

**Community Plan Update  
Goleta Vision Committee  
May 6, 2006 8:30 AM – 4:30 PM**

Location: Best Western South Coast Inn Enterprise Room  
5620 Calle Real,

**Final Workshop Notes**

---

<b>Vision Committee Members:</b>		<b>County Staff Support:</b>
Ted Adams	Lauren Hanson	Terri Maus
Michael Brown	Hal Hill	John McInnes
Oscar Carmona	Eva Inbar	Derek Johnson
Gary Earle	Valerie Olson	Rosie Dyste
Tish Gainey	James Richard	
Susan Grgich	Tom Schmidt	<b>Facilitator:</b> John Jostes

---

**1. Welcome and Opening Remarks**

Facilitator John Jostes opened up the meeting and led the introductions of those members of the Vision Committee in attendance. He provided a brief overview of the agenda. He noted that this workshop was the last in a series of information gathering efforts to assist the Vision Committee in gauging existing conditions and trends that should be taken into account in the process of creating a vision for the planning area. He indicated that this workshop would be more flexible than previous workshops because of the amount of information being discussed and the preference of the committee members for time to ask questions and engage in dialogue amongst each other.

John highlighted for the Committee several key questions that had arisen since the last Committee meeting. The questions which were highlighted included the following:

- Overall Organization of the Committee’s Recommendations – Should the vision document be based upon the current outline of the Table of Contents and address the issues from a temporal basis, or should the structure be reworked to address specific topics such as open space, agriculture, transportation, etc.?
- Role and Level of Involvement of the Committee and Writing Sub-Committee– How strong a role does the Committee wish to play in the actual drafting of its vision document – providing general guidance to County Staff and the Facilitator, or taking a lead role in preparing the first series of drafts?
- Moving from Information Gathering to Policy Recommendations – With the completion of today’s workshop, the information gathering phase will have been completed. Is the Committee ready to move on to the actual development of a vision? If so, how will it know it has accomplished its task? Ho long and involved should its recommendation be? \

John suggested that the Committee revisit these questions preferably during its lunch break and resolving outstanding issues before the end of the day.

**2. Public Comment Periods**

A short period for public comment was provided. Two members from the public addressed the Committee.

### **3. Guest Presentation – City of Goleta Planning and Development Issues**

Ken Curtiss, Community Development Director for the City of Goleta provided an overview of the City's General Plan development and review process. He reviewed for the Committee, the various elements of the new General Plan and their status in the public review process. He indicated that over 1000 individuals had participated in the planning process to date. He responded to questions posed by the Committee.

### **4. Staff Presentation – Agricultural Production, Activities and Land Use Issues**

Bill Gillette, Santa Barbara County Agricultural Commissioner provided the Committee with an overview of agricultural crop production in the South Coast and Goleta in particular. He highlighted the trends and influences associated with agriculture, including the implications of development in close proximity to agricultural operations, particularly the inherent incompatibilities associated with agriculture on urban infill parcels. He distributed the 2002 Goleta Valley Urban Agriculture report prepared by the Planning and Development Department and provided to GVC members, and noted some of the agricultural economic issues (e.g. imports, scales of economic production, water costs, etc) that have contributed to a decline in the total amount of acreage in agriculture in recent years. He then responded to questions from Committee members. The following bullet-points summarize the observations and suggestions of committee members

### **5. Staff Presentations – Financed County Affordable Housing Program**

Pat Gabel of the County's Housing and Community Development Department provided an overview of the financing mechanisms and efforts to assist individuals and families in attaining entry into affordable housing for sale. She summarized the various programs available to assist potential future home owners in qualifying for loans to purchase housing within the County and along the South Coast. She reviewed affordable housing income and price guidelines, and the various programs being made available to individuals by the County. She responded to a series of questions posed by the Committee.

### **6. Staff Presentations – Water Quality and Watershed Planning**

Rob Almy, Manager with the Santa Barbara County Water Agency provided an overview of water quality issues facing the South coast in general and the watersheds within the planning area specifically. He traced the history of Project Clean Water, non-point source pollution issues, and the regulatory requirements of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permitting process and associated storm water management plans. He reviewed the importance of best management practices in the land use and construction process, as well as the dynamics of developing a watershed plan for San Jose Creek. He responded to questions posed by those in attendance.

### **7. Staff Presentations – Growth and Development Issues**

Dianne Meester, Acting Director of Planning and Development gave an overview of existing and planned development in the unincorporated Goleta Valley since adoption of the 1993 Goleta Community Plan. She utilized a series of maps and graphics to review the location and extent of vacant and underdeveloped lands within the planning area, major projects built since 1993 within both the incorporated (City of Goleta) and unincorporated land in the Goleta Valley. She also reviewed a map depicting pending residential and commercial projects within and adjacent to the planning area. Copies of the maps and her presentation were provided to the GVC.

**Lunch Break** – The Committee broke for lunch at 12:35 pm.

### **8. Round-Table Discussion – Core Structural Questions from Earlier in the Day**

Following its lunch break and before the beginning of the afternoon panel discussion of transportation issues, the Vision Committee members discussed the three structural questions posed by John Jostes at

the beginning of the meeting. In general, the committee determined that it wished to pursue a topical approach to their recommendations, addressing the issues at hand on a subject-by-subject basis, rather than strictly answering the four focus questions that had guided discussions early in the process. They indicated that they felt their recommendations would be better understood and communicated if they addressed the key focus questions for each of the areas of concern that had been identified thus far, i.e., agriculture, watershed planning, open space, housing, transportation, infrastructure, etc. There was general agreement on the part of the committee to follow through with this approach.

Regarding the second issue, the Committee determined that it wished to have County Staff and the Facilitator take primary responsibility for developing an initial draft of its recommendations for the Committee as a whole to then consider, critique and refine as a full group. The Committee felt that the Writing Subcommittee could provide support and assistance to the group, but only after it had provided initial comments and constructive criticism of the first draft as an entire group.

Lastly, the Committee acknowledged that it may have residual information needs and questions regarding specific topics and issues, but that it was indeed time for the group to begin the process of discussing what it had learned and crafting a vision to be reflected in a series of recommendations to the county. It indicated that it needed to have time to digest what it had heard and discuss the issues as a group before reviewing an initial draft of a vision document. By doing so, the group reasoned, it could enlighten itself as to the key principles, values and visions it felt should be reflected in an initial draft of its recommendations. Discussions then progressed to the afternoon agenda.

## **9. Panel Discussion – Transportation, Transit, Bicycle and Multi-Modal Linkage Issues**

The afternoon discussion focused on a panel discussion that included the following individuals:

- David Murray, Deputy Director in Charge of Planning – Caltrans District 05
- Michael G. Powers, Deputy Director, Santa Barbara County Association of Governments
- Scott McGolpin, Brett Stewart, and Matt Dobberteen, Santa Barbara County Public Works Department
- David Damiano, Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District

The panelists discussed a wide range of topics ranging from U.S. 101 long range transportation planning to the status of County transportation planning, road maintenance and intersection performance to bicycle planning and transit planning. Each of the panelists gave a ± 15 minute summary of the issues key to their department/agency. Vision Committee members provided a wide range of questions that were fielded by the participants, either individually or in tandem.

## **10. Roundtable Discussion and Highlights**

The Vision Committee was then asked to provide their insights into the benefits and insights gained through the day's discussions of transportation, growth and development issues facing the Planning Area. The following bullet-points summarize the observations and suggestions of committee members:

- There is a need for a vision that promotes mobility instead of being overwhelmed by traffic
- Don't expect every house to add 10-12 trips per day – some trips are linked and others would occur anyway, such as mail deliveries and shopping trips
- Goleta was built in an area where the car culture was the basis for getting around. You've got to take what you've got and re-engineer it to make it work for today and tomorrow
- We need to do more re-education when it comes to transit and an auto-dependent environment
- Make things more convenient so that people get out of their cars – this requires us to be really creative

- It was startling to hear how much some farmers can make growing specialty crops
- Need to look at a new paradigm for farming and preserving important agricultural lands that provide community value beyond just economics,
- A bleak picture was painted for Agriculture and the prospects for preserving it in the Goleta Valley,
- It was good to hear an honest clear picture of the challenges facing urban farmers.
- You can bond agricultural land so as to turn it back into productive agriculture
- Organic agricultural farmers are willing to pay only about \$1,000 per acre in rent
- Stormwater runoff is going to be a big issue in the future – we need to maximize pervious surfaces in new and existing development
- There is access to the ocean and the coast, but not access to the mountains for the residents of Goleta
- Peak oil prices will create a different transportation environment. The future will need to respond to the costs of driving going up significantly and provide cost-effective alternatives
- The Hollister/Modoc area is an area that really needs beautification – we should focus on a district such as this to build momentum for revitalization
- The Upper State Street vision process should blend into/with the Hollister/Modoc area
- We need to talk about more trees and vegetation as critical elements of a new streetscape
- Disappointed with the lack of affordable housing being constructed today
- Not much useful information was learned from the Affordable Housing Program presentation,
- The audit that is being conducted by the Auditor-Controller’s Office raises doubts about how effective affordable housing programs are managed and how reliable they can be in terms of providing affordable housing.
- The County Auditor may identify additional issues during an audit of the County’s affordable program.
- Watershed planning should be an integral part of the update of the Goleta Community Plan.
- Alarmed by Ken Curtis’ comments particularly in that they say they do not have an answer for the issue of water supply availability
- There is a real need for agencies to work more closely to provide the linkages between modes of travel – this is a critical piece of the solution
- Will oil prices outstrip our ability to vision?
- Review the latest expose on housing
- Develop guidelines for transportation way down the line in the future
- Think about braking down barriers to the use of alternative modes of travel particularly when people have to change modes to get from point “A” to point “B”
- We need more information regarding the economics of agriculture to make decisions about how to preserve it
- We need to think about what agricultural land should be used for if not for Ag. – what about agricultural holding zones as an interim solution?

- We need to get children more involved with agriculture so they appreciate the role it plays in our community
- The levels of bus ridership disclosed by MTD are quite remarkable
- Buses need to have more bike racks on each bus
- Dealing with Union Pacific regarding passenger rail is the big challenge because it's so difficult to get them to prioritize passenger rail over freight
- Look into a "land trust" approach to agricultural preservation
- We need to get a copy of the Goleta Chamber of Commerce Agriculture Study
- We need to get a copy of the Central Coast Survey just published at UCSB
- It's going to be important to support the County Board of Supervisor's funding of this process during the budget hearings

### **11. Next Step and Adjourn**

The meeting concluded with the committee agreeing to schedule a follow-up meeting for May 15<sup>th</sup> from 6:30 pm to 9:00 pm to revisit the issue of articulating its vision for the future, based upon the information and feedback it had received to date. The group agreed to a homework assignment where each member would write down:

What is their vision for the future of the Eastern Goleta Valley?

What they like about the Eastern Goleta Valley?

What they would like to change about the Eastern Goleta Valley?

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 pm.