Gainey		Rachael Couch
Susan Grgich		
Lauren Hanson		Facilitator: John Jostes
Hal Hill	County Staff Support:	
Eva Inbar	Terri Maus;	

---

**1. Welcome and Opening Remarks**

Facilitator John Jostes opened up the workshop and led the introductions of those members of the Vision Committee in attendance. He provided a brief overview of the agenda and noted that this meeting would be focused on moving forward with the vision process as its principal objective. He also noted that the meeting would provide an opportunity for participants to begin to receive the baseline information they had asked for at previous meetings. He noted this meeting would serve as the first of four information gathering workshops for the Committee.

**2. Public Comment**

A brief period for public comment was provided to those in the audience. One member of the public addressed the Committee and indicated that the GVC had not finalized its discussion on the issue of housing sites and questioned what was the process to select housing sites. Facilitator John Jostes indicated that the GVC had elected not to engage the housing issue as part of the visioning process.

**3. Agency Presentations – Part 1: Water and Wastewater Issues**

A brief period for public comment was provided to those in the audience. One member of the public addressed the Committee.

**a. Overview of Wastewater Treatment: Conditions, Trends and Issues**

Kamil Azoury General Manager of the Goleta Sanitary District provided an overview of existing conditions and emerging trends relative to the provision of wastewater collection and treatment in the Planning Area. He distributed a copy of his power point presentation to the Committee and members of the public. In addition to his power point presentation, he invited those in attendance to visit the Sanitary District facilities during their annual open house. Mr. Azoury indicated that he would share his presentation with County staff so that it could be posted on the website for viewing by the Committee. A question and answer session followed his presentation.

**b. Overview of Water Supply and Demand Conditions, Trends and Issues**

Kevin Walsh, General Manager of the Goleta Water District then provided an overview of existing conditions and emerging trends relative to water supply and demand issues. Similar to Mr. Azoury, Mr. Walsh distributed a copy of his power point presentation and indicated that

County staff would post the presentation on the website. In addition to regional water supply and demand issues, Mr. Walsh touched on the District's current policies regarding agricultural water use and meters. A question and answer session followed his presentation.

#### **4. Roundtable Discussions and Break-out Session – Part 1**

Members of the public and Vision Committee members then broke into small groups of 5-6 individuals to discuss each of the two issues as they related to three focus questions: 1) What existing conditions and emerging trends with respect to water and sanitation issues are most important? 2) Where are we headed and is that the right direction? 3) Where should we be going over the next 5, 10- or 15 years? After the focus group discussions, each group presented their findings and conclusions to the broader group as a whole. The following observations and commentaries were presented:

(Facilitator's Note: The observations below have been reorganized to provide for greater topical consistency.)

##### ***Water Supply***

###### Existing Conditions and Needs

- Appears that the Water District Rules discourage agriculture and granny units
- Appears that the Water District develops policies independent of the Community Plan process

###### Current Direction/Emerging Trends – Where are we headed?

- We do not think there is any additional information regarding water supply or wastewater that is necessary to allow us to continue with the vision process or making recommendations regarding the planning area.
- The Community Plan needs to support agriculture with action
- Does the 20 units/acre exceed what was used in the capacity study?
- Has a study been made to determine how much additional flow will result from more families per home or illegal occupancy?
- Need some computer modeling to determine trends
- More demands from the state for low income housing
- Higher priced water that limits water supply
- Agencies should not work at cross purposes
- Trend is for higher costs with respect to water and wastewater rates
- Water will be the issue that determines what the Goleta Valley will look like in the future
- Year to year water demand variability is greater than the build-out cushion of 1000 AFY
- Concerns about “pipe size” in the cumulative build-out and the associated costs of responding to potential deficiencies

###### Future Directions

- Need action items in the Community Plan on agriculture – need better direction in this regard
- Need to plumb additional pipeline capacity for recycled water – need recycling infrastructure so its there when we need it

- Need to educate people on the proper use of water
- A Goleta Community Plan is needed that is integrated with the entire Goleta Valley (i.e., City of Goleta, UCSB, etc.)
- We need to continue to promote conservation and expand the use of recycled water
- Need to coordinate/integrate with efforts by other cities using the districts' services
- Need to continue to promote conservation education
- State housing mandate will cause concern over groundwater issues and may pose conflicts
- GWD – two cycles of growth – only 5-10 years of growth left.
- Take a 15 year view with 5 year increments

### ***Sanitation***

#### Existing Conditions and Needs

- Make better use of recycled water potential
- Moratorium on laws because a great deal of pollution is coming from run-off.

#### Current Direction/Emerging Trends – Where are we headed?

- Does the 20 units/acre exceed what was used in the capacity study?
- Has a study been made to determine how much additional flow will result from more families per home or illegal occupancy?
- Need some computer modeling to determine trends
- Were RHNA densities considered in the water and wastewater assumptions regarding build-out?
- Future state housing mandates will result in more service and supply demands
- Trend is for higher costs with respect to water and wastewater rates
- Concerns about “pipe size” in the cumulative build-out and the associated costs of responding to potential deficiencies

#### Future Directions

- How do high housing costs and resultant doubling up of density affect per dwelling unit use and associated demands? Computer modeling could help; need new models
- Recycled water is a more expensive commodity but a more reliable supply
- Need better cooperation and collaboration between agencies dealing with the same issue – coordination and integration
- Need to coordinate/integrate with efforts by other cities using the districts' services
- Take a 15 year view with 5 year increments

The group then broke for lunch to return at 1:00 for the second series of presentations and roundtable discussion.

## **5. Agency Presentations – Part 2: Flood Control, Parks and Open Space**

### **a. Overview of Flood Control Issues, Facilities, Trends and Issues**

Tom Fayram of the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District provided an overview of existing conditions, issues, and emerging trends relative to flood control facilities within the Planning Area. He distributed a copy of his power point presentation to the Committee and members of the public. A question and answer session followed his presentation.

**b. Overview of Parks and Recreation Facilities, Trends and Issues**

Terri Maus, Assistant County Executive Officer and former Director of the Department of Parks and Recreation led a discussion of parks and recreation conditions, trends and issues within the planning area and on a broader planning scale. She distributed a power point presentation and responded to questions from the Committee and the public.

**c. Overview of Open Space Conditions, Trends and Issues**

Rachael Couch, Administrative Assistant to 2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor Rose provided an overview of the County Lands Inventory that was prepared by the Natural Resources Advisory Committee (NRAC) in 2004. She provided copies of the NRAC Executive Summary and her power point presentation and responded to questions from the Committee and the public.

(Facilitator Note: All of the power point presentations by the presenters are scheduled to be posted on the committee web site.)

**6. Roundtable Break-out Discussions and Feedback – Part 2**

Members of the public and Vision Committee members then broke into small groups of 5-6 individuals to discuss each of the two issues as they related to three focus questions: 1) What existing conditions and emerging trends with respect to flood control, parks and recreation and open space are most important? 2) Where are we headed and is that the right direction? 3) Where should we be going over the next 5, 10- or 15 years? After the focus group discussions, each group presented their findings and conclusions to the broader group as a whole. The following observations and commentaries were presented:

**Flood Control**

Existing Conditions and Needs

- Farm lands serve to mitigate flooding and increase the feeling of open space

Current Direction/Emerging Trends – Where are we headed?

- Increasing impervious and impermeable surfaces
- Need more upstream storage to prevent downstream flooding (e.g., sedimentation basins, etc.)
- Need more ways to reduce runoff (e.g., bio-swales, permeable paving, etc.)
- Need to expand program to reduce pollution of the watershed

Future Directions

- Enhance porosity of development

**Parks and Open Space**

Existing Conditions and Needs

- Not enough open space and parks
- Habitat is being degraded
- Inadequate public open space and parks south of Hollister Avenue

- Question of existing conditions meeting current needs – study needed
- Deficit and inadequate distribution of neighborhood parks/active parks
- Deficit of public community built facilities
- Pressure on private open space
- Allowing development to occur without knowing how much land should be reserved for parks and open space.

#### Current Direction/Emerging Trends – Where are we headed?

- Currently there is insufficient funding for expert analysis of input on the nature of parks that should be developed
- Small amount of Open Spaces planned
- No Plan to address deficits
- Need to study traffic generated by new parks
- Need better distribution of park land

#### Future Directions

- Develop parks according to population and plan for that
- Pay attention to interconnectivity of parks and open space
- Designate specific sites in the Community Plan Update for parks and open space
- Tie quality of life aspects (parks, open space, etc.) to rezoning instead of to the planning process
- Give particular attention to the issue of impervious land – need minimal hardscapes for pollution and flooding
- Developers should build the parks
- Create an open space district or landscape maintenance district for neighborhoods
- Connectivity among resources within neighborhoods such as trails
- Create linear parks along trails
- Use County campuses as park sites
- Create visitor centers with a nature focus – either stationery or mobile
- Create mobile recreation van/trailer to be deployed south of Hollister Avenue.
- We need to consider requiring more park acreage per 1000 people than 4.7 acres
- Need to link open space for the benefit of wildlife and to encourage walking and bicycling
- Need to consider converting farm land into farm parks and target children as those who can take advantage of these “farm parks”
- Flood control easements should be mapped and identified so that they can serve both as flood basins and recreation space.

**7. Wrap-up, Next Steps and Adjourn**

John Jostes provided an overview of the upcoming workshops and meetings and the topics to be discussed. Having completed its agenda, the Vision Committee adjourned until its next meeting on March 22, 2006 in the same location at Vieja Valley School.