

Subject: GVPAC Meeting Summary: 2 June 2009
From: "Kenan Ezal" <kezal@toyon.com>
Date: Sat, 6 Jun 2009 04:47:10 -0700
To: "Kenan Ezal \ (Home\)" <Kenan.Ezal@cox.net>

Hello Everyone,

The GVPAC has been meeting approximately twice a month since October of 2008. Thus far the primary purpose of the meetings were to educate the members of the GVPAC and the public on the planning process and all the variables that need to be considered when updating the Community Plan. The most recent meeting was held on June 2, 2009 was the last of the "Planning 101" series. From this point forward the character of future meetings will be markedly different starting with the GVPAC Community Workshop to be held on July 11, 2009 at Vieja Valley School (434 Nogal Drive in Goleta). The next regular meeting of the GVPAC will be on August 4 when it will resume its bi-monthly schedule (first Tuesday and third Wednesday of each month). The purpose of those meetings will be to make land-use recommendations for the Draft Community Plan.

While the workshop will begin at 9:00 am and end at 5:00 pm, the public can stop by at any time. There will be an introductory presentation at 9:00 am that will review the results of the online survey (<http://sbcountyplanning.org/survey/index.cfm>). [Don't forget to participate in the survey by June 19!] A summary discussion will conclude the workshop starting at 4:00 pm. *The entire purpose of the workshop is for the public to express their views on the future of Eastern Goleta Valley.* The GVPAC members and County staff will be there to listen and record those wishes. There will be seven tables at the workshop with each table representing a specific area of interest including: Environmental Protection; Residential Land Use; Parks, Trails, and Open Space; Agricultural Land Use; Mobility Circulation, and Parking; Commercial Land Use; and Public Safety and Infrastructure. Residents can visit all, some or just one of the tables and they will be encouraged to discuss their views and vision regarding our community.

The following summarizes the general issues discussed during the last GVPAC meeting.

Meeting Notes for June 2, 2009:

1. Next Meeting:

- a. *Date:* July 11, 2009
- b. *Time:* 9:00 am
- c. *Location:* Vieja Valley School
- d. *Agenda:* Community input and discussion regarding all aspects of land-use in Eastern Goleta Valley

2. Administrative:

- a. *Foothill Centre Development:* Mr. Derek Johnson of the County summarized a proposal by the Towbes Group to build three two-story office buildings at the intersection of Highway 154 and Foothill. Although this property is within the unincorporated Eastern Goleta Valley boundary, the project was submitted to the City of Santa Barbara for review with a concurrent proposal for the City to annex the property. The property is currently zoned for a shopping center by the County. The proposed project is still in the conceptual stage and no formal proposal has been submitted. Approval from the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) and the County would be required before being annexed by the City. This project has been submitted to the City for conceptual review several times in the past without any further action. There are several major administrative hurdles that must be overcome prior to development, including approval by the Board of Architectural Review (BAR) and Planning Commission, a general plan amendment, zone change, and there needs to be a revenue exchange agreement between the County and City before LAFCO can even begin to consider the annexation proposal. Although the County cannot prevent the developer from applying through the City instead the County, it will have an opportunity to comment on the project at several stages of the process, including environmental review and annexation proceedings. Members of the committee asked

that this issue be officially brought forth during a future meeting of the GVPAC.

- b. *Goleta Transportation Improvement Plan (GTIP)*: Will Robertson of the Public Works Transportation Division provided a general update on the 2009 GTIP which will become part of the General Plan Update. The GTIP satisfies a state requirement imposed by AB1600.
 - i. The GTIP update will identify required transportation improvements due to changes in our community and will contain no major revisions except a cost index adjustment. The GTIP was last updated in 1999.
 - ii. An outside consultant, KOA Planning and Engineering Services, has been hired to complete the update. Major tasks include updating the traffic model, a roadway capacity analysis, identification of improvement measures, a cost estimate, and establishing a fee program to fund those improvements.
 - iii. The GTIP will be completed in two steps: the first step will update the GTIP with its current boundaries and, once the Community Plan is complete, it will be revised to conform to the new boundaries. The first step will be completed by Fall of 2009.
 - iv. A workshop is planned for July to introduce the GTIP to the public.
 - v. UCSB's Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) will have a significant impact on our transportation system. However, the County is forbidden from collecting fees from a single development for transportation system improvements and is also forbidden from collecting fees for impacts assigned to a single developer from other new developments. Hence, any new transportation system improvements necessary due to UCSB's LRDP will be unfunded.
3. Main Overview: The primary purpose of this meeting was to learn about a sustainable Goleta Valley, climate change impacts on land-use, and clean water.
 - a. *Sustainable Goleta Valley*: Sustainable development is defined as *land use that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs*.
 - i. Sustainable development considers sociopolitical sustainability (vibrant, safe, fair), environmental sustainability (livable, enjoyable), and economic sustainability (cost effective). Sustainable development must be bearable, equitable, and viable.
 - ii. A livable community is achieved with the three pillars of the sustainability prism: equity, ecology, and economy. Livability requires resolution of the gentrification conflict (the process of transforming a neighborhood to make it more appealing to the middle class), the growth management conflict, and the green cities conflict (open space vs. housing).
 - iii. Sustainable development principles include: harmony with the natural environment (sustains the ecosystem); a livable built environment (enhances urban form); a place-based economy (economic activity operates within natural limits and meets local needs); equity (provides equitable access to social and economic resources); polluters pay (those responsible for pollution bear its costs); and responsible regionalism (minimize harm to other jurisdictions).
 - b. *Climate Change*: Mr. David Matson, the Deputy Director, and Ms. Angela Hacker, Planner for Planning Department, as well as Mr. Chris Rich discussed climate change as it pertains to land-use planning.
 - i. There are several initiatives at state and federal level related to climate change and sustainability. California leads in sustainability development and technology. The Board of Supervisors voted on March 17, 2009 on a set of Climate Change Guiding Principles.
 - ii. Sustainability is related to climate change through the reduction of green house gas (GHG) emissions. 38% of GHG emissions in California are from transportation, 20% is due to industry, 13% is due to imported electricity generation while 12% is due to in-state electricity generation. Without any action GHG emissions are projected to increase 28% by 2020.
 - iii. Assembly Bill (AB) 32 requires that GHG emissions in 2020 to be same as the 1990 levels, which equates to a reduction of 15% (169 metric tons) from the projected 2020 levels. Another 80% reduction (from 1990 levels) is required by 2050.
 - 40% of target reductions dictated by AB32 will be achieved with air and energy programs, including

a cap and trade program; 14% with green building programs; 11% due to resource conservation programs; and 35% due to transportation and land use programs.

- California Air Resources Board (CARB) has recommended that each of the local governments in California be responsible for their share of the reductions.
- iv. Senate Bill (SB) 375 requires the reduction of vehicle miles traveled (VMT). It aligns three planning processes aimed at reducing sprawl and locating homes near jobs: regional transportation, regional housing, and planning for GHG emissions. It does not supersede local authority. However, it only accounts for 3% of the total reduction in GHG emissions and only applies to urban areas, not rural areas.
- v. SB 97 requires the development of procedures under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to address GHG emissions (which are considered to be pollutants).
- vi. The County needs to identify GHG emission sources and develop mitigation measures. The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has issued a set of recommended mitigation measures for planning and land-use:
<http://opr.ca.gov/index.php?a=ceqa/index.html>
- vii. The County is in the process of developing a Climate Action Strategy and Timeline.
- c. *Clean and Sustainable Water*: Ms. Joy Hufschmid, the Program Manager for Project Clean Water provided a review of storm water runoff monitoring and discharge elimination.
 - i. Project Clean Water was initiated in 1988 as a result of public demand for open and healthy beaches and watersheds.
 - ii. The primary causes of polluted storm water (which is not treated before finding its way to the ocean) are increases in impervious surfaces (hardscapes), over use of pollutants and chemicals; lack of best management practices and illicit discharge.
 - iii. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has identified urban surface runoff as a significant cause of water pollution. This includes sediment, bacteria, oil and grease, heavy metals, toxic chemicals and trash.
 - iv. The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) became effective in 2003 and requires a permit for any discharge of pollutants into U.S. waters. It derives its authority from the 1990 Clean Water Act and is administered by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
 - Local governments must develop, implement and enforce storm water management programs designed to reduce pollutants; specify best management practices; and report on implementation and effectiveness of the programs.
 - The storm water management program requires public involvement and participation; public education and outreach; illicit discharge detection and elimination; construction site storm water runoff control for projects of at least one acre; post construction storm water management; and pollution prevention.
 - Additional standards are in the works for low-impact development (LID). LID can be achieved by clustering development, limiting disturbances, maximizing vegetation, promoting infiltration, and preserving riparian and wetland areas. Various methods of accomplishing these goals were reviewed. Maintenance costs for some of these measures vary from \$200/year to \$3000/year.

4. Public Comment:

- a. *Mary Whalen*: Ms. Whalen thanked the staff and GVPAC members for the public notifications of the upcoming community workshop and community survey. She also noted the Santa Barbara News Press article on a proposal by the Towbes Group to build three office buildings within the Eastern Goleta Valley. She particularly objected to the fact that the proposal is being submitted to the City of Santa Barbara and not the County. She believes that this action is counter to the wishes of the Board of Supervisors who have placed a moratorium (except for public benefit) on all new development in Eastern Goleta Valley until the Community

Plan is updated. She also asked the GVPAC to take action against this new development in the form of a letter to the City and to convene a special meeting on the matter.

- b. *Patti Close*: Ms. Close expressed concerns about the survey. In particular, she believes that the questions are vague and that the results can be misinterpreted.

Ms. Close objected to the Foothill Centre development proposed through the City instead of the County by the Towbes Group. She believes that it undermines the GVPAC process.

- c. *Ann Crosby*: Ms. Crosby believes that the survey questions are too complicated and should be simpler such as: “What do you like about Eastern Goleta Valley?”, “What don’t you like?” and “What would you change?” She asked that the questions at the upcoming Workshop be simpler.

Ms. Crosby also noted that the Goleta Valley Vision document explicitly states that success in our Community Plan shall be achieved when there is no net loss in agricultural land. She believes that any inclusion of agricultural land in regional planning will open the doors to rezoning of that land.

- d. *Shelly Cobb*: Ms. Cobb believes that the survey is too complicated and unclear. She noted that there are 109 questions instead of 21. She believes that most residents would not be able to answer many of the questions within the survey. Ms. Cobb expressed her opinion that it was difficult for her to convey to the reader of the survey her desire to preserve agricultural land in order to preserve our local food supply.

Ms. Cobb expressed her concern that the discussion on sustainability and climate change did not include mention of agriculture, fire and water. She recommended the book “Plan B 3.0” for sustainability measures and would like the 20/20 Vision Document to be available to the public prior to the Workshop.

- e. *Steve Moss*: Mr. Moss is the Manager of Strategic Planning for the Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District (MTD). Mr. Moss said it was likely that there will be a transit oriented project on the MTD site in Goleta Valley sometime in the future. He offered to help with matters related to public transportation and circulation planning.

- f. *Dave Davis*: Mr. Davis is the Executive Director of the Community Environmental Council (CEC). He is also a director of the Santa Barbara MTD. CEC has published a blueprint for how Santa Barbara can be fossil-free by 2030 through efficiency in buildings, transportation, and using renewable resources.

- g. *Marsha Zilles*: Ms. Zilles is the Building Administrator for Hope Ranch. Hope Ranch is a producer of horse manure and would like to use it to generate methane for renewable energy. She wanted information on how Hope Ranch could achieve its goals. Mr. Dave Matson responded that the federal stimulus package contains a lot of funding for alternative sources of energy and renewable energy. AB32 also has requirements for renewable energy and resource preservation.

- h. *Lauren Hanson*: Ms. Hanson is on the Board of Directors of the Goleta Water District. Ms. Hanson pointed out inconsistencies in the County Planning and Permitting process related to water runoff from residences. One requires runoff to be directed to the street while the other requires on-site retention and absorption for filtration and to repopulate the ground water levels. She urged the committee to do more than the minimum required for sustainability. She stated that reducing the *growth* in required resources is not sufficient: we must use less than before. Developers should not be given exceptions and should have to abide by resource management restrictions. She believes that new development requirements in the Community Plan should apply retroactively to those developers who attempt to obtain permits before those policies are officially adopted.

For additional information, the official minutes, and the meeting audio, please see the county website:

<http://longrange.sbcountyplanning.org/planareas/goleta/gvpac.php>

Once again let me know if you do not wish to receive these e-mails, and feel free to forward them to others.

Thank you!

-Kenan (Kenan.Ezal@cox.net)

Note: I am fully responsible for any errors you may find in the above—no one else.

Kenan Ezal, Ph. D.
Senior Scientist
Toyon Research Corporation
6800 Cortona Drive
Goleta, CA 93117-3021
Email: kezal@toyon.com
Tel: (805) 968-6787 x180
Fax: (805) 685-8089