



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
AGENDA LETTER

Agenda Number:

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 407  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101  
(805) 568-2240

**Department Name:** Planning & Development  
**Department No.:** 053  
**For Agenda Of:** March 24, 2015  
**Placement:** Administrative, Set hearing 1.5 hours on 4/14/15 and 30 minutes on 5/5/15  
**Estimated Tme:**  
**Continued Item:** No  
**If Yes, date from:**  
**Vote Required:** Majority

---

**TO:** Board of Supervisors

**FROM:** Department Planning and Development  
Director(s) Glenn Russell, Director, 568-2084

Contact Info: Kevin Drude, Deputy Director, Energy and Minerals Division,  
568-2519

**SUBJECT:** Board of Supervisors Hearing to Allocate Year 2015 Coastal Resource Enhancement Fund (CREF) Grants

---

**County Counsel Concurrence**

As to form: Yes

**Other Concurrence:** N/A

As to form: No

**Auditor-Controller Concurrence**

As to form: N/A

**Recommended Actions:**

That the Board of Supervisors set hearings on April 14, 2015 (1.5 hours) and May 5, 2015 (30 minutes) to:

**On April 14, 2015:**

- A. Receive staff's recommendations for the 2015 CREF awards and take public testimony; and
- B. Continue the hearing to May 5, 2015 for final action on the following:

**On May 5, 2015:**

- A. Approve 2015 CREF budgeting of funds as proposed on pages 8 and 9 of the attached staff report (Attachment A);

- B. Determine that the budgeting of CREF funds is exempt from CEQA pursuant to Sections 15061(b)(3) and 15378(b)(4) of the State Guidelines (Attachment B); and**
- C. Direct staff to prepare the proposed contractual agreements with grantees, including final grant conditions, for Board consideration and approval, including appropriate CEQA compliance.**

**Summary Text:**

A total of \$337,750 is available for coastal acquisition and \$363,169 is available for general allocation in the 2015 Coastal Resource Enhancement Fund (CREF) cycle. Staff recommends granting awards to eight proposals (two for coastal acquisitions and six for general allocation). Please refer to the attached staff report in Attachment A that, among other things, evaluates each CREF proposal with the CREF criteria and recommends grants for the 2015 CREF cycle.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 15061 (b)(3) states that CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. CEQA Section 15378 (b)(4) defines a “Project” as not including the creation of government funding mechanisms. Allocation of CREF awards is a proposed budget allocation, and therefore is not considered a “Project” nor is it considered to cause a significant effect on the environment. CEQA compliance will be addressed when individual CREF Grant Agreements are approved by the Board of Supervisors.

**Background:**

The County established CREF as a condition of permits to mitigate environmental impact of offshore oil and gas development and transportation projects. Mitigation is provided through CREF for impacts to four categories of coastal resources: recreation, tourism, aesthetics, and environmentally sensitive resources (e.g., marine mammals and birds). The County must ensure that CREF fees are used to mitigate those impacts, according to condition of approval on projects and the CREF Guidelines.

On October 21, 2014, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to commence the 2015 CREF cycle.

**Fiscal and Facilities Impacts:**

The Coastal Resource Enhancement Fund is funded by mitigation fees paid by developers of offshore oil and gas reserves. Fees to fund grants are received annually. CREF is included in the Coastal Mitigation Program of the Planning & Development Department’s FY 14/15 Budget on page D-212. Administration of CREF is budgeted at \$23,875 for FY 14/15. Administration includes solicitation and evaluation of proposals, preparation of an annual status report, and preparation and monitoring of contracts to complement CREF awards.

Potential benefits and adverse fiscal and facilities’ impacts that may result or potentially result due to awards of CREF grants are described in Attachment A, Appendix 1 under the staff evaluation of each grant proposal.

**Attachments:**

- Attachment A: 2015 CREF Staff Report
- Attachment B: Notice of Exemption

**Attachment A**

**2015 CREF Staff Report**

**2015 CYCLE  
COASTAL RESOURCE ENHANCEMENT FUND  
(CREF)**

**Board of Supervisors Hearing  
April 14, 2015**

**County of Santa Barbara  
Planning & Development Department  
Energy & Minerals Division**

## Table of Contents

Background.....	1
Future Revenues.....	3
Evaluation Process.....	3
2015 CREF Cycle.....	4
Proposals Recommended for Funding.....	8
Appendix 1 – Evaluations of Year 2015 CREF Proposals.....	10
Project #1 – Circle G Ranch Fish Passage Restoration Project.....	11
Project #2 – Mission Creek Lagoon & Laguna Creek Restoration: Final Design Phase.....	14
Project #3 – The Story of California’s Channel Islands.....	15
Project #4 – Arroyo Burro Creek Acquisition.....	18
Project #5 – Adopt-A-Block .....	21
Project #6 – Coal Oil Point Reserve Education and Conservation Center.....	23
Project #7 – Coronado Butterfly Preserve Revitalization Project.....	26
Project #8 – Ellwood Beach Drive Parcel Acquisition .....	28
Project #9 – Gaviota Cove Acquisition.....	30
Project #10 – Jalama Beach Restroom Replacement.....	31
Project #11 – Dunes Exhibition Project.....	33
Project #12 – Santa Ynez River Bank Stabilization Project.....	36
Appendix 2 – 1988-2014 CREF Awards by District.....	38

## BACKGROUND

The County established the Coastal Resource Enhancement Fund (CREF) as a condition of permits for the Point Arguello, Point Pedernales, Santa Ynez Unit, Gaviota Oil Terminal, and Molino Gas projects. Permits require payment of mitigation fees to CREF for the life of the project. (The Gaviota Oil Terminal and Molino Gas projects, since dismantled, do not contribute to CREF anymore.) The fund represents one of several measures that the County applied to help mitigate significant adverse impacts to coastal recreation, coastal visual aesthetics, coastal tourism, and environmentally sensitive coastal resources to the maximum extent feasible. Since impacts could not be mitigated entirely through direct measures, the fund offsets the impacts by enhancing coastal resources at another location or in another way. Allocation of grants or loans from CREF must be directed at mitigating the specific types of impacts for which the permit conditions were crafted to address.

Since 1988, the Board of Supervisors has awarded 290 CREF grants for a total of \$21,664,281. Table 1 shows the distribution of past CREF dollars among the various categories (i.e., coastal acquisitions, capital improvements, education, equipment and planning and research). Prior to 1990, the CREF Guidelines rated capital projects as the highest priority use of CREF. In 1990, the Board amended the criteria to add coastal acquisitions as a higher priority use of CREF and devoted at least one half of each year's CREF fees to such acquisitions. Since 2007, the Board of Supervisors has amended the CREF Guidelines in regards to the percentage of CREF fees allocated to acquisitions from 0% to 65%. For this 2015 CREF cycle, the Board of Supervisors directed that the percentage of funds for coastal acquisitions return to a minimum of 50%.

Public agencies, municipalities, special districts, and non-profit organizations may compete for CREF awards. Table 2 illustrates the five categories of previous CREF grantees, and Tables 3 and 4 show which cities and County agencies received grants, respectively.

**Table 1: CREF Allocations by Type of Project**

<b>PROJECT CATEGORIES</b>	<b>DOLLAR AMOUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
<b>Acquisitions</b>	\$9,822,712	45%
<b>Capital Improvements</b>	\$8,323,266	38%
<b>Planning &amp; Research</b>	\$2,522,229	12%
<b>Educational</b>	\$853,648	4%
<b>Equipment</b>	\$142,426	< 1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$21,664,281</b>	

**Table 2: CREF Allocations by Type of Grantee\***

<b>GRANTEE</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
<b>Cities</b>	\$1,604,531	7%
<b>County Agencies</b>	\$10,110,398	47%
<b>Non-Profit Agencies</b>	\$9,241,991	43%
<b>State &amp; Federal Agencies</b>	\$7,500	<1%
<b>Educational Institutions</b>	\$699,861	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$21,664,281</b>	

\* Some projects have partnerships between a Non-Profit Agency and a Governmental Agency.

**Table 3: Total CREF Allocations to Cities**

<b>CITY</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
<b>Santa Barbara</b>	\$602,931	38%
<b>Carpinteria</b>	\$414,629	26%
<b>Santa Maria</b>	\$55,000	3%
<b>Lompoc</b>	\$142,126	9%
<b>Guadalupe**</b>	\$25,000	2%
<b>Goleta</b>	\$364,845	23%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,604,531</b>	

\*\* The City of Guadalupe co-partnered with non-profit agencies on various CREF awards for a total of \$170,000 which is figured into the non-profit category in Table 2.

**Table 4: Total CREF Allocations to Santa Barbara County Departments**

<b>COUNTY DEPT.</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
<b>Community Services/Parks</b>	\$5,492,859	54%
<b>Public Works</b>	\$1,336,389	13%
<b>P&amp;D/Long Range Planning</b>	\$2,741,600	27%
<b>County Administrator</b>	\$281,162	3%
<b>General Services</b>	\$120,000	1%
<b>Fish &amp; Game Commission</b>	\$3,000	<1%
<b>Third District Supervisor</b>	\$45,000	<1%
<b>Ag. Commissioners Office</b>	\$90,388	<1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$10,110,398</b>	

## FUTURE REVENUES

Impacts and corresponding fee amounts are to be reassessed at five-year intervals. As impacts may not actually occur as predicted by the environmental analysis used for the initial CREF assessments, fee amounts are to be reassessed throughout the duration of the remaining oil and gas projects that currently contribute to CREF. In August of 2012, the Board of Supervisors approved the sixth five-year (2013-2017) assessment of payments, and the CREF fee schedule for 2016 and 2017 appears in Table 5. At the beginning of spring 2017, staff will assess the seventh five-year (2018-2022) assessment of payments.

**Table 5: CREF Fees\* for 2016 and 2017**

<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
<b>Point Arguello</b>	\$250,900	\$250,900
<b>Santa Ynez Unit</b>	\$231,600	\$231,600
<b>Point Pedernales</b>	\$193,000	\$193,000
<b>CREF Fees Per Year</b>	<b>\$675,500</b>	<b>\$675,500</b>

\* Assessed at \$38,600 per point, pursuant to CREF Guidelines to reflect 1988 dollars.

Additional revenue for new grants becomes available for allocation in future years if previously approved CREF awards do not materialize or move forward in a timely manner. In such cases, these awards revert back to the uncommitted CREF balance.

## EVALUATION PROCESS

Staff annually solicits and evaluates proposals for CREF awards, then submits recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for consideration in a duly noticed public hearing.

Staff follows two steps to evaluate the proposals: (1) determine the extent to which each proposal meets the eight Board-approved CREF criteria, and (2) determine the competitive advantage of each proposal over other proposals.

The following criteria guide CREF recommendations:

Criterion 1. *Enhancement projects must be located in the coastal area or have a coastal relationship, and must be consistent with the County's Local Coastal Program and Comprehensive Plan or other applicable local coastal/general plans. Enhancement projects should be located within geographical proximity to oil and gas onshore/offshore development activities while still providing for the broadest public benefit.*

Criterion 2. *Projects should compensate for coastal impacts due to oil and gas development, specifically for sensitive environmental resources, aesthetics, tourism, and negative effects on coastal recreation in the County.*



Criterion 3. *Projects should provide a level of broad public benefit.*

Criterion 4. *The intent of the CREF program is to fund coastal acquisition and capital improvement projects; therefore, projects which offer coastal acquisition and capital improvements will receive higher priority than those projects which do not.*

Criterion 5. *Projects should utilize matching funds and/or in-kind services to the maximum extent possible.*

Criterion 6. *Projects should be self-supporting or should require minimum on-going County operations/maintenance costs once the project is completed and implemented.*

Criterion 7. *Projects to be funded should lack other viable funding mechanisms to complete the project.*

Criterion 8. *The feasibility of implementing and completing the project shall be considered. Projects with a high probability of success should be given preference.*

Along with the above criteria, staff may also consider the following factors in determining its recommendations for CREF funding:

- (a) the time-critical importance of the proposal compared to other competing proposals;
- (b) the relative ranking which the applicant gives a particular proposal, if submitting more than one proposal for consideration this cycle;
- (c) future investments, beyond on-going operations and maintenance that may be required by the County if the proposal is implemented;
- (d) performance on previous CREF grants;
- (e) timing of the CREF request in relation to the anticipated commencement of the project (i.e., the CREF request may be premature);
- (f) the extent to which a proposal compliments or conflicts with other similar ongoing projects in the community (particularly projects funded with CREF grants); and
- (g) benefits distributed throughout the County.

## **2015 CREF CYCLE**

***Amount of Funds Available.*** The 2015 cycle represents the twenty-sixth CREF cycle. A total of \$700,919 is available in this cycle. The County received a total of \$675,500 in CREF fees for the 2015 cycle. Pursuant to the Fund Deferral Program in the CREF Guidelines, half of the annual fees (in this cycle, \$337,750) is designated for exceptional acquisitions. Of the remaining other half of the CREF fees, \$313,875<sup>1</sup> is available to fund all types of proposals that enhance coastal recreation, visual aesthetics, tourism, and environmental resources, including coastal acquisitions. As shown in Table 6, an additional \$6,877 in the general allocation fund is available from CREF administrative costs, which were not used in the Fiscal Year 13/14, and \$42,417 is available in the general allocation fund from a relinquished grant.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> \$23,875 was budgeted for CREF administration costs in the FY 14/15.

<sup>2</sup> South Coast Habitat Restoration relinquished a \$42,417 grant from the 2014 CREF.

**Table 6: Funds Available in the 2015 CREF Cycle**

SOURCE OF FUNDING	ACQUISITION	GENERAL ALLOCATION
2015 CREF fees	\$ 337,750	\$ 313,875
Remaining CREF administrative monies from FY 13/14		\$ 6,877
Relinquished monies		\$ 42,417
<b>TOTAL AVAILABLE PER CATEGORY</b>	<b>\$ 337,750</b>	<b>\$363,169</b>

*Amount of Funds Requested.* The County received 12 proposals for this cycle; however, two applicants withdrew their proposals. The remaining 10 proposals seek cumulative awards of approximately \$1.2 million (\$791,797 seeking General Allocation monies and \$402,750 seeking Acquisition monies). Tables 7 and 8 show types of proposals and types of applicants, respectively, in the 2015 cycle. Table 9 lists the proposals, applicants, amounts requested, and types of proposals.

**Table 7: Types of Proposals in the 2015 CREF Cycle**

CATEGORIES	AMOUNT
<b>Acquisitions</b>	\$ 402,750
<b>Capital Improvements</b>	\$ 565,749
<b>Planning &amp; Research</b>	\$ 16,000
<b>Education</b>	\$ 182,224
<b>Ongoing Operations*</b>	\$ 27,824
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,194,547</b>

\*CREF does not fund ongoing operations.

**Table 8: Types of Applicants in the 2015 CREF Cycle**

<b>CATEGORIES</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>
<b>County Agencies</b>	\$ 305,000
<b>Non-Profit Agencies</b>	\$ 578,391
<b>Cities</b>	\$ 133,332
<b>Educational Institutions</b>	\$ 150,000
<b>Special Districts</b>	\$ 27,824
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,194,547</b>

**Table 9: 2015 CREF Proposals**

DISTRICT	NO.	PROPOSAL TITLE	APPLICANT	AMOUNT REQUESTING	TYPE OF PROPOSAL
1 <sup>st</sup> District	1	Circle G Ranch Fish Passage Restoration Project	South Coast Habitat Restoration	\$42,417	Capital Improvement
	2	Mission Creek Lagoon & Laguna Creek Restoration Project: Final Design Phase	City of Santa Barbara	withdrew	
2 <sup>nd</sup> District	3	The Story of California's Channel Islands	Santa Cruz Island Foundation	\$30,000	Educational
	4	Arroyo Burro Creek Acquisition	The Trust for Public Land	\$337,750	Acquisition
3 <sup>rd</sup> District	5	Adopt-A-Block	Isla Vista Recreation & Park District	\$27,824	Ongoing Operations
	6	Coal Oil Point Reserve Education & Conservation Center	Nature Reserve Center, University of California, Santa Barbara	\$150,000	Capital Improvements
	7	Coronado Butterfly Preserve Revitalization Project	The Land Trust for Santa Barbara County	\$23,000	Planning & Research (\$16,000)/ Education (\$7,000)
	8	Ellwood Beach Drive Parcel Acquisition	City of Goleta	\$65,000	Acquisition
	9	Gaviota Cove Acquisition	The Trust for Public Land	withdrew	
	10	Jalama Beach Restroom Replacement	County Community Services Department	\$305,000	Capital Improvement
	11	Dunes Exhibition Project	Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Center	\$145,224	Educational
4 <sup>th</sup> District	12	Santa Ynez River Bank Stabilization Project	City of Lompoc	\$68,332	Capital Improvement
5 <sup>th</sup> District	No proposals submitted				

## PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

As typical in past CREF cycles, the requests exceed the amount of funds available. In this cycle, 10 proposals seek approximately \$1.2 million, and \$700,919 is available. All the 10 proposals are worthy projects; however, one proposal is for funding operational costs, which CREF does not fund.

Table 10 shows staff's recommendations for eight grants. These eight awards provide exceptional benefits to different communities and the coastal environment throughout the County in a timely manner.

One of the eight 2015 recommended grants is a transfer of a 2014 CREF grant to the same applicant with a similar project as the 2014 grant but in a different location. The South Coast Habitat Restoration received a \$42,417 grant in the 2014 CREF cycle to remove existing concrete and install a bridge over Refugio Creek, on a private ranch known as Rancho Guacamole along the Gaviota Coast. Engineering designs for the site determined that the project is cost prohibitive. The applicant requests the 2014 CREF grant monies be transferred to a new 2015 proposal – Circle G Ranch Fish Passage Restoration Project (removal of concrete and installation of a bridge over Carpinteria Creek). The two projects are similar in that they both would remove barriers to steelhead trout migration in local creeks. The geotechnical investigation is completed for this 2015 proposal so the applicant's estimated costs for the project are secure. This new proposal would enhance steelhead migration on a creek that is rated as the highest priority for steelhead recovery.

Two of the eight 2015 recommended grants are for coastal acquisitions:

- One proposal is for the Arroyo Burro Creek property, which would enhance the contiguous habitats associated with Elings Park, Douglas Family Preserve and the Arroyo Burro Estuary, all previously funded by CREF; and
- The other proposal is for the Ellwood Beach Drive Parcel, which would add important habitat to the Sperling Preserve in Goleta.

Three of the recommended proposals are capital improvement projects:

- One proposal is to remove steelhead migration barriers in a local creek (described above).
- Another proposal would restore a building at Coal Oil Point Reserve that would benefit visitors at this preserve; and
- Another proposal would help fund an improved bathroom at Jalama County Beach Park.

Two of the recommended proposals are educational projects:

- One proposal is to enhance awareness of the Channel Islands; and
- The other proposal is to educate visitors to the Dunes Center about the Guadalupe Dunes.

And one proposal is mostly planning and research, which could enhance environmentally sensitive coastal resources at the Coronado Butterfly Reserve.

An evaluation of each proposal appears in Appendix 1. The *Staff Recommendation* section of each evaluation contains preliminary conditions that staff believes necessary prior to award of each proposal. Staff recommends that the Board of Supervisors acknowledge these conditions as general direction to staff and grantees when preparing final grant agreements, or as basic conditions on grants awarded to County departments. Conditions imposed on awards are necessary to provide sufficient safeguards for the required use of CREF.

**Table 10: Staff Recommendations for the Year 2015 CREF Cycle**

<b>Proposal Title</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Amount Recommended</b>
Circle G Ranch Fish Passage Restoration Project	South Coast Habitat Restoration	\$42,417
The Story of California's Channel Islands	Santa Cruz Island Foundation	\$30,000
Arroyo Burro Creek Acquisition	The Trust for Public Land	\$300,000
Coal Oil Point Reserve Education & Conservation Center	Nature Reserve Center, UCSB	\$50,000
Coronado Butterfly Preserve Revitalization Project	The Land Trust for Santa Barbara County	\$15,000
Ellwood Beach Drive Parcel Acquisition	City of Goleta	\$37,750
Jalama Beach Restroom Replacement	County Community Services Department	\$170,752
Dunes Exhibition Project	Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Center	\$55,000
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$700,919</b>

## **Appendix 1**

### **Evaluations of Year 2015 CREF Proposals**

**PROJECT # 1**  
**CIRCLE G RANCH FISH PASSAGE**  
**RESTORATION PROJECT**

*1<sup>st</sup> District*  
*South Coast Habitat Restoration/Earth Island Institute*  
*Requests \$42,417*  
*Total Project Costs: \$871,835*

---

**Staff Recommendation:** Transfer the applicant's 2014 CREF award in the amount of \$42,417 from Rancho Guacamole Fish Passage Restoration Project to this proposal. The applicant has secured all remaining monies (95% of the budget) to complete the project.

[The applicant received a \$42,417 CREF award in the 2014 cycle to remove an existing low-flow concrete crossing in Rincon Creek (on Rancho Guacamole along the Gaviota Coast), install a cast-in-place concrete bridge and restore the natural stream bottom and riparian habitat around the bridge. However, engineering designs for the site determined that the Rancho Guacamole Fish Passage Restoration Project is cost prohibitive. The applicant requests the 2014 CREF grant monies be transferred to this proposal – Circle G Ranch Fish Passage Restoration Project.]

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests transfer of its 2014 CREF award from the Rancho Guacamole Fish Passage Restoration Project to the Circle G Ranch Fish Passage Project. The two projects are similar in that they both would remove barriers to steelhead trout migration in local creeks. The new proposal site is along Carpinteria Creek located on a private ranch known as Circle G Ranch, approximately 3 miles from the ocean off of Carpinteria. There is 100 feet of concrete stream channel in the creek that is a complete barrier to steelhead trout migration. The applicant proposes to remove the 100 feet of concrete and an existing narrow bridge and then install a wider steel bridge and restore the natural stream bottom and riparian habitat around the bridge.

**Background:** Currently, 10 projects to remove barriers to steelhead trout have been completed in the Carpinteria Creek Watershed. This proposal would remove the last major barrier from the Carpinteria Creek Watershed and restore access for southern steelhead into the headwaters of Carpinteria Creek.

The Carpinteria Creek watershed ranks as a CORE 1 Watershed in the 2012 National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration's Southern Steelhead Recovery Plan. According to the Recovery Plan, CORE 1 Creeks are those identified as "the highest priority for recovery actions based on a variety of factors.... [CORE 1] should be the first focus of an overall recovery effort." (Page 7-4.)

The applicant has received two CREF grants in the past. In addition to the \$42,417 grant from the 2014 CREF cycle, the applicant received a \$14,671 grant in the 2002 CREF cycle towards educating the public about steelhead trout in Carpinteria Creek.



**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

*[The eight CREF criteria can be found on page 3 of the staff report. The symbol (+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; the symbol (-) means it doesn't satisfy; and the symbol (+/-) means it partially satisfies.]*

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposal has a coastal relationship. In practice, the County has only funded creek restoration projects that provide a direct coastal relationship, limiting such CREF grants to areas closest to the coast or enhancement of ocean-related species. This proposal would allow for passage for steelhead trout, a coastal-dependent species, thereby establishing the project's coastal nexus.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposal would enhance an environmentally sensitive coastal resource, the steelhead trout, in migrating up a creek that has been identified as a primary focal watershed for steelhead recovery efforts on the southern Santa Barbara Coast. Just 60 years ago, Carpinteria Creek had plentiful runs of steelhead trout, migrating each spring to spawning and feeding habitat in the upper watershed. The southern California steelhead has been listed as federally endangered under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) since 1997. The Southern Steelhead's distribution has been reduced to roughly 1% of its historic water ways.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The project would provide steelhead trout access upstream of the current barrier in a watershed ranked as CORE 1 (see definition, above). There are a number of agencies, organizations and individual people who would like to see the steelhead trout migrating in local creeks; making efforts toward that goal would benefit these people, not to mention the steelhead trout.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** This restoration qualifies as a capital improvement; therefore, this proposal satisfies the higher priority of CREF.
- (+) **Criteria #5 and #7.** The applicant requests 5% of the total budget from CREF and has secured 95% (over \$800,000) from the landowner, the US Fish and Wildlife Service, the California Fish Passage Forum, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).
- (+) **Criterion #6.** There would be no County ongoing maintenance associated with this project. The applicant states that the landowner will maintain the bridge, and the applicant will maintain and monitor the restoration efforts for three years after installation.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** The applicant has removed a total of 12 barriers to steelhead migration since 2008 (eleven in Santa Barbara County and one in Ventura county), indicating that the applicant is likely to be successful in completing the project. As part of these barrier removal projects, the applicant has permitted and installed seven vehicular bridges over creeks.

Regarding this proposal, the applicant has secured the remaining monies (over \$800,000) to complete the project. In addition, topographic surveys, hydrologic modeling, and the geotechnical investigation for the project are complete and final construction designs will be completed in March. With having the geotechnical investigation completed, the applicant's estimated costs for the project are secure. (The results from the geotechnical investigation for the 2014 CREF project – Rancho Guacamole Fish Passage Restoration Project – had not been conducted when the 2014 CREF grant was awarded and the results from that investigation rendered the project cost prohibitive.)

**Other Considerations:** As noted above, this proposal would remove the last major barrier from the Carpinteria Creek Watershed and restore access for southern steelhead into the headwaters of Carpinteria Creek. The County Flood Control District's modified debris basin and the Pinkham crossing (2 of the 10 completed steelhead projects in the Carpinteria Creek Watershed Basin) are both upstream of this project. Once this project is completed, approximately 7.5 miles of fish passage in the Carpinteria Creek Watershed would be open (over 4 miles along Carpinteria Creek and 3.3 miles along Gobernador Creek).

---

---

**PROJECT # 2**  
**MISSION CREEK LAGOON & LAGUNA CREEK**  
**RESTORATION PROJECT: FINAL DESIGN PHASE**

*1<sup>st</sup> District*  
*City of Santa Barbara*

---

The applicant withdrew this proposal.

The applicant states it has decided to move forward on a separate phase of this project (involving a wetland restoration further upstream near the El Estero treatment plant) as the first phase of restoration.

---

---

**PROJECT # 3**  
**THE STORY OF CALIFORNIA'S CHANNEL ISLANDS**

*2<sup>nd</sup> District*  
*Santa Cruz Island Foundation*  
*Requests \$30,000*  
*Total Project Costs: \$377,000*

---

**Staff Recommendation:** Recommend full funding of the applicant's request - \$30,000, contingent on the applicant securing all necessary funds to complete the project.

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests funding to:

- Produce a two-hour documentary film on the Channel Islands, including stories of the islands' history (as far back as 13,500 years), of the human and economic connections to the mainland, of environmental and wildlife restoration, and of the islands' spectacular destinations.
- Produce eight to ten half-hour programs that expand on subjects that cannot fit into the two-hour film. These series of programs would be made for television.
- A comprehensive web-based academic component for schools and colleges, including academic institutions throughout Santa Barbara County.
- Disseminate the films and academic component through public TV stations throughout the U.S., museums, film festivals, film premieres, and educational institutions.

The film would be divided into ten chapters and organized into three Acts. Act 1 consists of "Ancient Peoples," "Contact," and "The Lone Woman of San Nicolas Island." Act 2 is "The Graveyard of Ships," "Swiss Family Lester – San Miguel Island," "The Last Roundup - Santa Rosa Island," and "The Odd Couple of Santa Cruz Island." Act 3 is "Wrigleyville West – Catalina Island," "The Island Adventurers," and "The Fight for the Future." The stories in each chapter will be told largely through live interviews, archival film footage, old photographs, documents, and native songs and period music.

**Background:** Producers Peter Seaman and Sam Tyler are each veteran filmmakers: Mr. Seaman, a Hollywood screenwriter, and Mr. Tyler a producer of documentaries for PBS. The project began in June of 2013 and the applicant states that the following has been accomplished:

- 42 shoot days have been completed, with another 15 - 20 to go
- 4 of the 10 stories in the 2-hour film are in early stages of editing
- A commitment from KRCB to present the programs to 350 public TV stations throughout the U.S.
- A commitment from Santa Barbara's Granada Theater to show the premiere of the film.

The applicant is working with the Santa Barbara County Education Office and the Channel Islands National Park to develop relevant lesson plans and teacher's guides to go along with the video "chapters."

The Santa Cruz Island Foundation, Santa Rosa Island Chapter has received one CREF grant in the past, a \$9,250 grant in the 1993 CREF cycle to prepare a portable public display and a written publication, portraying the cultural and natural history of Santa Rosa Island.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

*[The eight CREF criteria can be found on page 3 of the staff report. The symbol (+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; the symbol (-) means it doesn't satisfy; and the symbol (+/-) means it partially satisfies.]*

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The focus of the proposal – the Channel Islands – possesses a coastal relationship in that the islands are off the coast of California and almost every aspect of the islands are connected with and influenced by their surrounding ocean. The proposed film aims to educate and inform viewers of many aspects of the Channel Islands, including the islands' sensitive coastal habitats and recreational uses.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** Four of the eight Channel Islands are off the coast of Santa Barbara County. The proposed film would enhance awareness of the islands, which in turn could enhance coastal recreation and tourism.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The applicant plans to show its film in movie theaters in Santa Barbara and various cities in between San Diego and San Francisco. The applicant secured a commitment to have the film distributed to 350 PBS stations across the country. In addition, the applicant will distribute the film to community access TV channels, museums, film festivals, educational institutions and similar organizations throughout California. The applicant is working closely with the Santa Barbara County Education Office to create classroom materials for schools throughout Santa Barbara County and other California public schools.
- (-) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is considered educational, which is not one of the higher priorities of CREF (coastal acquisitions and capital improvements).
- (+) **Criteria #5 and #7.** The applicant seeks 1% of the budget from CREF. The applicant has secured \$201,000 (53% of the project's budget) from: Hutton Parker Foundation, Venoco, Inc., Union Bank N.A., Reiter Foundation, Ann Jackson Family Foundation, Mosher Foundation, Kirby-Jones Foundation, Santa Barbara Foundation, Anne & Michael Towbes, J.S. Bower Foundation, Deckers Outdoor Corp., Tina and Bob Gale, and the film's producers (Peter Seaman and Sam Tyler). The film's producers are working on this film for free, with over 2,500 hours; the in-kind value for this service could be calculated at well over \$500,000. The applicant is seeking grants from the following: \$40,000 from the Cal Humanities Documentary Fund and \$60,000 from major donors.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** There would be no ongoing County operations or maintenance involved with this proposal. The applicant's budget includes the necessary copies for disseminating the film.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** The proposal is considered to be completed successfully in some form. The project has already started with four of the chapters in the editing phase. The producers for the proposed film are veteran filmmakers: Mr. Seaman, a Hollywood screenwriter, and Mr. Tyler a producer

of documentaries for PBS. They teamed up to produce *Citizen McCaw*, a documentary about the *Santa Barbara News-Press*, a few years ago. Together, they have almost 70 years of experience in filmmaking and distribution. Because of their combined close association with movie making and venues showing films, the film has a high success in meeting its objectives of outreach.

**Other Considerations:** None.

---

---

**PROJECT # 4**  
**ARROYO BURRO CREEK ACQUISITION**

*2<sup>nd</sup> District*  
*The Trust for Public Land*  
*Requests \$337,750*  
*Total Project Costs: \$4.5 million*

---

**Staff Recommendation:** Fund a partial award of \$300,000, contingent on the following:

- The applicant shall enter into a signed contract with the landowner, agreeing on a purchase price that shall not exceed the fair market value.
- The applicant shall secure all necessary funds to complete the purchase.
- The applicant shall record a conservation easement, stipulating that all the purchased land (except for land used for a proposed bike path through the property) shall be dedicated to habitat preservation and passive recreation in perpetuity. Specific passive recreational uses shall be limited to those uses that do not:
  - impact the onsite habitats;
  - conflict with others who passively recreate; and
  - conflict with surrounding neighbors.
- The property itself cannot be used as collateral for any loans, including loans required to purchase the property.
- Transfer of property ownership must be approved by County.

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests a CREF grant to help purchase 14.7 acres, located adjacent to Elings Park and along Arroyo Burro Creek, approximately a half mile upstream from Arroyo Burro County Beach Park. The site is undeveloped and its eastern boundary runs 1,400 feet along Arroyo Burro Creek. The banks and stream corridor of Arroyo Burro Creek support willow and riparian species. Small groves and single stands of oak, eucalyptus, and palm trees can be found along the property. A meadow and a recently graded area are located in the middle of the property. Coastal sage scrub and patches of chaparral are on the western slopes of the property.

Once acquired, the applicant would transfer the property to the City of Santa Barbara. The applicant states the City would manage the majority of the property in passive recreation, including restoration of the riparian habitat along the creek. The applicant states that the City would pursue one recreational use that is not consider passive – a Class I bikeway, moving a portion of the bike path off of Las Positas Road.

**Background:** The landowner has been seeking approval for a 23-unit development onsite, and City staff would be recommending approval of the development. The next step would be to bring the development project before City Council. The landowner is deciding to either sign a purchase contract with the applicant or move forward with its development project.

The applicant has received six CREF grants in the past, totaling \$3,528,901:

- \$1,000,000 in the 1994 cycle to help purchase the Douglas Family Preserve (Wilcox property);
- \$367,963 in the 2004 cycle to help purchase the Ellwood Mesa Sperling Preserve;
- \$50,000 in the 2005 cycle to help purchase the Ellwood Mesa Sperling Preserve;
- \$1,360,938 in the 2008 cycle to help purchase the Gaviota Village property;
- \$438,500 in the 2010 cycle to help purchase the Ocean Meadows property; and
- \$311,500 in the 2011 cycle to help purchase the Ocean Meadows property.

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

[The eight CREF criteria can be found on page 3 of the staff report. The symbol (+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; the symbol (-) means it doesn't satisfy; and the symbol (+/-) means it partially satisfies.]

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The property has a coastal nexus due to its contiguous habitat also found at Elings Park, Douglas Family Preserve, and the Arroyo Burro estuary, which have all been funded by CREF in the past. Coastal-dependent flora that are found onsite include coastal sage and prickly coyote thistle. Coastal-dependent fauna that have been onsite or could be supported by habitat onsite in the future include the tidewater goby, steelhead trout and monarch butterfly. (See *Coastal nexus discussion* under *Other Considerations* below.)
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposed purchase could enhance environmentally sensitive coastal resources by acquiring land with habitat that is contiguous with habitat at Elings Park, Douglas Family Preserve, and the Arroyo Burro estuary. Once the City's Creeks Division carries out its plan to remove the last remaining fish barrier ¼ mile downstream, the project site could provide important spawning habitat. In addition, the applicant states that the City would like to re-locate a portion of the bike path along Las Positas Road to this site. This would allow for a safer biking route to and from Arroyo Burro beach.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The proposed property has the potential to benefit present and future generations, depending on the specific future use of the property. The applicant would open the property's open space to the public; the City, upon transfer of the property would pursue installing a Class I bikeway along the property in order to move pedestrians, joggers, and bikers off of Las Positas Road.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is an acquisition, and although the project is not on the coast, the site contains a contiguous coastal habitat with nearby properties. Therefore, the proposal satisfies the higher priority of CREF.
- (+) **Criteria #5 and Criterion #7.** The CREF request is only 8% of the total budget. The applicant has secured a total of \$1 million: \$500,000 from the California Natural Resources Agency and \$500,000 from the State Coastal Conservancy. The applicant is seeking \$3 million from the City of Santa Barbara's Creeks Division (Measure B funds) and \$162,250 from private donors. The applicant states that the proposed site is the highest priority acquisition of the City's Creek Department.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** There would be no ongoing County operations or maintenance involved with this proposal. The City would obtain ownership of the site.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** The applicant has received a letter from the landowners of the proposed site, stating that the landowners would be willing to sell the property to the applicant for a purchase price not to



exceed fair market value of the site. The applicant states it has a verbal agreement with the landowners with all major terms of the acquisition agreed to and now just working on contract negotiations over the more minor details. The applicant hopes to have a signed contract in March. In addition, an appraisal has been completed, as well as a title report.

**Other Considerations:** There is a time-limited opportunity to protect this property from urban development, as the landowner is currently seeking site plan approvals for a 23-unit development.

The City received a \$1.372 million grant from the California Transportation Commission to plan a bike path along Las Positas Road from Cliff Drive to Modoc Road. The City would like to plan a portion of the proposed bikeway on the proposed site.

---

---

**PROJECT # 5**  
**ADOPT-A-BLOCK**

*3<sup>rd</sup> District*  
*Isla Vista Recreation & Park District*  
*Requests \$27,824*  
*Total Project Costs: \$83,471*

---

**Staff Recommendation:** Although a very worthwhile activity to help clean up the ocean water off of Isla Vista, deny request for CREF funding. The project is considered an on-going operation; CREF does not pay for on-going operational or maintenance costs.

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicants request CREF funding to pay for one-third of the Adopt-A-Block (AAB) Program's budget in fiscal year 2015-2016. The CREF monies would help pay for Isla Vista Recreation & Park District salaries and benefits, cleanup supplies, computer maintenance, training and office expenses associated with implementing the AAB Program.

**Background:** The Adopt-A-Block (AAB) Program is administered by the Isla Vista Recreation & Park District (IVRPD). The AAB Program's goal is to reduce the amount of trash and waste that reaches Isla Vista's beaches and oceans by engaging volunteers in regular street cleanups, outreach, and education programs.

Currently, the Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD) dispatches a street sweeper one day a week in Isla Vista. However, there are no assigned street sweeping days for Isla Vista. Therefore, cars are not required to be moved so that the street sweeper can clean in between the cars and the curb. The AAB Program dispatches volunteers to clean up the trash which can accumulate in between cars and the curb.

The applicant states that the amount of trash that accumulates in Isla Vista's streets can overwhelm the County's four Continuous Deflective Separation (CDS) units. These CDS units separate trash, sediments and oils from storm water before these pollutants reach the ocean. There are other drains in Isla Vista that are not linked to the CDS units and storm water drains directly to the beach and ocean below Isla Vista.

IVRPD has received three CREF grants in the past for a total of \$59,000 to:

- \$24,000 in the 1998 CREF cycle for a lathhouse at Estero Park to grow native plants for restoration projects;
- \$25,000 in the 1999 CREF cycle to install benches, landscaping, and signs at Pescadero Blufftop Park; and
- \$10,000 in the 2001 CREF cycle to install a water meter at Del Playa Pelican Park.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

*[The eight CREF criteria can be found on page 3 of the staff report. The symbol (+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; the symbol (-) means it doesn't satisfy; and the symbol (+/-) means it partially satisfies.]*

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The project is coastal related because it would help reduce waste heading to the beach and ocean below Isla Vista.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** Reduction of trash at beaches below Isla Vista and the ocean waters beyond would enhance environmentally sensitive coastal species. The applicant states that the AAB program removed 85,000 pounds of trash from the streets of Isla Vista in the fiscal year 2013-2014.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The AAB program would benefit the coastal ecosystem below Isla Vista and the marine ecosystem out beyond Isla Vista. The program would benefit the beach-goers below Isla Vista and up and down the coast.
- (-) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is considered operational expenses, and therefore, does not satisfy the higher priorities of CREF.
- (+) **Criteria #5 and #7.** The applicant requests 33% of AAB's program's budget for fiscal year 2015-2016. The applicant also is seeking 33% from the University of California, Santa Barbara and the GWSD.
- (-) **Criterion #6.** The proposal is to fund 33% of the AAB Program's 2015-2016 fiscal year budget. The project is not self-supporting nor would it require minimum on-going County operation costs since it is seeking funds for the program's operational costs. The applicant would need to seek operational costs annually to various entities to operate the AAB Program. See *Other Consideration* below.
- (-) **Criterion #8.** Once funded, the AAB Program is successful in reducing trash and waste that reach the beaches and ocean below Isla Vista (85,000 pounds were collected by volunteers last year). However, there is no secured budget for the AAB program; the applicant has to seek funds annually to cover the Program's costs. Although GWSD has helped funding in the past, the applicant states that there is no guarantee that GWSD will fund AAB annually.

**Other Considerations:** Currently, GWSD is the sole funder of the AAB program with a funding cap of \$79,021. However, the applicant explains that the Board of Directors of the GWSD does not feel that they should have the sole financial burden of the AAB program and that other organizations have a responsibility to keep the streets of Isla Vista clean, too. Therefore, the applicant is seeking a third of the AAB Program's annual costs each from UCSB, CREF and GWSD.

---

---

**PROJECT # 6**  
**COAL OIL POINT RESERVE EDUCATION**  
**& CONSERVATION CENTER**

*3<sup>rd</sup> Districts*  
*Nature Reserve Center, University of California Santa Barbara*  
*Requests \$150,000*  
*Total Project Costs: \$1,140,000*

---

**Staff Recommendation:** Fund a partial grant of \$50,000, contingent on the applicant securing the necessary funds to complete the project.

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests funding toward renovation of an existing 5,390 square-foot building, adjacent to the University of California, Santa Barbara's (UCSB) Coal Oil Point Reserve (COPR), into a new Education & Conservation Center.

- A portion of the CREF request (\$100,000) would go towards renovating the building, bringing the structure into compliance with the current building code, upgrading utility systems, and repurposing interior spaces. The interior spaces would include a large meeting room for lectures and events, a classroom, wet lab, library, conference room, kitchen, public restrooms and offices.
- A portion of the CREF request (\$20,000) would go towards converting an existing courtyard into an outdoor meeting room and classroom. Existing paths, grass, shrubs and other small plants would be removed, and new concrete paths that would be compliant with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), native plant demonstration gardens, and split rail fencing would be installed.
- A portion of the CREF request (\$30,000) would help purchase furniture needed to support the use of the meeting room, classroom, staff offices, researcher offices, conference room, multi-use room, library & collections room. Also included are outdoor tables with benches for the courtyard.

COPR is a protected natural area with important coastal wetland resources. UCSB's Natural Reserve System (NRS) focuses on protecting these coastal resources with conservation, restoration, education and research. The proposed Education & Conservation Center would provide the infrastructure needed to expand the conservation and restoration programs even further by supporting NRS staff members and volunteers who lead and run these program and activities (offices, space for storing seeds of native vegetation, resources needed to maintain the GIS database for mapping vegetation types and restoration projects). In addition, the Center would provide space for lectures, slide shows, videos, training of docents, summer nature day-camps for students, indoor classes, and public restrooms.

**Background:** On the project site are a number of existing buildings owned by UCSB. There is a conference center onsite and is used by UCSB, church groups, and NRS staff as a space for training docents. There is a classroom with an after school program for kids. Some buildings are still used by the Devereux Foundation for clients that need special assistance. There are also some cottages that are for rent (typically to visiting scholars). The proposed building was used as a dormitory for clients of the Devereux Foundation, until UCSB purchased it in 2007 and deemed it not up to code. Once renovated,

the building would be assigned solely to COPR activities. There are 20 parking spaces available for the proposed Center.

Currently, NRS has a small office in an un-insulated shed, which would become a maintenance building once the building for the Center is restored. NRS rents UCSB's conference center once a month for training docents. The applicant explains that currently there is a portable toilet onsite (for NRS staff and the public), but there is no space available for wet labs and a large room for lectures, videos, and slide shows. The applicant explains that the duration of tours and other activities often have to be limited due to the fact that there are no other public restrooms other than the portable toilet.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

*[The eight CREF criteria can be found on page 3 of the staff report. The symbol (+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; the symbol (-) means it doesn't satisfy; and the symbol (+/-) means it partially satisfies.]*

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposal is coastal-related; the COPR is located on the coast and protects important coastal natural resources (e.g., snowy plover, tide pool habitats, Devereux Slough, coastal native vegetation and coastal dunes, etc). The proposed Center would be for COPR use only, including public and UCSB groups doing research or education at COPR.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposed project would enhance environmentally sensitive coastal resources, recreation and tourism. Currently, the existing buildings onsite are able to accommodate some of what the proposed restored building would accommodate, and it would allow for all of COPR's activities to be under one roof and in an improved building. The proposed building would allow new uses onsite, such as improved public restrooms, a wet lab, insulated offices for NRS staff, and for the applicant to expand COPR's conservation and restoration programs (e.g., holding events such as lecturers and slideshows, etc).
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The project would benefit the staff at COPR and the public visiting COPR. The applicant states that COPR formally engages about 2,000 people annually, participating in COPR's programs, and that approximately 40,000 tourist, students and local residents visit COPR each year and engage in educational and recreational activities. The applicant explains that the duration of tours and other activities often have to be limited due to the fact that there are no other public restrooms onsite other than the portable toilet.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** Eighty percent (80%) of the proposal is considered a capital improvement (20% furniture/equipment purchases); therefore, most of the proposal satisfies the higher priorities of CREF (capital improvements and acquisitions).
- (+) **Criteria #5 and #7.** The applicant is seeking 13% (\$150,000) of the budget from CREF. The applicant has secured 43%, \$185,000 from donors to COPR and a \$300,000 grant from the Coastal Conservancy. The applicant is seeking a \$550,000 grant from the Wildlife Conservation Board and will know if it is selected for that grant in May of 2015.

- (+) **Criterion #6.** The proposal would not increase the County's ongoing operation or maintenance costs. The applicant has its own budget for maintenance and operations and will cover the maintenance and operation of the proposed new facility.
  
- (+) **Criterion #8.** It appears the proposal has a very good chance to be completed successfully if funded. The building is already onsite and the applicant has schematic plans drawn up.

**Other Considerations:** None.

---

---

**PROJECT # 7**  
**CORONADO BUTTERFLY PRESERVE**  
**REVITALIZATION PROJECT**

*3<sup>rd</sup> District*  
*The Land Trust for Santa Barbara County*  
*Requests \$23,000*  
*Total Project Costs: \$35,000*

---

**Staff Recommendation:** Grant a partial grant of \$15,000, contingent on the applicant securing funds to complete the project.

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests CREF funds to revitalize the Coronado Butterfly Preserve (CBP) by the following:

- Outreach to the local community to rebuild the existing Coronado Butterfly Preserve Advisory Committee (CBPAC) and to assist the Committee in redefining its goals;
- Update, redesign or replace seven interpretative signs;
- Survey vegetation on the site to determine the need for exotics removal and replanting with native plants (and if money is available from the estimated survey's costs, remove exotics and plant native plants);
- Prepare a feasibility study for potential future native grassland and/or vernal pool restoration on a portion of the site;
- Work with City of Goleta staff to ensure that the trails on the Sperling Preserve and on the CBP complement each other, in ways that make the two properties function more like a single unit.

**Background:** The CBP is approximately 10 acres and contains the northern extension of the Ellwood Main Monarch Butterfly habitat. The applicant acquired the CBP property in 1998, in part with a \$43,005 CREF grant in the 1998 cycle and a \$25,000 CREF grant in the 1999 cycle. A portion of the 1999 CREF also paid for completing a master plan for the property and installing plants, trees, site signs, interpretive displays, and elementary school work stations.

In recent years, the CBPAC has become less active. All of the signs are now deteriorating, difficult to read, and/or contain information that is no longer accurate.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

*[The eight CREF criteria can be found on page 3 of the staff report. The symbol (+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; the symbol (-) means it doesn't satisfy; and the symbol (+/-) means it partially satisfies.]*

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposal's subject site is within the coastal zone and is connected to 650 acres of contiguous bluff top open space. The site is important to the Monarch butterfly trees.

- (+) **Criterion #2.** The property serves as a gateway for access through the Monarch groves to the coastal trail along the bluffs. The applicant plans to upgrade interpretative signs, restore native plants, and survey for potential vernal pools and grasslands onsite. This proposal enhances environmentally sensitive coastal resources.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** Many community residents, local students, and visitors from all over visit the Monarch butterfly trees and the Sperling Preserve. The new signs would benefit some of these users. The vegetation and native grasslands/vernal pool could also benefit environmental coastal resources.
- (-) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is for surveys, outreach, design, and signage, which are not considered capital improvements. The proposal does not satisfy the higher priorities of CREF, capital improvements and acquisitions.
- (+/-) **Criteria #5 and #7.** The applicant is requesting 66% of the total budget from CREF. The applicant has secured the remaining 34% of the proposal from UCSB's AS Coastal Fund and the Goleta West Sanitary District.
- (+/-) **Criterion #6.** With the past 1998 and 1999 CREF grants that went towards purchase and restoration of the site, the applicant stated that The Land Trust, students, and the neighbors plan to maintain the property once acquired and no ongoing County operations or maintenance would be involved. It is understandable that after 15 years, the signs would need to be updated and replaced. However, with the request for funds to remove exotics onsite, it appears that the project site has not been maintained properly.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** There is a high probability of the proposal being completed. The applicant plans to replace signs, prepare surveys and outreach to the community and the City of Goleta. Staff believes these activities can be performed successfully. The applicant has received many CREF awards in the past and has successfully completed many of them.

**Other Considerations:** The applicant's proposed feasibility study for potential future native grassland and vernal pool restoration comes from policies in the Ellwood-Devereux Coast Open Space and Habitat Management Plan (OSHMP). OSHMP's Vernal Pool Policy 2 states: "Seek opportunities to enhance and restore vernal pools...." and identifies the CBP as a potential future vernal pool restoration opportunity. OSHMP's Native Grassland Policy 2 states, "Seek opportunities to enhance and restore native grasslands..." and recognizes the upland restoration on the CBP.

---

---



**PROJECT # 8**  
**ELLWOOD BEACH DRIVE PARCEL ACQUISITION**

*3<sup>rd</sup> District*  
*City of Goleta*  
*Requests \$65,000*  
*Total Project Costs: \$133,000*

---

**Staff Recommendation:** Fund a partial award of \$37,750, contingent on:

- The applicant shall secure all necessary funds to complete the purchase.
- The purchase price shall not exceed the fair market value.
- The applicant shall record a conservation easement, stipulating one hundred percent of the purchased land shall be dedicated to habitat preservation and passive recreation in perpetuity. Specific passive recreational uses shall be limited to those that do not impact the environmentally sensitive resources onsite, and to prohibit conflicts with others who passively recreate.
- The property itself cannot be used as collateral for any loans, including loans required to purchase the property.
- Transfer of property ownership must be approved by County.

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests a grant to purchase a 0.33-acre parcel, adjacent to and north of the Sperling Preserve Ellwood Mesa open space in the City of Goleta. There are no structures on the site and no existing street access. A designated wetland, Monarch Butterfly and raptor habitats, willow woodland and the Devereux Creek Floodway/plain all exist onsite. The 0.33-acre parcel is designated as an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) in the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. Once acquired, the parcel would be added to the adjacent Sperling Preserve.

**Background:** There are 18 separately owned parcels that total 7.77 acres in an area north of the Sperling Preserve Ellwood Mesa that the City seeks to buy and add to the Sperling Preserve. The Goleta Community Plan states that the 18 parcel sites are located next to ecosystems of regional importance and are "key components of remaining local blocks of coastal open space which experience heavy public use." The City has successfully acquired five of the 18 parcels.

The City of Goleta has received two CREF grants in the past, for a total of \$364,845. Both grants went towards two of the five acquired parcels north of Sperling Preserve Ellwood Mesa:

- \$300,000 CREF grant in the 2007 cycle towards a one-acre site; and
- \$64,845 CREF grant in the 2010 cycle towards a 0.25-acre site.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

*[The eight CREF criteria can be found on page 3 of the staff report. The symbol (+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; the symbol (-) means it doesn't satisfy; and the symbol (+/-) means it partially satisfies.]*

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposed property has a coastal nexus. Past documents identify the parcel as being important because it is located next to coastal ecosystems with regional importance. In addition, a designated wetland, Monarch Butterfly and raptor habitats, willow woodland and the Devereux Creek Floodway/plain all exist onsite. Preservation of this habitat is consistent with the City's General/Local Coastal Plan and the Goleta Community Plan.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** A designated wetland, Monarch Butterfly and raptor habitats, and a willow woodland exist onsite, and the Devereux Creek Floodway/plain encompasses most of the property. The applicant states there are informal trails on the site, connecting the residential area to the north to the Sperling Preserve to the south.
- (+/-) **Criterion #3.** Purchasing the 0.33-acres may benefit present and future users of this site. Historically, many people walk, bike, horseback-ride, bird-watch, and use the site for access to the Sperling Preserve. Development of the parcel would put development closer to coastal ecosystems with regional importance. However, development on this site would not block public beach access since there are many other access points to the Sperling Preserve and the beach below. In addition, the development potential of this site is considered low with all the environmental constraints on the site.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is a coastal acquisition, which satisfies the higher priority of CREF.
- (+/-) **Criteria #5 and #7.** The applicant seeks 49% of the total purchasing costs from CREF and offers 51% from itself. The applicant seeks 49% of the purchasing costs from the Habitat Conservation Fund (HCF) and will know if it was successful by July of 2015. The applicant states that if it was successful with both HCF and CREF grants, the HCF would reduce the City's contribution.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The applicant states that the properties would be maintained with the applicant's current management of the adjoining Sperling Preserve. There would be no ongoing County costs.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** The applicant has received an offer-to-sell letter from the property owners and the agreed upon purchase price is \$130,000. In 2008, the property was appraised at \$187,000. Staff believes that the property can be acquired once the necessary funds are secured.

**Other Considerations:** An appraisal was prepared in March of 2008. The parcel is zoned residential but is designated as Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas in the City of Goleta's General Plan/Local Coastal Plan. The parcel's environmental constraints include a designated wetland, which would restrict development to a minimum 100 feet outward on both sides of the centerline of the wetland area. Monarch Butterfly habitat is also onsite, which require a 50-foot setback. In addition, approximately 90% of the property is within a floodway, approximately 5% is within a floodplain area, and the remaining 5% within a flood zone.

The appraisal of the property also notes physical constraints to developing the parcel; there are no paved road accesses to the parcel. Ellwood Beach Drive terminates approximately 84 feet from the parcel. The appraisal states that the area designated for the right-of-way would require significant re-grading and filling from the terminus of the improved portion of the Ellwood Beach Drive to the parcel. The appraisal states "...development of the site with a single-family residence would likely be costly and the entitlement process would be lengthy and difficult with an uncertain outcome."

**PROJECT # 9**  
**GAVIOTA COVE ACQUISITION**

*3<sup>rd</sup> District*  
*The Trust for Public Land*

---

The applicant withdrew this proposal.

The applicant states it had hoped to be further along with the landowners than it is at this time, and that it hopes to have a signed contract by next CREF cycle.

---

---

**PROJECT # 10**  
**JALAMA BEACH RESTROOMS REPLACEMENT**

*3<sup>rd</sup> District*  
*County Community Services Department*  
*Requests \$305,000*  
*Total Project Costs: \$335,000*

---

**Staff Recommendation:** Fund a partial grant of \$170,752, contingent on the applicant securing the necessary funds to complete the project. A full request grant would consume 86% of the available CREF funds for general allocation in this cycle.

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests \$305,000 to design and construct one restroom facility at Jalama County Park, located on the coast north of Point Conception and southeast of Point Arguello. The applicant states the restroom facilities are approximately 30 years old and are not up to the current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. The restrooms need to be replaced since the facilities are deteriorating, and the facilities need to meet the updated ADA standards. The new and improved facility would be more energy and water efficient.

**Background:** Currently, five restroom facilities exist at the County Park (two large and three smaller ones). The applicant is using Development Impact Fees to replace and upgrade two of the smaller restroom facilities and a \$280,000 CREF grant (from the 2014 cycle) to fund the other large restroom.

Jalama County Park encompasses 23 acres along the coast. It has 109 campsites and cabins that all either are on or overlook the beach. The park has a natural trail, life guard facilities in the summer, restroom facilities, and a small market and deli.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

*[The eight CREF criteria can be found on page 3 of this staff report. The symbol (+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; the symbol (-) means it doesn't satisfy; and the symbol (+/-) means it partially satisfies.]*

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposal's coastal relationship is improving one of the restroom facilities at a popular coastal park. Jalama Beach provides beach access and camping in a unique and isolated location along the coast. The proposal is consistent with the County's Local Coastal Program.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposal would enhance coastal recreation and coastal tourism at a popular County beach by replacing one of the aging restroom facilities. The facilities are approximately 30 years old.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The proposal would provide a benefit to visitors and campers at Jalama Beach by replacing one of the restroom facilities. The new restroom would meet current ADA standards and would benefit people using wheelchairs.

- (+) **Criterion #4.** This proposal is a capital improvement, which along with coastal acquisitions is a high priority for CREF.
- (-) **Criteria #5 and Criterion #7.** The applicant seeks 91% of the proposal's budget from CREF and offers 8% from its Department's budget. The applicant is using Development Impact Fees to pay for replacement of the two smaller restrooms and a past CREF grant to pay for the other larger restroom.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** Since the proposal would be replacing the restroom facilities, the maintenance and operational budget would remain the same. There would be no increase in the County on-going funds.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** The proposal is considered to have a good probability of being completed successfully if sufficient funds can be secured. The applicant has improved restroom facilities at some of its other parks successfully. However, the applicant has not secured funding yet.

**Other Considerations:** None.

---

---

**PROJECT # 11**  
**DUNES EXHIBITION PROJECT**

*3<sup>rd</sup> District*  
*Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Center*  
*Requests \$145,224*  
*Total Project Costs: \$205,144*

---

**Staff Recommendation:** Fund a partial request of \$55,000, contingent on the applicant securing the necessary funds to complete the project.

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests funds to create a community space and new exhibits associated with Guadalupe Dunes, including:

- Removal of existing concrete in between and around the Dunes Center building and the Guadalupe Cultural Arts and Education Center (GCAEC), and creation of a community space in this area, including seating, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-standard accessible paths, landscaping of plants native to the Dunes ecosystem, and a Chumash tule reed hut (Budget: \$29,056).
- Fabrication and installation of various exhibits (Budget: \$112,056):
  - Cabinets that would display Guadalupe Dunes artifacts (bone specimens, drift balls, photographs (Wunderkammer Exhibit).
  - Wallpaper on dunes habitat, an aquarium and terrarium with fish, amphibians, insects, and reptiles (The Living Dunes Exhibit).
  - Place setting, pedestal, and photographs illustrating how people in the past two centuries lived around the Guadalupe Dunes and Guadalupe and how natural resources sustain them (The People and Bounty of the Land Exhibit).
  - The strata of sand layers and all the fossils and plants that the Guadalupe Dunes have buried would be displayed (Shifting Sands Exhibit).
- Data collection to measure the success of the new exhibits and save data as lessons learned to be used on future projects (Budget: \$27,056).

**Background:** The Dunes Center is a visitor educational and research center supporting the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes. The Dunes Center (and the Nature Conservancy) has received a number of CREF grants in the past for a total of \$304,222, as follows:

- \$33,222 grant in the 1994 cycle to update the Guadalupe Dunes master plan;
- \$120,000 grant in the 1995 cycle to design and fabricate exhibits and displays for the Dunes Center;
- \$5,000 grant in the 1996 cycle to purchase an interpretative trailer;

- \$22,500 grant in the 1999 cycle to develop and implement an educational package for teachers and students to visit the Dunes Center;
- \$22,000 grant in the 1999 cycle to produce a 20-minute video of the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes; and,
- \$21,500 grant in the 2001 cycle to create an interactive computer program about the life history of Guadalupe Dune's land and sea mammals.
- \$80,000 in the 2014 cycle to excavate a sphinx body, which is partially buried at Guadalupe Dunes and was from *The Ten Commandments* 1923 movie set.

In addition, the Board awarded a \$50,000 grant in the 1994 cycle and a \$166,836 grant in the 2000 cycle to construct a building to house exhibits. The Dunes Center returned the awards to CREF because the Center could not secure the additional monies to complete the project.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

*[The eight CREF criteria can be found on page 3 of the staff report. The symbol (+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; the symbol (-) means it doesn't satisfy; and the symbol (+/-) means it partially satisfies.]*

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposal has a coastal relationship since the exhibits would educate the public about the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes complex. The Local Coastal Program Dunes Study has identified the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes as highly valuable and a sensitive coastal environment. The Dunes are listed in the California Natural Diversity DataBase with a large number of known sensitive species and habitats.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The project would enhance coastal recreation and tourism by providing new exhibits that focuses on the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes and by promoting protection of the dune's sensitive resources.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The proposal is aimed at visitors of the Dunes Center. The applicant states that the center serves many visitors a year, especially local residents, tourist, and school groups.
- (-) **Criterion #4.** Most of this proposal is considered educational, which is not one of the higher priorities of CREF (coastal acquisitions and capital improvements). The landscaping portion can be considered capital improvement but that is less than one percent of the budget.
- (-) **Criteria #5 and #7.** The applicant seeks 71% of the proposed costs from CREF. The applicant has already secured \$62,920 from the Coastal Conservancy, Santa Barbara Foundation, and the Santa Maria Valley Chamber.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The project would not require any ongoing County operational or maintenance costs. The applicant has its own operational budget.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** Staff believes this proposal can be completed successfully, if funded. The applicant has successfully completed a number of CREF grants in the past. However, the applicant seeks 71% of the proposal's cost.

**Other Considerations:** The applicant's proposal budget and what is written up in staff's evaluation differ by \$25,000. The applicant includes an additional \$25,000 in its budget. This \$25,000 is associated with the Sphinx excavation project, which was partially funded by a CREF grant in the 2014 CREF cycle. Staff's evaluation of the current proposal did not consider the sphinx excavation project partially funded in 2014.

---

---



**PROJECT # 12**  
**SANTA YNEZ RIVER BANK**  
**STABILIZATION PROJECT**

*4<sup>th</sup> District*  
*City of Lompoc*  
*Requests \$68,332*  
*Phase 1 Project Costs: \$273,330*  
*Total Project Costs: \$992,682*

---

**Staff Recommendation:** Deny request since the project has not been determined if it is feasible yet. The applicant requests CREF funds to go towards Phase 1 (design and permitting). The results of Phase 1 will allow Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to determine if the project is technically feasible, cost effective and compliant with Environmental and Historic Preservation Requirements. If the project received a CREF grant for Phase 1 and then FEMA determined the project was infeasible, the CREF monies would not have been used to enhance a coastal resource. Staff believes the applicant should fund the design and permitting phase with other funding sources to determine if Phase 2 of the project is feasible.

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests CREF funds to help pay for Phase 1 of a project that would stabilize an eroding bank area along the Santa Ynez River. Phase 1 is the design, preliminary engineering plans, environmental analysis and project permitting.

Phase 2 is installation of a Reinforced Vegetative Bank Protection (RVBP) system to prevent further bank erosion in the area. The method includes bents of piles connected with cables, running from the riverbank out into the riverbed. Between the pile bents, cuttings of native plants (e.g., willows) would be planted. The idea is that water flowing near the pile bents would be slowed, preventing additional erosion along the bank and causing the deposition of sediment in between the piles to build up the bank. As the bank builds up, river flows will be pushed back to the center of the river channel.

The eroding area is located 11 miles from the ocean. The proposed project would protect riparian habitat along the river, a portion of a 1.5-mile bike path, four blocks of residential street and eight single-family homes.

**Background:** A CREF grant for \$25,000 in the 1998 cycle was used to help the City of Lompoc purchase this area to be made into a park. Staff considered the coastal nexus portion of the project at that time to be: (1) a proposed bikeway that leads Lompoc residents to Ocean Beach; and (2) habitat restoration programs that protect various wildlife species, including coastal-dependent species.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

*[The eight CREF criteria can be found on page 3 of the staff report. The symbol (+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; the symbol (-) means it doesn't satisfy; and the symbol (+/-) means it partially satisfies.]*

- (+/-) **Criterion #1.** Although all watersheds eventually drain into the ocean, this virtue alone does not provide a sufficient nexus for the use of CREF. In practice, the County funds watershed projects that provide a direct coastal relationship: areas of the watershed closest to the coast or enhancement of ocean-related species. This project is located 11 miles from the ocean. Staff considers the only coastal nexus associated with the project is that it would protect habitat for the steelhead trout. The other aspects of the project (protection of a 1.5-mile bike path – which does not lead to the ocean, four blocks of residential street and eight single-family homes), although very important, do not contain the necessary coastal nexus for CREF funding. Therefore, staff considers the project to have a partial coastal nexus.
- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** The proposal is a step towards enhancing an environmentally sensitive coastal species, the steelhead trout. As noted above, the only coastal resource that would be enhanced is the habitat for the steelhead trout. Recreational and public and private infrastructure (protection of the 1.5-mile bike path, four blocks of residential street and eight single-family homes) would be enhanced from this project but are not considered coastal resources. Therefore, staff considers the project to partially enhance coastal resources. In addition, Phase 1 is only for the design and permitting portion. The design phase will allow FEMA to determine if the project is cost-effective and feasible. Since it is unknown if the project is feasible at this time, it is uncertain if the project would enhance steelhead trout habitat.
- (+/-) **Criterion #3.** Ultimately, if installed, the proposed project would provide multiple benefits by restoring habitat for many animals, including the steelhead, by protecting a portion of a 1.5-mile bike path, four blocks of residential street and eight single-family homes. However, since it is unknown if the project is feasible at this time, it is uncertain if the project would have any benefits.
- (+/-) **Criterion #4.** Design and engineering plans are first steps towards capital improvements. However, since it is uncertain, at this time, if this project would be constructed, it is uncertain if the proposal is considered a first step towards a capital improvement. It is uncertain if the proposal would satisfy the higher priorities of CREF (capital improvements and acquisitions).
- (+) **Criteria #5 and #7.** The applicant requests 25% of Phase 1 from CREF. The applicant has secured a \$204,998 grant from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Hazard Mitigation Grant Program. The applicant has unsuccessfully sought funds from the California Rivers Parkways Grant Program, FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program, California Urban Greening Grant Program, and CREF last year. The applicant estimates an in-kind service, valued at \$39,800 for managing the proposed project.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The applicants state that the City of Lompoc will maintain the subject area. Therefore, there are no on-going costs associated with the County.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** Once funded, staff believes that Phase 1 of the project can be completed successfully. However, it is uncertain if Phase 2 (construction ) of the project is feasible. So it is not known at this time if the project can be completed successfully.

**Other Considerations:** The County's Public Works Department Flood Control Water Agency supports the City's proposed project (letter dated 10/3/11).

## **Appendix 2**

### **1988-2014 CREF Awards by District**

**Table 1: First District<sup>3</sup>**

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Andree Clark Bird Refuge	\$ 170,000	1988	Cap. Improve. <sup>4</sup>
Andree Clark Bird Refuge Wetlands Margin Restore Project	30,901	2014	Cap. Improve
Carpinteria Swimming Pool	150,000	1988	Cap. Improve.
Carpinteria Salt Marsh Land Acquisition	83,000	1990	Acq. <sup>5</sup>
Carpinteria Salt Marsh Land Acquisition	150,000	1993	Acq.
Carpinteria Salt Marsh Land Acquisition	25,000	1995	Acq.
Carpinteria Salt Marsh Nature Park Interpretative Signs	38,500	2002	Cap Improve.
Carpinteria Salt Marsh, Basin I and So. Marsh Improve. Plan	50,000	2003	Cap Improve.
Santa Barbara Zoo – Sea Lion Exhibit	25,000	1990	Cap. Improve.
Santa Barbara Harbor Boat Launch	150,000	1990	Cap. Improve.
Carpinteria Bluffs Appraisals	20,000	1991	Acq.
Carpinteria Bluffs Appraisals	15,000	1992	Acq.
Carpinteria Bluffs Appraisals	15,000	1997	Acq.
Carpinteria Bluffs Acquisition	100,000	1998	Acq.
Carpinteria Bluffs Acquisition	350,000	1999	Acq.
Carpinteria Bluffs Restroom/Storage Facility	30,000	2004	Cap. Improve.
Carpinteria Creek Appraisals	5,000	1992	Acq.
Loon Point Beach Access Easement	2,872	1990	Acq.
Loon Point Beach Access Easement Realignment	65,519	1994	Cap. Improve.
Lookout Park Accessibility Modifications	30,000	1994	Cap. Improve.
Lookout Park Arundo Removal	40,000	2007	Cap. Improve.
Lookout Park Arundo Removal	8,500	2010	Cap. Improve.
Carpinteria Lions Community Building	25,000	1995	Cap. Improve.
Oceanview Park (Careaga) Acquisition	200,000	1995	Acq.
Channel Drive/Butterfly Beach Stair Refurbishment	27,000	1995 (1999 <sup>6</sup> )	Cap. Improve.
Pedestrian Improvements at Butterfly Beach	0	2005	Cap. Improve.
Coastal Bikeway, North Jameson Lane	95,000	1995	Cap. Improve.
Summerland Greenwell Park Improvements, Phase 1	20,000	1996	Cap. Improve.
Phase 2	16,000	2001	Cap. Improve.
Seed Storage/Demonstration Garden	10,000	2005	Cap. Improve.
Bikeway Studies: Santa Claus Lane/Carp. Ave & Ortega Hill	50,000	1996	Cap. Improve.
Hammonds Meadows Beach Access Stairs	10,500	1996	Cap. Improve.
Ocean Recreation Center	60,000	1997	Cap. Improve.
Rincon Beach Access	29,000	1997	Cap. Improve.
Rincon Beach Day Use Area Planning	28,500	2001	Cap. Improve.
Rincon Beach Day Use Area Implementation	7,720	2002	Cap. Improve.
Rincon Beach Day Use Area, Phase I	37,037	2003	Cap. Improve.
Rincon Beach Day Use Area, Phase II	40,000	2006	Cap. Improve.
Rincon Beach Day Use Area, Phase II	92,000	2007	Cap. Improve.
Rincon Creek Arundo Removal	20,000	2010	Cap. Improve.
Finney Street Beach Access	21,413	1997	Cap. Improve.
Surfrider Extension Trail	6,440	2000	Acq.

< Table Continues >

<sup>3</sup> Grants listed reflect the district boundaries in effect at the time of award.

<sup>4</sup>Capital improvement

<sup>5</sup>Acquisition

<sup>6</sup>Reallocated in the 1999 cycle

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Santa Claus Lane Preliminary Beach Access	\$ 26,000	2000	Acq.
Santa Claus Lane Beach Access, Phase I	22,500	2004	Acq.
Santa Claus Lane Streetscape Plan	73,889	2010	Plan/Rsch
Santa Claus Lane Streetscape Plan	69,559	2011	Plan/Rsch
Santa Claus Lane Streetscape Plan	96,404	2012	Plan/Rsch
Design Guidelines for Hwy 101 Landscaping and Structures	10,000	1998	Plan/Rsch. <sup>7</sup>
Carpinteria Creek Watershed Outreach	14,671	2002	Edu <sup>8</sup>
Carpinteria-Rincon Coastal Multi-Use Trail, Feasibility Study	49,622	2003	Plan/Rsch
Harbor Seal Sanctuary Improvement	12,629	2004	Cap. Improve.
Lifeguard Facility at Ash Avenue/Beach	20,000	2005	Cap. Improve.
Carpinteria Old Town (Palm to Linden) Trail Segment	24,500	2006	Plan/Rsch
Franklin Trail	0	2007	Cap. Improve.
Summerland Community Plan Update	68,791	2010	Plan/Rsch
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,838,467</b>		

<sup>7</sup>Planning & Research

<sup>8</sup>Education

**Table 2: Second District<sup>9</sup>**

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Adjusted Amount</b>	<b>Approved</b>	<b>Type</b>
Arroyo Burro Beach, Tot Lot	\$ 0	1988	Cap. Improve.
Parking Lot	50,000	1991	Cap. Improve.
Parking Lot Appraisals/Negotiations	6,000	1996	Acq.
Coastal Overlook	26,300	1998	Cap. Improve.
Wheelchair Accessible Coastal Overlook	14,762	2002	Cap. Improve.
Pampas Grass Removal	21,888	2003	Cap. Improve.
Estuary Restoration	12,930	2005	Cap. Improve.
Estuary Restoration	75,000	2006	Cap. Improve.
Beach Restrooms	402,500	2013	Cap. Improve.
Tide Pool Care Interpretative Sign	2,500	2014	Edu.
Sea Center, Renovation/Expansion	115,000	1988	Cap. Improve.
Touch Tank Shade Canopy	23,523	1994	Cap. Improve.
Wharf Improvements	50,000	2003	Cap. Improve.
Shark Exhibit	13,000	2005	Cap. Improve.
Generator for Aquariums	52,925	2009	Cap. Improve.
Coastal Immersion Zone Exhibits	30,000	2014	Cap. Improve.
SB City College Improvements, La Playa Stadium Renovation	150,000	1990	Cap. Improve.
Restoration of Chumash Point	15,000	1992	Cap. Improve.
West Campus Walkway	19,470	1995	Cap. Improve.
Bikeway	0	1997	Cap. Improve.
More Mesa Vehicle Restriction	3,649	1992	Cap. Improv
Goleta Beach, Parking Lot	28,274	1990	Cap. Improve.
Revetment	0	1992	Cap. Improve.
Fireline	202,500	1993	Cap. Improve.
Master Plan	55,000	1993	Plan/Rsch.
Irrigation	70,000	1994	Cap. Improve.
Pier Structural Rehabilitation	90,000	1994	Cap. Improve.
Restrooms	37,500	1997	Cap. Improve.
Carrying Capacity	15,000	1999	Plan/Rsch.
Coastal Data Collection	36,500	2001	Plan & Rsch.
Winter Sand Berm, Phase I	15,000	2003	Cap. Improve.
Coastal Data Collection	55,000	2004	Plan & Rsch.
Coastal Data Collection	63,700	2005	Plan & Rsch.
Goleta Slough Mouth Hydrologic Modeling Study	30,000	2014	Plan & Rsch.
Los Marineros Marine Education	20,000	1992	Edu.
Los Marineros Marine Education Expansion	11,723	1995	Edu.
Santa Barbara Waterfront Aquatic Park Dredging	15,000	1992	Cap. Improve.
Santa Barbara Waterfront Aquatic Park Dredging	0	2001	Cap. Improve.
Los Banos del Mar Pool	15,000	1992	Cap. Improve.
Los Banos del Mar Pool	30,000	1993	Cap. Improve.
Oral History of Santa Rosa Island	9,250	1993	Edu.
Douglas Family Preserve (Wilcox Property) Acquisition	1,000,000	1994	Acq.
Los Positas Park Master Plan	50,000	1995	Plan/Rsch.
Los Positas Park Expansion/Acquisition	175,000	1995	Acq.
Los Positas Park Expansion/Acquisition	25,000	1997	Acq.
Los Positas Park Expansion/Acquisition	325,000	1998	Acq.

< Table Continues >

<sup>9</sup> Grants listed reflect the district boundaries in effect at the time of the award.

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Santa Barbara Maritime Museum, Museum Construction	\$ 30,000	1996	Cap. Improve.
-- Auditorium Construction	15,172	1998	Cap. Improve.
-- Outreach Library	8,850	1999	Cap. Improve.
-- Increase Visibility Project	0	2004	Edu.
-- Surf Exhibit	50,000	2007	Cap. Improve.
-- Presentation Wall Upgrade	30,000	2014	Cap. Improve.
Santa Barbara County Veterans Memorial	20,000	1996	Cap. Improve.
Lower Westside Bikeway	29,720	1997	Cap. Improve.
South Coast Watershed Resource Center (WRC)	50,000	2000	Cap. Improve.
WRC & Arroyo Burro Firehydrant/Underground Utilities	29,883	2001	Cap. Improve.
WRC Improvements and Exhibits	19,861	2003	Edu
Shoreline Drive Enhancement	50,281	2000	Cap. Improve.
Shoreline Park Stairs Beach Access	30,000	2002	Cap. Improve.
Shoreline Park Improvements	40,000	2010	Cap. Improve.
Audubon Goleta Slough Restoration	15,500	2000	Cap. Improve.
Atascadero Mutt Mitt Stations	4,800	2002	Cap. Improve.
Atascadero Creek Trail Bridge Decking (near Patterson Ave.)	5,118	2004	Cap. Improve.
Atascadero Creek Trail Bridge Decking (near Turnpike Road)	19,000	2006	Cap. Improve.
Shade Structure for Native Plants <sup>10</sup>	15,000	2002	Cap. Improve.
Lifeguard Towers at Arroyo Burro, Goleta, and Jalama Beaches <sup>11</sup>	57,505	2002	Cap. Improve.
San Jose Creek Bikeway	0	2004	Cap. Improve.
Santa Cruz Island Habitat Restoration	40,000	2014	Cap. Improve.
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,019,584</b>		

<sup>10</sup> Benefits both the Second and Third Districts.

<sup>11</sup> Benefits both the Second and Third Districts.

**Table 3: Third District<sup>12</sup>**

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Isla Vista, Camino Corto Acquisition	\$ 550,000	1988	Acq.
Isla Vista Redevelopment Agency -- \$250,000 Loan	0	1991	Acq.
Del Playa Land Swap	10,300	1996	Acq.
Blufftop Acquisition	57,500	2001 (2005) <sup>13</sup>	Acq.
Blufftop Acquisition	493,159	2003 (2005) <sup>14</sup>	Acq.
Camino Corto Master Plan & Implementation	17,355	1994	Plan/Rsch.
Camino Corto and Del Sol Vernal Pool Reserve	30,311	1996	Cap. Improve.
Camino Corto and Del Sol Vernal Pool Reserve – Irrig.	30,000	1997	Cap. Improve.
Estero Park Lathhouse for Propagating Natives	24,000	1998	Cap. Improve.
Pescadero Blufftop Improvement	25,000	1999	Cap. Improve.
Del Playa Pelican Park – Water Meter	10,000	2001	Cap. Improve.
Camino del Sur Stairway Improvements	25,000	2001	Cap. Improve.
Bathrooms, Preliminary Planning & Permitting	30,000	2003	Cap. Improve.
Blufftop Acquisition	215,350	2005	Acq.
Improvements to Three Beach Accesses	210,000	2006	Cap. Improve.
Improvements to Walter Capps Park	54,305	2007	Cap. Improve.
Improvements to Walter Capps Park	130,800	2008	Cap. Improve.
Improvements to Walter Capps Park	90,125	2009	Cap. Improve.
Goleta Valley Transfer Development Rights	10,500	1988	Plan/Rsch.
Goleta Beach Slough Revetment	100,000	1988	Cap. Improve.
Santa Barbara Shores/Ellwood Mesa, Acquisition (SB Shores)	1,000,000	1988	Acq.
Acquisition (SB Shores)	140,000	1991	Acq.
Improvements	280,000	1991	Cap. Improve.
Improvements	49,981	1991	Cap. Improve.
Improvements	201,724	1991	Cap. Improve.
Debt Repayment (on Santa Barbara Shores loan)	115,217	1996	Acq.
Improvements	46,351	1997	Cap. Improve.
Regional Plan	50,000	2000	Plan/Rsch.
Regional Plan	31,599	2002	Plan/Rsch.
Acquisition (Ellwood Mesa/Sperling Preserve)	367,963	2004	Acq.
Acquisition (Ellwood Mesa/Sperling Preserve)	50,000	2005	Acq.
Trails Habitat Restoration Plan	35,000	2014	Plan/Rsch.
More Mesa Appraisal and Hazardous Waste Survey	25,000	1990	Acq.
More Mesa Management Plan	10,000	1991	Plan/Rsch.
Mission Santa Ines and Its Harbors Project	8,723	1995	Edu.
Phase II – El Capitan Bikeway and Trail	50,000	1996	Cap. Improve.
Gaviota Creek Fish Passage	50,000	1991 (1996) <sup>15</sup>	Cap. Improve.
Gaviota Creek Fish Passage	20,000	1993 (1996) <sup>16</sup>	Cap. Improve.
Gaviota Creek Fish Passage	30,000	1996	Cap. Improve.

<Table Continues>

<sup>12</sup> Grants listed reflect the district boundaries in effect at the time of the award.

<sup>13</sup> Reallocated in the 2005 cycle

<sup>14</sup> Reallocated in the 2005 cycle

<sup>15</sup> Reallocated in the 1996 cycle

<sup>16</sup> Reallocated in the 1996 cycle



Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Conservation Efforts Along the Gaviota Coast, Phase IV	\$ 14,452	1994	Plan/Rsch.
Phase V	25,000	1995	Edu.
Gaviota Coast Resource Study	20,000	1997	Plan/Rsch.
Gaviota Coast Resource Study	27,000	2000	Plan/Rsch.
Agricultural Conservation Easement Appraisals	32,810	1997	Acq.
Easement Fund	25,000	1998	Acq.
Easement Fund	100,000	1999	Acq.
Easement Fund	303,268	2000	Acq.
Easement Fund	204,732	2002	Acq.
Suitability/Feasibility Study	10,000	1999	Plan/Rsch.
Suitability/Feasibility Study	15,000	2002	Plan/Rsch.
Facilitation of Common Ground Process	15,000	1999	Plan/Rsch.
Facilitation of Common Ground Process	45,000	2003	Plan/Rsch.
Arroyo Hondo Ranch Acquisition	208,929	2001	Acq.
Gaviota Ranch/Brinkman Estate Conservation Easement	0	2003 (2005) <sup>17</sup>	Acq.
Gaviota Ranch/Brinkman Estate Conservation Easement	0	2005	Acq.
Jalama Beach County Park Expansion	616	1996	Acq.
Jalama Beach Restrooms	280,000	2014	Cap. Improve.
Coronado Acquisition	43,005	1998	Acq.
Coronado Acquisition and Restoration	25,000	1999	Acq.
Ponds and Aviaries -- Animal Hospital	0	1998	Cap. Improve.
San Jose Creek Class I Bike, Planning	74,266	1998	Cap. Improve.
Snowy Plover & Coastal Access Pilot Program	24,989	2001	Edu.
Ocean Beach Boardwalk	48,007	2003	Cap. Improve.
Surf Beach Snowy Plover Docent Wind Shelter	0	2004	Cap. Improve.
Doty Property Acquisition	300,000	2007	Acq.
Gaviota Village Property	1,360,938	2008	Acq.
Gaviota Coast Plan	280,710	2010	Plan/Rsch.
Gaviota Coast Plan	260,580	2011	Plan/Rsch.
Gaviota Coast Plan	296,497	2012	Plan/Rsch.
Gaviota Coast Plan	273,000	2013	Plan/Rsch.
Ocean Meadows Acquisition	438,500	2010	Acq.
Ocean Meadows Acquisition	311,500	2011	Acq.
Mathilda Drive Parcels	64,845	2010	Acq.
Guadalupe Dunes Bypass Road	224,346	2012	Cap. Improve.
Rancho Guacamole Fish Passage Restoration	0 <sup>18</sup>	2014	Cap. Improve.
Cabrillo High School Aquarium	75,000	2014	Edu.
Dunes Center Heritage Exhibit	80,000	2014	Edu.
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$10,183,253</b>		

<sup>17</sup> Reallocated in the 2005 cycle

<sup>18</sup> \$42,417 to be reallocated in the 2015 cycle

**Table 4: Fourth District<sup>19</sup>**

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Leroy Park Recreational Center	\$ 75,000	1988	Cap. Improve.
Leroy Park Recreational Center	75,000	1990	Cap. Improve.
Leroy Park Recreational Center	75,000	1991	Cap. Improve.
Point Sal Acquisition	125,000	1988	Acq.
Point Sal Road Reopening, Alternative Analysis Report	50,000	2005	Plan/Rsch
Ocean Park Improvements	400,000	1988	Cap. Improve.
Ocean Park Improvements	100,000	1990	Cap. Improve.
Host Site	16,896	1999	Cap. Improve.
Mission Vieja Site Acquisition	50,000	1990	Acq.
Burton Mesa Management Plan	19	1988	Plan/Rsch.
Burton Mesa Management Plan	76,320	1992	Plan/Rsch.
Burton Mesa Management Plan	40,000	1994	Plan/Rsch.
Burton Mesa Acquisition	281,162	1996	Acq.
Burton Mesa Acquisition	72,691	1996	Acq.
Burton Mesa Acquisition	210,000	1997	Acq.
Cabrillo High School Aquarium, Construction	100,000	1994	Cap. Improve.
Construction	77,943	1998	Cap. Improve.
Construction	123,335	2000	Cap. Improve.
Outreach Program	11,724	1995	Edu.
Technology/Media Exhibit	71,142	2001	Edu.
Santa Ynez River Enhancement Plan <sup>20</sup>	36,088	1995	Plan/Rsch.
Surf Beach Pedestrian Crossing	120,000	1997	Cap. Improve.
Santa Ynez River Open Space/Park	25,000	1998	Acq.
Burton Mesa Chaparral Garden	2,271	2000	Cap. Improve.
Guadalupe Dunes Vehicle Barrier to Protect Snowy Plovers	13,450	2002	Cap. Improve.
Guadalupe Dunes Tractor	89,000	2004	Equipment
Lompoc Aquatic Center	67,126	2002	Cap. Improve.
Dunes Center, Exhibit Hall/Visitor Center	0	2003 (2005) <sup>21</sup>	Cap. Improve.
Exhibit Hall/Visitor Center	0	2005	Cap. Improve.
Pioneer Space Center's Coastal Display	11,942	2004	Equipment
The Natural Ways Exhibit at La Purisima	63,531	2006	Cap. Improve.
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,459,640</b>		

<sup>19</sup> Grants listed reflect the district boundaries in effect at the time of the award.

<sup>20</sup> Benefits both the Third and Fourth Districts.

<sup>21</sup> Reallocated in the 2005 cycle

**Table 5: Fifth District<sup>22</sup>**

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Waller Park Water Conservation	\$ 125,000	1988	Cap. Improve.
Allan Hancock Theater Expansion	175,000	1990	Cap. Improve.
Peregrine Falcon Reintroduction	5,000	1992	Plan/Rsch.
S.M./Guadalupe Dunes Bikeway Study	30,000	1992	Plan/Rsch.
General Plan Amendment	374	1996	Plan/Rsch.
Construction of Bikeway, Phase IV	0	1997	Cap. Improve.
Guadalupe Dunes County Park, Kiosk Staffing	0	1993	Edu.
Management Plan Update	33,222	1994	Plan/Rsch.
Trailer	5,000	1996	Cap. Improve.
Phase II, Master Plan for Road Repairs	23,705	1996	Plan/Rsch.
Implementation Plan	104,065	1998	Cap. Improve.
Implementation Plan	22,935	1999	Cap. Improve.
Guadalupe Dunes Education Center, Construction	0	1994	Cap. Improve.
Construction of Exhibit Hall	0	2000	Cap. Improve.
Exhibits	120,000	1995	Edu.
Ecosystem Education Unit Package	22,500	1999	Edu.
Video of Dunes	22,000	1999	Edu.
Land & Sea Mammals Interactive Computer Program	21,500	2001	Edu.
Santa Maria Valley Discovery Museum, SEA IT!	24,550	1994	Edu.
SEA IT! Phase II	13,444	1997	Edu.
Ocean Supermarket Exhibit, Phase I	20,000	2002	Edu.
Ocean Supermarket Exhibit, Phase II	79,000	2005	Edu.
Marine Exhibit, Phase I	115,000	2004	Cap. Improve.
Marine Exhibit, Phase II	47,750	2006	Cap. Improve.
Tide & Seek Exhibit	45,000	2007	Cap. Improve.
Belly of the Whale, Phase I	75,000	2008	Cap. Improve.
Belly of the Whale, Phase II	55,099	2009	Cap. Improve.
Point Sal Appraisals	5,000	1995	Acq.
Point Sal Acquisition	33,415	1999	Acq.
Pioneer Park	25,000	1996	Acq.
Santa Maria YMCA Pool	0	1997	Cap. Improve.
Santa Maria Valley Beautiful Earth Week	10,000	1998	Edu.
Salmon & Trout Educational Program	3,000	1998	Edu.
Guadalupe Community Park Ball Fields	25,000	1998	Cap. Improve.
Van for the Environmental Education on Wheels	0	1999	Edu.
Van for the Environmental Education on Wheels	16,500	2001	Edu.
Marine Science Curriculum, Pilot Program	8,332	2000	Edu.
Santa Maria Natural History Museum, Exploring the Seashore	26,000	2001	Edu.
-- Sand & Sea Learning Area	30,000	2004	Cap. Improve.
-- From the Beginnings Under the Sea	50,000	2006	Cap. Improve.
-- Shore bird Collection Exhibit	12,309	2010	Edu.
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,429,700</b>		

<sup>22</sup> Grants listed reflect the district boundaries in effect at the time of the award.

**Table 6: Grants Benefiting Three or More Districts**

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Earth Day 1990	\$ 10,000	1990	Edu.
Earth Day 1995	10,000	1995	Edu.
Open Space and Recreation Element	50,000	1991	Plan/Rsch.
Coastal Access Implementation Plan	30,000	1992	Plan/Rsch.
Offers to Dedicate Coastal Access	37,843	1996	Plan/Rsch.
South Coast Water Quality – Education Component	26,000	1998	Edu.
California Central Coast Birding Trail	0	1998	Cap. Improve.
Snowy Plover Video	8,930	1998	Edu.
SB Wildlife Care Network, Upgrades to Seabird Facility	1,580	2000	Cap. Improve.
Seabird Net Enclosure	1,037	2004	Equipment
Seabird Care Compound	31,800	2005	Cap. Improve.
Seabird Care Compound	120,000	2006	Cap. Improve.
Seabird Care Compound	150,000	2007	Cap. Improve.
Seabird Care Compound	191,000	2010	Cap. Improve.
Pelagic Bird Care Equipment	6,039	2014	Equipment
Waves on Wheels Van	25,000	2001	Edu.
Marine Mammal Rescue Project	24,408	2004	Equipment
Marine Mammals Rescue Project	10,000	2005	Equipment
Santa Barbara Beaches Hazards Removal Project	0	2004	Cap. Improve.
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$733,637</b>		

**Table 7: Amounts Allocated by Districts<sup>23</sup>**

District	Amount
First	<b>\$2,838,467</b>
Second	<b>\$4,019,584</b>
Third	<b>\$10,183,253</b>
Fourth	<b>\$2,459,640</b>
Five	<b>\$1,429,700</b>
Three or More Districts	<b>\$733,637</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$21,664,281</b>

<sup>23</sup> Grants listed reflect the district boundaries in effect at the time of the award.

**Attachment B**

**Notice of Exemption**

## NOTICE OF EXEMPTION

**TO:** Santa Barbara County Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

**FROM:** Planning & Development

The project or activity identified below is determined to be exempt from further environmental review requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as defined in the State and County Guidelines for the implementation of CEQA.

**APN:** n/a

**Case No.:** n/a

**Location:** Various areas within the County

**Projects Title:** 2015 Coastal Resource Enhancement Fund (CREF) Awards

**Projects Description:** Allocation of CREF Awards in the 2015 Cycle

**Name of Public Agency Approving Project:** n/a

**Name of Person or Agency Carrying Out Project:** County of Santa Barbara

**Exempt Status:** (Check one)

- Ministerial
- Statutory Exemption
- Categorical Exemption
- Emergency Project
- Declared Emergency

**Cite specific CEQA and/or CEQA Guideline Section:** 15061 (b)(3) and 15378(b)(4)

### Reasons to support exemption findings:

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 15061 (b)(3) states that CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. CEQA Section 15378 (b)(4) defines a "Project" as not including the creation of government funding mechanisms. Allocation of CREF awards is a proposed budget allocation, and therefore is not considered a "Project" nor is it considered to cause a significant effect on the environment. CEQA compliance will be addressed when individual CREF Grant Agreements are approved by the Board of Supervisors.

There is no substantial evidence that there are unusual circumstances (including future activities) resulting in (or which might reasonably result in) significant impacts which threaten the environment. The exceptions to the categorical exemptions pursuant to Section 15300.2 of the State CEQA Guidelines are:

- (a) **Location. Classes 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11 are qualified by consideration of where the project is to be located -- a project that is ordinarily insignificant in its impact on the environment may in a particularly sensitive environment be significant. Therefore, these classes are considered to apply all instances, except where the project may impact on an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, state, or local agencies.**
- (b) **Cumulative Impact. All exemptions for these classes are inapplicable when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant.**
- (c) **Significant Effect. A categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.**
- (d) **Scenic Highways. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may result in damage to scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, historic buildings, rock**

**outcroppings, or similar resources, within a highway officially designated as a state scenic highway. This does not apply to improvements which are required as mitigation by an adopted negative declaration or certified EIR.**

- (e) Hazardous Waste Sites. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project located on a site which is included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.**
- (f) Historical Resources. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.**

The exceptions to Categorical Exemptions do not apply to the awarding of CREF funding to various County and non-County projects because CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(b)(4) provides that creating a funding mechanism is not a project. Allocation of CREF awards is a proposed budget allocation, and therefore is not considered a "Project." CEQA compliance will be addressed when individual CREF Grant Agreements are approved by the Board of Supervisors.

Lead Agency Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone #: \_\_\_\_\_

Department/Division Representative: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Acceptance Date: \_\_\_\_\_

distribution: Hearing Support Staff

Project file (when P&D permit is required)  
Date Filed by County Clerk: \_\_\_\_\_.