

**SANTA BARBARA COUNTY
BOARD AGENDA LETTER**



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

Agenda Number:

Prepared on: November 7, 2002
Department Name: Planning & Development
Department No.: 053
Agenda Date: Monday, November 18, 2002,
5:00 p.m.
Placement: Special Evening Hearing
Estimate Time: Staff: 10 mins; Total: 2 hours
Continued Item: No
If Yes, date from:
Document File Name: g:\group\energy\wp\policy\cref\03\
cycle\staffreport.doc

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Dianne Meester, Interim Director
Planning & Development

STAFF CONTACT: Kathy McNeal Pfeifer, Energy Division, 568-2507;
Doug Anthony, Energy Division, 568-2046

SUBJECT: Hearing to Allocate Year 2003 Coastal Resource Enhancement Fund Grants

Recommendation(s):

That the Board of Supervisors:

- A. Receive staff's recommendations and take public testimony;
- B. Continue this hearing to December 3, 2002 for final action on recommendations C -D;
- C. Approve 12 CREF awards in the 2003 cycle pursuant to staff recommendations contained in the attached staff report and staff recommended preliminary conditions of awards in Appendix A;
- D. Direct staff to prepare the required contractual agreements with grantees, including final grant conditions required, for approval by the Board of Supervisors of the non-County CREF awards.

NOTE: Staff recommends limiting testimony from each applicant to five minutes. We also suggest that speakers other than applicants be limited to three minutes of testimony per proposal.

Alignment with Board Strategic Plan:

The recommendations are primarily aligned with Goal No. 5. Maintain and Enhance the Quality of Life for all Residents.

Executive Summary & Discussion:

A total of \$1,327,445 is available in the 2003 CREF cycle, \$780,659 of which must be devoted to coastal acquisitions, and \$546,786 of which is available for general allocation and acquisitions.

Please refer to the attached document and its appendices that report on:

- (a) Information on the CREF 2003 cycle,
- (b) Evaluations of CREF proposals for this year,
- (c) Funding recommendations for the CREF 2003 cycle, and
- (d) Past CREF awards.

Mandates & Service Levels:

Improvements to County service levels, such as recreational services, would occur should the Board fund such improvements with this year's CREF allocation.

Fiscal & Facilities Impact:

No adverse fiscal and facilities impact. As shown in Table A below, this year's CREF cycle comprises fees paid by four offshore oil and gas projects to mitigate residual impacts to coastal resources. The allocations recommended in this report involve disbursement of principal from CREF. Interest earned on CREF's principal funds the administration of CREF. Specific benefits to County facilities may occur to the extent that proposed improvements to County facilities are awarded CREF funding. However, improvements to County facilities, such as Rincon and Ocean Beach Parks would increase park operational and maintenance costs. Grants paid during FY 02-03 as a result of the Board's action today will be processed through revisions to the CREF budget (Fund 0063, Dept. 053, Mitigation Programs, 5090) if sufficient funds are not available in the current estimated expenditure budget. The CREF program is part of the mitigation program within the Energy Division Cost Center on page D-276 in the Planning & Development Department's section of the County's Budget F02/03.

Table A: CREF Fees for 2003

PROJECT	2003
Point Arguello	\$253,300
Santa Ynez Unit	\$208,600
Gaviota Terminal	\$149,000
Point Pedernales	\$149,000
Total Base Fees	\$759,900

Attachments: Staff Report: 2003 CREF Cycle

Appendix A: Evaluations of Year 2003 CREF Proposals

Appendix B: 1988-2002 CREF Awards by District

**2003 CYCLE
COASTAL RESOURCE ENHANCEMENT FUND
(CREF)**

**Board of Supervisors Hearing
November 18, 2002**

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

BACKGROUND

The County established CREF as a condition of permits for the Point Arguello, Point Pedernales, Santa Ynez Unit, Gaviota Oil Terminal, and Molino Gas projects. The fund represents one of several measures that the county applies to help mitigate significant adverse impacts to coastal recreation, coastal visual aesthetics, coastal tourism, and environmentally sensitive coastal resources to the maximum extent feasible. Where such impacts cannot be mitigated entirely through direct measures, the fund offsets the impacts by enhancing coastal resources at another location or in another way. By law, allocation of grants or loans from CREF must be directed at mitigating these specific types of impacts for which the permit conditions were crafted.

Since 1988, the Board of Supervisors has awarded 195 CREF grants, including one loan, for a total of \$12,834,051. Table 1 shows the distribution of past CREF dollars among coastal acquisitions, capital improvements, education, and planning and research (including land management plans that may be associated with acquisitions). Prior to 1990, rating criteria in the CREF Guidelines heavily favored capital projects. In 1990, the Board amended the criteria to emphasize coastal acquisitions. In 1994, the Board amended the criteria once again to give higher priority to both coastal acquisitions and coastal-related capital improvements.

Public agencies, municipalities, special districts, and non-profit organizations may compete for CREF awards. Table 2 illustrates the five categories of previous CREF grantees, while Tables 3 and 4 show which cities and County agencies received grants and loans, respectively. The County's past CREF projects include coastal acquisition, improvement of coastal parks and coastal access, and enhancement of environmentally sensitive resources (e.g., Burton Mesa preserve, Gaviota Creek Crossing to enhance the return of the steelhead).

Table 1: CREF Allocations by Type of Project

PROJECT CATEGORIES	DOLLAR AMOUNT	PERCENTAGE
Acquisitions	\$6,377,669	50%
Capital Improvements	\$5,138,412	40%
Educational	\$731,878	6%
Planning & Research	\$ 586,092	4%
Total	\$12,834,051	

Table 2: CREF Allocations by Type of Grantee*

GRANTEE	DOLLAR AMOUNT	PERCENTAGE
Cities	\$960,907	7%
County Agencies	\$6,200,974	49%
Non-Profit Agencies	\$5,041,571	39%
State & Federal Agencies	\$5,000	<1%
Educational Institutions	\$625,599	5%
Total	\$12,834,051	

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

Table 3: Total CREF Allocations to Cities

CITY	DOLLAR AMOUNT	PERCENTAGE
Santa Barbara	\$460,281	47%
Carpinteria	\$278,500	29%
Santa Maria	\$55,000	6%
Lompoc	\$142,126	15%
Guadalupe	\$25,000**	3%
Total	\$960,907	

** 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

COUNTY DEPT.	DOLLAR AMOUNT	PERCENTAGE
Parks	\$3,929,256	63%
Public Works	\$1,052,271	17%
Planning & Development	\$815,285	13%
County Administrator	\$281,162	5%
General Services	\$120,000	2%
Fish & Game Commission	\$3,000	<1%
	\$6,200,974	

In October of 2002, the Board of Supervisors approved the fourth five-year assessment of payments that are required of four of the five oil and gas projects. The CREF Guidelines stipulate a process by which these fees are determined and require an assessment at five-year intervals, except for the Molino Gas Project; the Molino project's CREF fees have been set in its permit condition. In the past, the oil and gas projects have contributed approximately \$12.8 million.

The CREF fee schedule for 2004-2007 appears in Table 5. Additional monies sometimes become available for allocation in future years if previously approved CREF awards do not materialize and, as a result, revert back to the uncommitted CREF balance.

Table 5: CREF Fees for 2004-2007

PROJECT	2004	2005	2006	2007
Point Arguello*	\$223,500	\$223,500	\$223,500	\$223,500
Santa Ynez Unit	\$208,600	\$208,600	\$208,600	\$208,600
Gaviota Terminal	\$149,000	\$149,000	\$149,000	\$149,000
Point Pedernales**	\$149,000	\$149,000	\$134,100	\$134,100
CREF Fees Per Year	\$730,100	\$730,100	\$715,200	\$715,200

* This table assumes Arguello, Inc. will partially dismantle its onshore processing facility by removing 12 of the facility's 13 columns in 2003. These columns range 62 and 107 feet in height.

** The reduction in fees beginning in 2006 assumes that, by the end of 2005, the planted trees around the Surf electrical substation are established, thriving, and of adequate growth to screen the facility.

EVALUATION PROCESS

The Energy Division 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 these criteria, staff weighs the following factors in determining its recommendations for CREF funding:

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

2003 CREF CYCLE

The 2003 cycle represents the fifteenth CREF cycle. A total of \$759,900 in CREF fees will be available in late January, 2003, for grants. Pursuant to the Fund Deferral Program in the CREF Guidelines, half of this amount, or \$379,950 is designated for exceptional acquisitions while the other half, \$379,950 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 \$400,709 is available for acquisition: the Board of Supervisors deferred \$93,209 of acquisitional monies from the 2002 CREF cycle; the Isla Vista Redevelopment Agency paid back its \$250,000 CREF loan; and Planning & Development Department, Comprehensive Planning Division requests a reinstatement of its \$57,500 CREF award to purchase bluff top properties in Isla Vista. Therefore, a total of \$780,659 is available for acquisition of coastal

properties. The Dunes Center returned a \$166,836¹ CREF grant to be reallocated in this cycle, making a total of \$546,786 available for general allocations and acquisitions. With both subfunds, a total of \$1,327,445 is available in the 2003 cycle to fund CREF awards.

The County received 17 proposals for this cycle, seeking cumulative awards of \$1,934,459. Two proposals seek acquisitional monies: the Land Trust for Santa Barbara County seeks \$230,000 to fund conservation easements along the Gaviota Coast and the Comprehensive Planning Division seeks \$557,500 to purchase Isla Vista bluff top properties. The remaining fifteen proposals seek a total of \$1,146,959 to improve coastal parks, restore environmentally sensitive coastal habitats, and enhance facilities that educate the public about coastal resources.

Table 6: Funds Available in the 2003 CREF Cycle

SOURCE OF FUNDING	ACQUISITION	GENERAL ALLOCATION
2003 CREF fees (base)	\$ 379,900	\$ 379,900
Deferred Monies from 2002 Cycle	\$ 93,209	
Reallocated Monies	\$ 57,500	\$ 166,836
Repaid CREF Loan	\$ 250,000	
TOTAL (\$1,327,445)	\$ 780,659	\$ 546,786
FUNDS REQUESTED (\$1,934,459)	\$ 787,500	\$1,146,959

Table 7 lists the proposals, applicants, and amount requested. Tables 8 and 9 show types of projects and types of applicants, respectively, in the 2003 cycle.

¹ The Dunes Center received a \$166,836 grant in the 2000 CREF cycle to construct a building to house its exhibits. During the planning process, the cost to construct the building increased and the Center had to return the CREF grant since it was unable to secure the additional monies prior to the contract termination date.

Table 7: 2003 CREF Proposals

DISTRICT	NO.	PROPOSAL TITLE	APPLICANT	AMOUNT REQUESTING	TYPE OF PROPOSAL
1st	1	Carpinteria-Rincon California Coastal Trail Feasibility Study	County Planning & Development, Comprehensive Planning Division And City of Carpinteria	\$ 55,000	Planning & Research
	2	Rincon Beach County Park, Phase 1 Construction Day Use Area	County Parks Department	\$ 67,800	Capital Improvement
	3	Enhancement of the Carpinteria Salt Marsh: Basin I & South Marsh	The Land Trust for Santa Barbara County	\$ 50,000	Capital Improvement
	4	Coastal Wetland & Restoration in the Carpinteria Salt Marsh	Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District	\$ 161,500	Capital Improvement
2nd	5	Sea Center Revitalization Seismic & Fire Code Requirements	Santa Barbara Natural History Museum	\$ 50,000	Capital Improvement
	6	South Coast Watershed Resource Center Exhibits and Upgrades	Community Environmental Council	\$ 48,921	Education & Capital Improvement
	7	Arroyo Burro Beach County Park Ranger Office and Storage Shed	County Parks Department	\$ 25,000	Capital Improvement
	8	Arroyo Burro Pampas Grass Removal and Habitat Enhancement	County Agricultural Commissioner's Office	\$ 31,888	Capital Improvement
	9	Goleta Beach County Park Native Plant Parking Lot Plantings	County Parks Department	\$ 17,500	Capital Improvement
3rd	10	Isla Vista Community – Public Restroom & Shower Facility	County Parks Department, Isla Vista Recreation & Parks District, and Univ. of California, SB	\$ 30,000	Preliminary Planning & Design
	11	Isla Vista Bluff top Parcels Acquisition Project	County Planning & Development, Comprehensive Planning Division	\$ 557,500	Acquisition

Continue 3rd	12	Acquisition Fund for Gaviota Coast Conservation Easements	The Land Trust for Santa Barbara County	\$ 230,000	Acquisition
	13	Gaviota Coast Common Ground Facilitation	Third Supervisor District	\$ 45,000	Planning & Research
	14	Native Interpretive Center at Ocean Beach County Park	Lompoc Housing & Community Development Corporation And County Parks Department	\$ 227,250	Capital Improvement
	15	Space Exploration Research Library	Lompoc Valley Chamber & Visitors Bureau	\$ 50,000	Capital Improvement
4th	16	Promoting Tourism in the City of Guadalupe	City of Guadalupe	\$ 119,100	Planning & Research and Operating Costs
	17	Dunes Center Exhibit Hall	Dunes Center	\$ 168,000	Capital Improvement
5th	No proposals submitted.				
TOTAL				\$1,934,459	

Table 8: Type of Proposal in the 2003 CREF Cycle

CATEGORIES	AMOUNT	PERCENTAGE
Acquisitions	\$787,500	41%
Capital Improvements	\$878,684	45%
Planning & Research*	\$219,100	11%
Education	\$19,175	1%
Preliminary Designs/Permitting Costs	\$30,000	2%
Total	\$1,934,459	

*A grant for \$119,100 borderlines between Planning & Research and Operating Costs.

Table 9: Type of Applicant in the 2003 CREF Cycle

CATEGORIES	AMOUNT	PERCENTAGE
County Agencies	\$991,188	51%
Non-Profit Agencies	\$824,171	43%
Cities	\$119,100	6%
Total	\$1,934,459	

PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

Staff recommends 12 grants: two grants from funds available for acquisition and ten grants from the general allocation fund (see Table 10). All 12 recommended grants exhibit a strong coastal nexus.

First, staff recommends the Land Trust for Santa Barbara County’s full request of \$230,000 to help acquire easements along the Gaviota coast that conserve scenic or natural resources. The Land Trust has demonstrated that it can successfully fund-raise and acquire easements and property. With the help of CREF funds, the Trust has acquired a conservation easement over the 660-acre Freeman Ranch, acquired and restored nine acres at the Coronado Butterfly Preserve, and acquired the 782-acre Arroyo Hondo Ranch. It is also completing negotiations with the landowners for the 745-acre La Paloma Ranch. The Trust continues to negotiate with landowners for conservation easements and outright purchases.

Second, staff recommends the remaining acquisitional monies, \$550,659, toward the Planning & Development Department, Comprehensive Planning Division’s efforts to acquire seven bluff top properties along Del Playa in Isla Vista. Staff recommends that the award be contingent on, among other things, the applicant entering into escrow with a minimum of two properties by October 15,

2003. The applicant must compete again in the 2004 CREF cycle for the portion of this grant not committed in escrow. This approach allows the Board of Supervisors to decide if funds not committed in escrow should continue to be devoted to efforts to acquire the subject Isla Vista properties, be devoted to other more prominent coastal acquisitions, or be deferred for other, reasonably foreseeable coastal acquisitions.

With \$546,786 available in the general allocation sub-fund, staff recommends ten proposals that provide exceptional benefits to different communities and the coastal environment throughout the County in a timely manner. Seven of the ten are capital improvements to coastal parks and marine educational centers, and restoration of environmentally sensitive coastal habitats. The remaining three staff's recommendations include planning for a coastal bikeway, restroom and rinse showers at a beach access, and a local vision for preserving the rural Gaviota coast.

An evaluation of each proposal appears in Appendix A. 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 2003 CREF Cycle

Proposal Title	Applicant	Acquisition	Gen. Allocation
Carpinteria-Rincon California Coastal Trail Feasibility Study	County P&D, Comp. Planning		\$ 55,000
Rincon Beach County Park, Phase 1 Day Use Area	County Parks Department		\$ 37,037
Carpinteria Salt Marsh, Basin I and South Marsh	Land Trust for Santa Barbara		\$ 50,000
Sea Center Wharf Improvements	Santa Barbara Natural History Museum		\$ 50,000
South Coast Watershed Resource Center	Community Environmental Council		\$ 19,861
Arroyo Burro Pampas Grass Removal	County Agricultural Commissioner's Office		\$ 31,888
Isla Vista Ocean Bluff Top Properties	County P&D, Comp. Planning	\$550,659	
Isla Vista Bathrooms, Preliminary Planning & Permitting	County Parks Department		\$ 30,000
Gaviota Coast Conservation Easement Acquisition Fund	Land Trust for Santa Barbara	\$230,000	
Gaviota Coast Common Ground	Third Supervisorial District		\$ 45,000
Ocean Beach Nature Center	Lompoc Housing & Community Dev. Corporation		\$ 60,000
Dunes Center Exhibit Hall	Dunes Center		\$168,000
TOTAL		\$780,659	\$546,786

Appendix A

**Proposal Evaluations
2003 CREF Cycle**

PROJECT # 1
CARPINTERIA ~ RINCON CALIFORNIA COASTAL TRAIL FEASIBILITY STUDY

1st District
Santa Barbara County Planning & Development Department, Comprehensive Planning
and
City of Carpinteria, Parks and Recreation Department
Requests \$55,000
Total Project Costs: \$56,000

Staff Recommendation: Award full request of \$55,000.

Applicant's Priority Ranking: The Planning & Development Department, Comprehensive Planning Division ranks this proposal last out of two submitted, and the City of Carpinteria submitted only this proposal.

Summary of Proposal: The applicants request funds to prepare a feasibility study that analyzes three possible routes for a segment of the California Coastal Trail, between Rincon County Beach Park and the eastern end of the City of Carpinteria. For each of the three possible routes, the study will look at: (a) a comparison of costs with benefits; (b) biological, archaeological, and geological issues; and (c) real property issues (e.g., easements). Each of the routes are approximately a mile long and would connect with the proposed Carpinteria Coastal Vista Trail, which will be located along the bluff top from the eastern end of Carpinteria to the Carpinteria Marsh.

Background: Currently, there is no formal non-freeway bicycle and pedestrian access between Carpinteria and Rincon. The formal route for bicyclists along the California Coastal Trail, between Rincon and City of Carpinteria, is the shoulder of Highway 101. Some pedestrians, and bicyclists, use the railroad right-of-way, an authorized route.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (+/-) means partially satisfies; and (-) means it does not satisfy the criterion.]

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The feasibility study would be the first step towards realizing a multi-use trail located on or close to the bluff top, between Rincon and Carpinteria. If and when the trail was developed, the trail would move a segment of the California Coastal Trail from the Highway 101 shoulder to a quieter, safer, and more remote area that sports ocean views from many vantage points. The study would select a preferred route that would provide recreational and non-motorized access to and from a popular beach for surfers and beach-goers. The study is consistent with the Local Coastal Plan, in that it would provide horizontal access along the ocean bluff tops. The route would overlook the eastern Santa Barbara Channel, where many offshore oil and gas platforms have operated for several decades.
- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** The feasibility study is the first step towards transferring this segment of the coastal trail from the highway shoulder to the coastal bluff tops. If and when the trail is

developed, it would help to offset cumulative coastal recreational and tourist impacts. Currently, the highway shoulder only allows for bicyclist, not pedestrians or equestrians; however, biking so close to highway traffic discourages many bicyclists along this segment. A multi-use trail along the bluff top would encourage bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians to use the trail for access to Rincon County Beach Park.

- (+/-) **Criterion #3.** The feasibility study would be the first step towards: (a) increasing the safety of the many bicyclists who ride the coastal trail; and (b) encouraging some of the approximate 400,000 annual visitors to Rincon Beach to walk or ride a bike. In addition, the trail would offer people in Carpinteria another area to bike, hike, walk, jog, and horseback along the coastal bluff tops. However, without knowing the cost of installing the multi-trail yet, it is unknown what the benefit is to the community compared to the cost.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** This project is a first step towards a capital improvement, which along with coastal acquisitions is one of the highest priorities of CREF.
- (-) **Criterion #5.** The CREF request represents 98% of the total study costs. The applicants offer a mere \$1,000 worth of in-kind administrating and managing services.
- (-) **Criterion #6.** The feasibility study is the first step towards developing a multi-use trail, which would require County maintenance responsibilities.
- (+/-) **Criterion #7.** For the feasibility study, the applicants do not seek funding from any other sources. To develop a multi-use trail, the applicants will seek monies from the Coastal Conservancy, local T-21 grant program, Recreational Trail grant program, State TEA grant program, and CREF.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** Staff believes the study can be completed successfully. The budget appears to be a sufficient amount and the applicants have prepared this type of study before. Staff is uncertain if the multi-trail can be completed successfully since all of the proposed routes involve negotiations with Union Railroad or CalTrans. The applicants state that they have not contacted property owners whose land may be crossed by the proposed trail but owners will be contacted during preparation of the feasibility study. CREF has funded two similar bikeway feasibility studies in the past. One study led to the funding of both the Santa Claus Lane/Carpinteria Avenue bikeway and the Ortega Hill bikeway. The other study has not yet materialized into a complete Santa Maria/Guadalupe Dunes bikeway on the Santa Maria levy. The Comprehensive Planning Division has successfully completed eleven CREF projects in the past fourteen years. Timing of the project is uncertain since the applicant still has seven outstanding CREF projects to implement.

Other Considerations: None.

PROJECT # 2
RINCON COUNTY BEACH PARK, PHASE I CONSTRUCTION
DAY USE AREA DEVELOPMENT

1st District
Santa Barbara County Parks Department
Requests \$67,800
Total Project Costs: \$148,000 (Phase I)

Staff Recommendation: Award a challenge grant of \$37,037, contingent on the Parks Department securing all additional monies for Phase I or reducing the scope of the entire project to meet the revenues that it has already secured. The department has increased this project's budget by \$167,000 since last year's proposal and this would be the third CREF grant towards this project.

Applicant's Priority Ranking: The Parks Department ranks this proposal first out of five submitted.

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests additional CREF funds to implement Phase I construction at Rincon Beach County Park. Phase I includes:

- a) grading site,
- b) constructing a parking lot bioswale,
- c) constructing disabled access to restroom,
- d) constructing group picnic area,
- e) constructing disabled access to the beach ramp,
- f) planting trees,
- g) grading and hydroseeding lawn area, and
- h) installing new irrigation system.

Background: In the 2001 CREF cycle, the applicant received a \$28,500 grant to prepare engineering, landscape, and irrigation designs, conduct a Phase 1 archaeological report, and obtain permits for the proposed park improvements. The applicant had completed the designs in November of 2001 and submitted an application for the necessary permits in September of 2002. The applicant received a \$7,720 CREF grant in the 2002 cycle to match a \$69,480 AB1431 grant, both going towards completing the construction of the park's improvements. However, the applicant improved upon the plans by including more landscaping, stonework, picnic sites, a bioswale, and concrete pavers instead of decomposed granite. The total cost of the project increased by approximately \$167,000. Since the cost is so expensive, the applicant has broken construction down into two phases. The second phase adds more paved surface area, walls, trash/recycling bin enclosures, tables, chairs, drinking fountain, signs, and landscaping.

In addition, the Parks Department received a CREF grant in the 1997 cycle to construct and expand the concrete ramp at Rincon Park, which serves as one of the two accesses to Rincon Beach. The department extended the ramp in 2000.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (+/-) means partially satisfies; and (-) means it does not satisfy the criterion.]

- (+) **Criterion #1.** Rincon Beach Park is located on the bluffs, overlooking the ocean. It is a popular beach access for surfers and beach-goers. The park overlooks the eastern Santa Barbara Channel, where many offshore oil and gas platforms have operated for several decades. Park improvements would help to offset cumulative recreational and tourist impacts of offshore oil and gas development.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The \$167,000 increase in costs over the original proposal's budget would slightly enhance coastal recreation and tourism by adding more picnic tables to be used at this beach park. In addition, the newly proposed permeable paving and bioswale would enhance the water quality at the mouth of the Rincon Creek and the ocean. The additional stonework and landscaping slightly enhance the aesthetics of the park.
- (+/-) **Criterion #3.** The \$167,000 increase in costs over the original proposal's budget would slightly increase the benefit to the approximately 400,000 people who visit the beach park annually. The increase in costs allows for approximately 12 more picnic areas and allows for water draining off the site (e.g., from the parking lot) to be naturally filtered prior to entering Rincon Creek. When considering the additional stonework and landscaping, staff does not consider the benefit to outweigh the costs.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** This project is a capital improvement, which along with coastal acquisitions is one of the highest priorities of CREF.
- (+/-) **Criterion #5.** The new total cost of the project, including design, permitting, and Phase I and II construction is approximately \$277,000, approximately \$167,000 more than the original estimate.

A subtotal budget of \$176,500 will get the applicant through Phase I. Adding this 2003 CREF request and the past two CREF grants for this project, the applicant hopes to apply \$104,000 CREF monies to complete Phase I. This \$104,000 represents 59% of Phase I costs. The applicant offers a \$69,480 AB1431 grant and \$3,000 of in-kind services to make up the other 41%.

The applicant states that Phase II will cost approximately \$100,000 to implement and has requested monies from Propositions 12 and 40; however, the Park Commission withdrew this project from its recommended funding list in October of 2002. The applicant stated that it has sought a Prop 13 grant for the bioswale portion of the project and will continue to seek annual competing grants from Prop 12 and 40 for Phase II of the project, along with future CREF monies.

- (+/-) **Criterion #6.** Maintenance responsibilities and costs will increase a little once the project is completed.
- (-) **Criterion #7.** In the 2000 and 2001 CREF cycles, the applicant did not seek additional funds from other sources for this proposal. In the 2002 cycle, the applicant successfully sought an AB1431 grant, but did not explore other potential sources such as the Land and Water

Conservation Fund. For Phase II, the applicant is seeking funding from Prop 12 and 40 and Prop 13.

(+/-) **Criterion #8.** The project can be completed successfully once funded. However, it is uncertain if the applicant can fund the project since it is very expensive. The skills to complete the project are ones the applicant implements regularly. The applicant has successfully completed 26 CREF projects in the past fourteen years. Timing of the project is uncertain since the applicant still has 13 outstanding CREF projects to implement.

Other Considerations: On October 24, 2002, the Parks Commission approved a list of Prop 12 and 40 projects for funding. The Commission withdrew this Rincon Day Use project from the list but reserved it as an alternative for funding if other projects on the list do not make it to fruition. The Commission's reason for withdrawing this Rincon project from the Prop 12 and 40 list is because it felt Rincon could be funded by other sources, such as CREF.

PROJECT # 3

ENHANCEMENT OF THE CARPINTERIA MARSH: BASIN I & SOUTH MARSH

1st District
Land Trust for Santa Barbara County
Requests \$50,000
Total Project Costs: \$1,300,000

Staff Recommendation: Grant full request of \$50,000 contingent on the applicant securing all additional monies. This project helps round out the allocation of CREF this cycle by directly restoring environmentally sensitive coastal resources.

Applicant's Priority Ranking: The applicant ranks this proposal first of the two submitted.

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests CREF funds to restore and enhance the Carpinteria Salt Marsh and the transitional and upland areas situated in Basin I and the South Marsh. A grant from the Coastal Conservancy allowed the applicant to prepare and present a draft management plan to the public for these areas in October of 2001. The draft plan calls out for the following enhancements for Basin I and South Marsh:

- removal of non-native plant species;
- planting of native coastal sage scrub species, sycamore trees, and native grasses;
- creation of new channels to reflect the historic web of tidal channels onsite and connect existing relic channels to each other;
- creation of pedestrian trails and viewing areas;
- creation of three to four interpretative signs that focus on the fresh water marsh, the tidal habitat, and raptors;
- installation of fencing and signs to discourage biking, trespassing on private properties, and dangerous railroad crossing;
- removal and replacement of soil that sloughed off of the east Franklin Creek flood control levee; and

- protection of adjacent areas from flooding.

With these improvements, the applicant states the acreage of wetland riparian habitat will increase from 12.1 to 17.7 acres and transitional and upland habitat will increase from 7 to 10.4 acres.

Background: The Carpinteria Salt Marsh encompasses 230 acres and is home to numerous rare and endangered plant and animal species. The salt marsh is one of the few relatively natural estuaries along the Southern California coast and one of the State's most important coastal resources. The University owns and manages the majority of the salt marsh. The Land Trust owns and manages 14 acres, known as South Marsh, and 17 of the 25 acres that are known as Basin I. The University and Santa Barbara County own and manage the remaining 8 acres of Basin I.

The City of Carpinteria implemented Phase I of the *Carpinteria Salt Marsh Management Plan*; this \$4.5 million project included restoring degraded areas of the wetland and building an interpretative trail.

The applicant unsuccessfully sought a \$50,000 CREF grant for this project last year. The Board has awarded three CREF grants to the Land Trust to purchase property within the Carpinteria Marsh: a 1990 grant for \$83,000; a 1993 grant for \$150,000; and a 1992 grant for \$25,000.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (+/-) means partially satisfies; and (-) means it does not satisfy the criterion.]

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The Carpinteria Salt Marsh is located in the coastal zone in proximity to offshore oil and gas development. Its enhancement would be consistent with Carpinteria's Local Coastal Program, which designates the salt marsh as an extremely valuable wetland habitat. The proposal would offset oil and gas development impacts to coastal resources.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposed project seeks to enhance all four categories of coastal resources - recreation, tourism, aesthetics and environmentally sensitive coastal resources -- by enhancing a sensitive coastal resource, the Carpinteria Salt Marsh. However, its primary focus is restoration and protection of an environmentally sensitive resource of statewide importance.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The Carpinteria Salt Marsh has statewide environmental significance. The proposal offers a broad public benefit to local south coast residents and tourists that visit the salt marsh. The salt marsh is a magnificent outdoor classroom for youth groups, artists, birders, biologists, students, and the general public.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** The majority of the proposal is considered a capital improvement, which satisfies the higher priority of CREF.
- (+) **Criterion #5.** The applicant secured: (a) \$110,000 from the Coastal Conservancy to prepare the management plan and to permit the plan; (b) \$20,000 from the USFWS Partners for

Wildlife to remove weeds; and (c) \$31,000 as in-kind for various services (e.g., to review some of the environmental impacts of the plan, review project contracts, remove weeds, and manage project). The applicant is currently seeking \$1,130,000 from the State Coastal Conservancy's Wetland Recovery Project, USFWS' National Coastal Wetlands Conservation Program, and NOAA's 2003 Community-Based Habitat Restoration Program. The applicant plans to raise \$18,000 from donations and apply for \$18,000 in grants from various foundations. The CREF request represents 4 % of the total project costs.

- (+) **Criterion #6.** There would be no ongoing County operations or maintenance requirements. The applicant's project budget includes maintenance for 5 years, \$38,000. After these initial years, the applicant explains that maintenance costs will decrease substantially and can be raised through the applicant's on-going fundraising efforts.
- (+) **Criterion #7.** The applicant requests only 4% of the total cost from CREF and is aggressively fundraising over \$1 from various agencies, foundations and organizations (see *Criterion #5*).
- (+) **Criterion #8.** Staff considers this proposal to have a high probability of being completed successfully. The applicant is working with all parties that have a stake in the salt marsh. The applicant has successfully completed and implemented a management plan at the Coronado Butterfly Preserve.

Other Considerations: None.

PROJECT # 4
COASTAL WETLAND RESTORATION IN THE CARPINTERIA SALT MARSH
AN ALTERNATIVE PLAN FOR MOSQUITO CONTROL

1st District
Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District
Requests \$161,500
Total Project Costs: \$161,500

Staff Recommendation: Deny request for the following reasons. First, the proposal is premature; the applicant is unaware of the permits it may need to acquire. Second, the budget is excessive. The applicant's request includes \$50,000 for purchasing a pick-up truck and front-load tractor. Since the proposal is for a one-time project, staff believes it could rent the equipment for a significant amount cheaper or contract the work out to an agency that has these pieces of equipment (e.g., flood control). Other budget items that appear excessive include the request of \$48,000 for fill soil and delivery and \$20,000 for testing the soil for heavy metals. Third, the University of California, the owners of the land, had not seen the proposal until Energy Division staff sent them a copy.

Applicant's Priority Ranking: The applicant submitted only one proposal.

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests funding to purchase a garden-sized tractor and a pick-up truck. Upon purchase, the applicant proposes to use this equipment to fill in 117 depressions in the Carpinteria Salt Marsh that were made by bulldozer tracks back in the 1970s. The applicant states the depressions are 40-50 feet long, 7-8 feet wide, and one-foot deep. The applicant states the proposed project would reduce mosquitoes breeding in the depressions, reduce the amount of pesticides applied to the salt marsh, reduce the amount of foot traffic from annual spraying of pesticides, and return the salt marsh to a more natural state.

Background: In the 1970s, a berm was constructed in the Carpinteria Salt Marsh to protect the railroad tracks and State Highway 101 from flooding. Tracks from the bulldozer that constructed the berm have left depressions, which retain salt/brackish water after the marsh is flooded by high tides. The Black Salt Marsh Mosquito breeds in these areas of standing water. The applicant applies pesticides to control the mosquito every year. In the past, Carpinteria Valley taxpayers have bore the cost of the pesticide application; currently the University of California, the owner of the land, has reimbursed the applicant for the pesticide applications.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (+/-) means partially satisfies; and (-) means it does not satisfy the criterion.]

- (+/-) **Criterion #1.** The Carpinteria Salt Marsh is located in the coastal zone in proximity to offshore oil and gas development. Eliminating the man-made depressions and returning the marsh closer to its natural state would be consistent with Carpinteria's Local Coastal Program, which designates the salt marsh as an extremely valuable wetland habitat. However, it is uncertain if this proposal would benefit the marsh (see *Criterion #2*

below). Additionally, staff assumes other many uses of the acquired truck and tractor would not necessarily hold a coastal nexus.

- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** It is uncertain if the proposed project would enhance the environmentally sensitive coastal Carpinteria Salt Marsh. A University biologist, who had not seen the proposal, did not think bringing in a pick-up truck and a tractor in certain areas of the marsh would be beneficial for the marsh habitat. In addition, the biologist stated that the fill would most likely need to be stabilized with jute netting and/or native plantings, neither of which are included in the applicant's budget. Additionally, staff assumes other many uses of the acquired truck and tractor would not necessarily enhance coastal resources.
- (+/-) **Criterion #3.** The proposal offers a public benefit to residents nearby the salt marsh from the reduction of the mosquito. However, the high cost of this project dilutes the benefit of this proposal some. The Carpinteria Salt Marsh has statewide environmental significance and the enhancement of it would benefit residents and visitors to the marsh; it is uncertain if this project would benefit the sensitive habitat (see *Criterion #2*).
- (+/-) **Criterion #4.** Approximately 70% of the proposal is considered a capital improvement, which satisfies the higher priority of CREF; however, the remaining 30% is not a capital improvement, since it includes purchasing specialized equipment (i.e., a pick-up truck and tractor).
- (-) **Criterion #5.** The applicant seeks 100% of the project costs from CREF. The applicant does not seek funds from other sources nor offers any in-kind services. In addition, the budget is excessive, including a request for \$50,000 to purchase a pick-up truck and front-load tractor.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The applicant states that the project would actually reduce on-going mosquito maintenance in the marsh.
- (-) **Criterion #7.** The applicant is not seeking funds from other sources besides CREF nor is it offering in-kind services. Staff recommends that the applicant seek financial assistance from the University of California, the owners of the property.
- (-) **Criterion #8.** It is uncertain if the project can be completed successfully. When speaking to the applicant, he was unaware of the permits he may need to complete the project. The owners of the property, the University of California, had not seen the proposal nor spoken with the applicant recently about the proposal. The University's biologist for the Salt Marsh stated that using access with a pick-up truck and tractor may not be in the best interest of the sensitive habitat.

Other Considerations: Staff recommends that the applicant work with the University's biologist to identify the most environmentally sensitive plan to fill the depressions.

PROJECT # 5
SEA CENTER RENOVATION
WHARF IMPROVEMENTS & SEISMIC UPGRADES

2nd District
Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History
Requests \$50,000
Total Project Costs: \$812,000

Staff Recommendation: Award full request of \$50,000 contingent on the applicant securing all additional monies for the wharf improvements.

Applicant's Priority Ranking: The applicant submitted only one proposal.

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests funds to upgrade the wharf under the Sea Center to accommodate its proposed, enlarged and renovated facility (approximately \$100,000), to meet current seismic code requirements (approximately \$400,000), and to repair fire damage (approximately \$300,000). The City of Santa Barbara's Waterfront Department is paying for the \$300,000 fire repairs. The upgrades coincide with the renovation and enlargement of the Sea Center from a 3,329 square-foot facility to a 6,734 square-foot facility.

Background: The Sea Center, located on Stearns Wharf in Santa Barbara, is a visitor center for local marine education. Beginning in late 2003, the applicant plans on renovating and reconfiguring the Sea Center and the adjacent building into a larger integrated facility with more interactive exhibits. The applicant plans on opening the larger facility in mid-2004.

The applicant has received three past CREF grants that involved the Sea Center: (a) \$115,000 in 1989 to fabricate and install an outdoor exhibit featuring a touch tank with live marine organisms; (b) \$23,523 in 1995 for the touch tank's shade canopy; and (c) \$25,000 in 2001 to purchase a van and provide the public with a mobile science marine laboratory while the Sea Center is closed for renovation and beyond that time. In addition, the applicant has received two CREF grants to help with its Los Marineros Marine Education program: (a) \$20,000 in 1992; and (b) \$11,723 in 1995.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (+/-) means partially satisfies; and (-) means it does not satisfy the criterion.]

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposal would upgrade the wharf under the Sea Center. Both the wharf and the Sea Center have a strong coastal relationship. The proposal would be consistent with the City's Local Coastal Plan and would help to offset cumulative recreational, tourism and environmentally sensitive coastal impacts from oil and gas developments.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposed wharf improvements are an integral part in completing the Sea Center's renovation. The Sea Center enhances coastal recreation, tourism, and environmentally sensitive coastal resources by teaching visitors about marine species and their environment, and in so doing, heightens the sensitivity and enjoyment of the marine habitat.

- (+) **Criterion #3.** The Sea Center currently serves approximately 70,000 visitors a year and with the new renovation, the facility will accommodate 150,000 visitors. The applicant states that 60% of the annual visitors are local residents and the 40% are tourist.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** The proposed wharf improvements are considered capital improvements, which satisfies the higher priority of CREF.
- (+) **Criterion #5.** The applicant estimates the budget for the wharf improvements at approximately \$800,000. Towards the wharf's budget, the applicant has secured \$100,000 from itself and \$300,000 from the City of Santa Barbara's Waterfront Department. Aside from CREF, the applicant is seeking an additional \$100,000 from the City's Redevelopment Agency and \$250,000 from the Coastal Conservancy.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** There would be no ongoing County operations or maintenance involved with this proposal.
- (+) **Criterion #7.** The applicant has secured 49% of the wharf improvement budget and seeks only 6% from CREF. The applicant is seeking the remaining 45% of the budget from two other sources.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** Staff believes the project can be completed successfully. The applicant is using the same engineers that designed and managed the wharf improvements under the restaurant Moby Dick, three years ago; these engineers are familiar with the work. In addition, the applicant has: (a) successfully operated the Sea Center for a number of years; (b) has successfully renovated the Sea Center in the past; and (c) aggressively fundraised over \$4 million towards the \$6.5 million budget for the entire Sea Center renovation.

Other Considerations: The proposed project represents a precedent for CREF funding in that it entails removal of a capital improvement previously funded twice by CREF. The touch tank and the outdoor exhibit area that CREF funded in 1989 with a \$115,000 grant will be demolished. The 5-year old shade canopy, another CREF-funded item with a \$23,523 grant, is still in good condition and is being purchased by another organization. The applicant proposes to replace the touch tank and canopy in order to expand the existing Sea Center with the adjacent 6,941 square foot, two-story building (previously The Nature Conservancy's). The proposal does not conflict with contractual obligations for receipt of the previous CREF grants.

Staff believes the proposed project offers exciting opportunities to improve the current museum, expanding the existing enhancement to coastal resources that the touch tank and its canopy provide. As noted above, the Sea Center currently serves 70,000 visitors each year. The new building will provide a capacity to receive up to 150,000 visitors per year. It will also offer many additional amenities to visitors. Meanwhile, the previous CREF investments have realized a notable return on investment, measured in terms of visitors served.

PROJECT # 6
SOUTH COAST WATERSHED RESOURCE CENTER
EXHIBITS AND UPGRADES

*2nd District
Community Environmental Council
Requests \$48,921
Total Project Costs: \$58,247*

Staff Recommendation: Fund a partial grant of \$19,861 providing full funding for the following items that possess a coastal nexus:

- (a) a portable, interactive exhibit regarding the Southern Steelhead life-cycle and various habitats (\$9,000);
- (b) a mobile display with graphic panels, depicting several stream and steelhead attributes for watersheds along the south coast (\$7,000);
- (c) an indoor reading/interactive area for children (\$875);
- (d) two spotting scopes that allows visitors to view wildlife in Arroyo Burro Creek and to take along on docent-led hikes (\$800);
- (e) a small marine-theme tile mural in an area that drains water run-off to a vegetative swale (\$1,070); and
- (f) new shelving in the wetlab area for educational materials and equipment (\$1,116).

Staff does not recommend funding the remaining three items – the photo album depicting the historical uses of watersheds, the two photovoltaic inverters, and the separate electrical meter. Staff does not believe these items possess the necessary coastal nexus to warrant funding.

Applicant's Priority Ranking: The applicant submitted only one proposal.

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests funding to improve the South Coast Watershed Resource Center:

- (a) develop a portable, interactive exhibit regarding the Southern Steelhead life-cycle and various habitats (\$9,000);
- (b) develop a mobile display with graphic panels, depicting several stream and steelhead attributes for watersheds along the south coast (\$7,000);
- (c) create an indoor reading/interactive area for children (\$875);
- (d) purchase and install two spotting scopes that allows visitors to view wildlife in Arroyo Burro Creek and to take along on docent-led hikes (\$800);
- (e) create a photo album of historical photographs, depicting local watersheds and human development over time (\$1,500);
- (f) install a small marine-theme tile mural in an area that drains water run-off to a vegetative swale (\$1,070);
- (g) purchase and install two new photovoltaic inverters that are less susceptible to corrosion (\$8,000);
- (h) install a separate electrical meter that will separate the center's electrical uses from other County-related electrical uses at Arroyo Burro Beach (\$19,560); and
- (i) purchase new shelving in the wetlab area for educational materials and equipment (\$1,116).

Background: With help from a \$50,000 CREF grant from the 2000 cycle, the applicant constructed the South Coast Watershed Resource Center (WRC). A \$14,800 CREF grant allowed the applicant

to trench and underground existing overhead electrical and communication lines at the park location. The applicant has operated the WRC since August of 2001, teaching visitors about person responsibility and the connection to healthy watersheds. During the first year of operation, the applicant has identified some improvements for the Center. The list of improvements above reflects the applicant's desire to engage visitors of all ages in more interactive exhibits, to upgrade the photovoltaic system to handle the marine environment better, and to complete some miscellaneous items.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (+/-) means partially satisfies; and (-) means it does not satisfy the criterion.]

- (+/-) **Criterion #1.** Staff considers the proposal mostly coastal-related. The Center's focus of educating the public about watershed pollution deals with, among other things, the ocean's water quality. In addition, education of watershed pollution involves inland urban creeks. Although all watersheds eventually drain into the ocean, CREF funding has focused on areas that provide the strongest coastal nexus, enhancement of estuaries and rivermouths and ocean-related species. In addition, some of the items listed in the project description possess a strong coastal nexus (e.g., the steelhead exhibits and the spotting scopes) and some items possess a weaker coastal nexus.
- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** The exhibits and activities at the WRC partially enhance environmentally sensitive coastal resources. Informing visitors about the connection between healthy watersheds and the ocean's water quality may motivate visitors to take responsibility in their own actions, which can then help the water quality in the creeks and the ocean. Some of the items listed in the project description would enhance coastal resources and some items would not enhance coastal resources given the weaker coastal nexus.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The proposed improvements will provide a benefit to South Coast residents, school groups, and individuals visiting the WRC. After operating for a year, the applicant has identified a number of items that would enhance and improve the visitor's experience at the WRC. In addition, the applicant has identified items that would help the WRC operate more efficiently.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** The proposed improvements satisfy the highest priority of CREF since they all are capital improvements.
- (-) **Criterion #5.** The applicant does not seek funding from other sources and only offers \$9,326 as in-kind services to develop and install the improvements.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** This proposal would not increase the County's ongoing operational and maintenance costs. The County, however, already incurs ongoing operational costs for the WRC; for fiscal year 02/03, the County paid \$56,000 towards operating the facility. The County executed a lease agreement with CEC for the ranger house. In so doing, the County has formally agreed to fund 1/3 of a jointly and mutually agreed upon annual operating budget for the first five years. The County and the applicant may extend the lease agreement for four additional five-year periods upon mutual consent of both parties.

- (-) **Criterion #7.** Towards these improvements, the applicant offers 16% as in-kind services and does not seek funding from other sources.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** The applicant has successfully completed the WRC and has operated it for over one year. Staff believes the applicant can successfully complete the project.

Other Considerations: None.

PROJECT # 7
ARROYO BURRO BEACH COUNTY PARK
RANGER OFFICE/STORAGE SHED

2nd District
Santa Barbara County Parks Department
Requests \$25,000
Total Project Costs: \$32,000

Staff Recommendation: Deny request. The coastal enhancement of this proposal is weak and it does not have a broad public benefit when comparing it to other proposals in this cycle.

Applicant's Priority Ranking: The County Parks Department ranks this proposal second out of five submitted.

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests funding to purchase and install a 225 square foot, pre-fabricated building to be used as a ranger office and storage shed at Arroyo Burro Beach. The building will house beach warning signs, beach clean-up supplies, public information brochures for the Watershed Resource Center, Marine Mammal Center, City Animal Control, and other organizations.

Background: The past ranger house, which was not used as the ranger's office, has been converted into the South Coast Watershed Resource Center, and the current ranger shed/office is over 30 years old. This old shed cannot house any of necessary equipment to operate and maintain the county park (e.g., phone, fax machine, emergency generator, etc.) since it is easy to break into.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (+/-) means partially satisfies; and (-) means it does not satisfy the criterion.]

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposed ranger office/shed is located in the coastal zone and is consistent with the Local Coastal Program. The proposal would help offset cumulative recreational impacts from oil and gas developments.
- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** The proposed ranger office/shed is considered to slightly enhance coastal recreation and environmentally sensitive coastal resources at Arroyo Burro Beach. The

proposal would provide the needed space for the park ranger's duties and for safely storing ocean-related equipment and informational material. However, the enhancement is considered more indirect than directly enhancing coastal resources.

- (+/-) **Criterion #3.** Over half a million people visit Arroyo Burro beach each year. The county beach park ranger will benefit if the park ranger's equipment and needs are nearby and readily available; however, the visitors to Arroyo Burro beach will not reap the benefits of this proposal.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** As a proposed capital improvement, this proposal satisfies the higher priority of CREF.
- (-) **Criterion #5.** The applicant offers approximately \$8,000 as in-kind services for construction work. The applicant is not seeking additional monies from any other sources.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The applicant already maintains Arroyo Burro Beach; this proposal would not increase the maintenance of this beach park.
- (-) **Criterion #7.** The applicant is seeking 75% of the total budget from CREF. It offers 25% of the costs with in-kind services and does not seek any monies from other funding sources.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** The project can be completed successfully since the applicant just needs to install a pre-fabricated building. The Parks Department has successfully completed 26 CREF projects in the past fourteen years. Success in completing this project on schedule is uncertain since the applicant still has 13 outstanding CREF projects to complete.

Other Considerations: None.

PROJECT # 8
ARROYO BURRO PAMPAS GRASS REMOVAL
HABITAT ENHANCEMENT PROJECT

2nd District
Santa Barbara County, Agricultural Commissioner's Office
Requests \$31,888
Total Project Costs: \$60,732

Staff Recommendation: Grant full request of \$31,888. If the applicant receives a grant from the Noxious Weed Control Act of 2002, staff recommends that the applicant identify the amount it would apply towards this project and reimburse CREF with that same amount.

Applicant's Priority Ranking: The applicant submitted only this proposal.

Summary of Proposal: The applicant proposes to remove pampas grass from: (a) both sides of the access road to Elings Park south parcel and paragliding recreational area; and (b) private property and on the right-of-way on Las Positas Road between Cliff Drive and Modoc Road. The applicant would then restore the removal areas with coastal sage scrub vegetation.

Background: Pampas grass is an invasive non-native weed that is a significant threat to California's native coastal ecosystems. The pampas grass along Las Positas Road is growing within the riparian habitat along Arroyo Burro Creek. The pampas grass on Elings Park's dirt access road is growing from water draining from a natural seep.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (+/-) means partially satisfies; and (-) means it does not satisfy the criterion.]

- (+/-) **Criterion #1.** Staff considers the proposal to have a partial coastal relationship. In practice, the County has only funded creek restoration projects that provide a strong coastal relationship, limiting such CREF grants to areas closest to the coast or enhancement of ocean-related species. Although most creeks eventually drain into the ocean, this alone does not provide a sufficient nexus for the use of CREF. Since this proposal deals with the watershed containing Arroyo Burro Creek, the Arroyo Burro estuary is the area with the strongest coastal nexus. The applicant does not plan to remove pampas grass in the estuary (this is being funded by other monies); however, removal of pampas grass upstream of the estuary would help prevent seeds from reinfesting the estuary.
- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** The proposal would partially enhance a coastal resource, the Arroyo Burro estuary, by preventing any upstream pampas grass seeds from reinfesting the estuary. See *Criterion #1* above for explanation of partial enhancement.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** Sensitive coastal plant species and wildlife dependent on the Arroyo Burro Creek and open space at Elings Park benefit the most from this proposal. All south coast

residents benefit when the ecological functions of natural systems, such as the Arroyo Burro Creek, are enhanced.

- (+) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is a capital improvement because it is a restoration project and is, therefore, considered a high priority of CREF.
- (+/-) **Criterion #5.** The applicant offers \$28,844 as in-kind services from various agencies and individuals for planning the project, evaluating project plans, removing pampas grass, managing the project, and reducing disposal fees.
- (+/-) **Criterion #6.** The proposal will slightly increase ongoing County maintenance by surveying the area and treating pampas grass sprouts when necessary, for five years. Elings Park will be responsible for surveying and maintaining the pampas grass on its own property.
- (+/-) **Criterion #7.** The applicant is seeking 53% of the project's funding from CREF and the offers the remaining 47% as in-kind services from five agencies or individuals. The applicant has not sought funding from other funding sources. The applicant said that if the Noxious Weed Control Act of 2002 passes, the applicant would receive approximately \$20,000 to \$30,000 for approximately three years. The applicant would apply some of this money to this project.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** Staff believes the project can be completed successfully since the applicant's biological consultant was the same person who completed a similar restoration project in the Goleta Slough so successfully.

Other Considerations: None.

PROJECT # 9
GOLETA BEACH COUNTY PARK
NATIVE PLANTING FOR PARKING LOT MEDIANS

2nd District
Santa Barbara County Parks Department
Requests \$17,500
Total Project Costs: \$19,800

Staff Recommendation: Deny request. The coastal enhancement of this proposal is weak and it does not have a broad public benefit when comparing it to other proposals in this cycle.

Applicant's Priority Ranking: The applicant ranks this proposal third out of five submitted.

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests funds to: (a) remove non-native plants within Goleta Beach County Park's parking lot planter islands (1,325 square feet); (b) install an irrigation system in the planter islands; and (c) plant the planter islands with an approximate 1,200 native plants.

Background: The Draft Goleta Beach Carrying Capacity Study recommends the removal of non-native plants along the northern perimeter of the park and the parking lot islands and planting of native plants in these areas. The applicant anticipates the draft study to be finalized by summer of 2003. The applicant received an AB1431 grant in 2000 to remove and install plants along the northern park perimeter; the work should be completed in fall of 2002.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (+/-) means partially satisfies; and (-) means it does not satisfy the criterion.]

- (+/-) **Criterion #1.** The proposal site is located in the coastal zone and is consistent with the Draft Goleta Beach Carrying Capacity Study, which recommends removal of all non-native plants within the park.
- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** The project will partially enhance coastal aesthetics by providing native landscaping in the parking lot planters that will be consistent with the native landscaping along the northern boundary of the park. However, the planters are currently landscaped.
- (-) **Criterion #3.** Staff considers the public benefit of the proposal to be insignificant since the parking lot planters are already planted with plants. Unlike the northern boundaries of the park, the planters are not part of the ecological restoration efforts for the Goleta Slough. The native plantings in the planters would simply look more like the northern boundaries of the park with its native plantings.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** As a proposed capital improvement, this proposal satisfies the higher priority of CREF.

- (-) **Criterion #5.** The applicant offers \$2,300 as in-kind services to monitor and maintain the landscaping for the first year. No other matching or additional funds are offered.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The Park Department already maintains the parking lot planters at Goleta Beach; this proposal would not increase the maintenance.
- (-) **Criterion #7.** The applicant seeks 88% of the budget from CREF and only offers 12% as in-kind services. Other funding sources have not been pursued.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** The project can be completed successfully since the applicant is currently implementing a similar project along the northern boundaries of the park. The Parks Department has successfully completed 26 CREF projects in the past fourteen years. Success in completing this project on schedule is uncertain since the applicant still has 13 outstanding CREF projects to complete.

Other Considerations: None.

PROJECT # 10
ISLA VISTA COMMUNITY PUBLIC RESTROOMS AND SHOWER FACILITY

3rd District
Santa Barbara County Parks Department,
Isla Vista Recreation and Parks District, and
University of California, Santa Barbara
Requests \$30,000
Total Project Costs: \$30,000

Staff Recommendation: Grant full request of \$30,000. Staff typically does not recommend funding for preliminary plans and permitting since we are not assured that the project will be implemented. However, there is a great need for these bathrooms along the beach accesses in Isla Vista and this is a first step towards realizing a solution for that need.

Applicant's Priority Ranking: The Parks Department ranks this proposal fourth of five submitted, and the Isla Vista Recreation and Parks District and the University of California, Santa Barbara submitted only this proposal each.

Summary of Proposal: The applicants request funds to prepare, design, and permit a public restroom facility with two unisex toilets and four outdoor shower heads along Del Playa Drive in Isla Vista or at Coal Oil Point Reserve. By November, the applicants will have solicited input from area residents and interested parties and will know the chosen site for the facility. The 22' x 25' facility would be designed in compliance with the American with Disability Act.

Background: One public restroom currently exists within the community of Isla Vista; the applicants explain that this facility is four blocks from the nearest coastal access and is not readily available to beach goers. A single portable toilet is available at Coal Oil Point Preserve. Outdoor rinse showers are not available at either of these locations.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (+/-) means partially satisfies; and (-) means it does not satisfy the criterion.]

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposed project is a first step to locating restrooms along a beach access and would mainly cater to beachgoers. The proposed project would help to mitigate cumulative coastal recreational impacts due to the oil and gas developments, such as the Santa Ynez Unit and Point Arguello projects.
- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** If and when this project is implemented, it would enhance coastal recreation by offering restrooms and outdoor showers. Since this proposal is just for planning and permitting, it is uncertain if the proposal would be implemented.
- (+/-) **Criterion #3.** Beachgoers would benefit from having permanent restrooms and outdoor showers nearby, whether the location is at Coal Oil Point or Del Playa. Coal Oil Point has only one temporary toilet without showerheads. There are neither restrooms nor showerheads along Del Playa. Others, besides beachgoers, would use the bathrooms also. However, beachgoers in these areas would be the primary users.
- (-) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is for preliminary planning and permitting, which are not capital improvements nor acquisitions, the higher priorities of CREF.
- (-) **Criterion #5.** The applicants do not seek any additional funds from other sources nor offer any in-kind services for this proposal.
- (-) **Criterion #6.** The applicants estimate that the maintenance on the facility will be approximately \$10,000-\$15,000 per year. The County would contract with the Isla Vista Recreation & Parks District or the University to maintain the facility.
- (-) **Criterion #7.** The applicants request 100% of this proposal's budget from CREF and does not seek additional funds from other sources. In addition, the applicants plan on seeking additional funds from future CREF cycles to construct the facility. The applicants would also seek additional construction funds from the Isla Vista Recreation & Parks District, the University, and Propositions 12 and 40 monies.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** Staff believes this project will be completed successfully once funded. The Parks Department, one of the applicants, has constructed restroom facilities before.

Other Considerations: Identifying a site for the bathrooms is a controversial issue in the community of Isla Vista. Many residents believe the bathrooms would be used mainly by college students partying at night or by the homeless population. Other concerns have been raised about vandalism.

3rd District
Santa Barbara County Planning & Development Department, Comprehensive Planning
Request \$557,500
Total Project Costs: Approximately \$2 million

Staff Recommendation: Award a challenge grant of \$550,659. This recommendation reinstates the division's 2001 CREF grant of \$57,500 towards this endeavor and awards \$493,159 from the 2003 cycle. Staff recommends the following preliminary terms and conditions:

- (a) The applicant has entered into escrow with a minimum of two properties by October 15, 2003. If the applicant is not in escrow by this date or if the applicant has not put the full \$550,659 award in escrow by this date, the applicant must submit to the Energy Division an update of the proposed land acquisitions by this October date. This update will serve as a request from the applicant to extend the award not yet committed to escrow for another year. The Board of Supervisors would consider this request in the 2004 CREF cycle.
- (b) All additional monies to acquire property(ies) must be secured before the County releases all or part of the CREF grant.
- (c) The purchase price of the property(ies) shall not exceed its fair market value.
- (d) The property(ies) shall preserve habitat onsite and/or coastal viewsheds for perpetuity.

Applicant's Priority Ranking: The applicant ranks this proposal first out of two submitted.

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests \$500,000 from this cycle to purchase one to seven ocean blufftop parcels along the 6700 and 6800 blocks of Del Playa Drive in Isla Vista. The seven parcels total just less than one acre. In addition, the applicant requests that the Board of Supervisors grant the applicant another two years to use a \$57,500 CREF grant from the 2001 cycle towards this project. The Board of Supervisors awarded the applicant this past grant, contingent on escrow closing on five of the seven properties by January 23, 2003. However, the applicant is still trying to secure monies to purchase these properties, update appraisals, and negotiate with landowners. The applicant states a portion of the total CREF grant (up to 15%) would be used for preliminary acquisitional costs (e.g., appraisals, transaction-related costs, etc) and the remaining monies (85% or more) would be placed in escrow.

Background: The County Redevelopment Agency (RDA) owns the parcels on each side of five of the seven parcels to be acquired. If acquired, the five parcels and the contiguous RDA parcels would create an approximate two-acre coastal open space. The other two parcels proposed to be acquired would connect to another set of publicly owned parcels and would create an approximate one-acre coastal open space.

In November of 1990, Isla Vista voters approved the formation of the Isla Vista Redevelopment Project Area. The primary purpose of this redevelopment project is to purchase remaining undeveloped blufftop properties as open space in Isla Vista. In 1991, the Redevelopment Agency secured approximately \$3 million for the Isla Vista Project Area and purchased 15 parcels as permanently protected public coastal open space.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (+/-) means partially satisfies; and (-) means it does not satisfy the criterion.]

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposed properties are coastal bluffs with 180° views of the Santa Barbara Channel. The proposal is consistent with the County's Local Coastal Program. Related oil and gas impacts associated with this proposal include the Santa Ynez Unit and Point Arguello projects' aesthetic, recreational, and environmentally sensitive coastal impacts; these impacts are associated with the cumulative change in the offshore visual environment due to the oil and gas developments.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposal enhances coastal recreation, coastal aesthetics, and environmentally sensitive coastal resources (vernal pools) by purchasing blufftop properties to preserve as open space and allow for passive recreation.
- (+/-) **Criterion #3.** The proposal provides a public benefit, mostly for the residents of Isla Vista and the students and faculty at UCSB. Purchasing the seven parcels would allow for larger open space areas along the Isla Vista blufftop rather than smaller isolated open spaces.

However, using over a half million dollars, \$557,500, for purchasing less than one acre in open space, does not offer as much benefit as past CREF grants have offered. For example, the County awarded:

- (a) \$500,000 of CREF monies towards purchasing 83 acres along the Carpinteria Bluffs;
- (b) \$525,000 towards purchasing 130 acres at Las Positas Park;
- (c) \$550,000 towards purchasing 24 acres (Camino Corto Park) in Isla Vista;
- (d) \$208,929 towards purchasing 782 acres at Arroyo Hondo;
- (e) \$ 1 million towards purchasing 69 acres at the Douglas Family Preserve;
- (f) \$150,000 towards purchasing 375 acres along Point Sal; and
- (g) \$560,000 towards purchasing 987 acres of Burton Mesa Chaparral.

The smallest amount of acres purchased has been 3.5 acres at the new Oceanview Park in Summerland for \$200,000. However, this \$200,000 included park improvements also.

- (+) **Criterion #4.** This proposal is considered coastal acquisition, which satisfies the higher priority of CREF.
- (+) **Criterion #5.** The applicant secured a \$250,000 State Environmental Enhancement Mitigation Program grant. The applicant plans on seeking \$500,000 from the Coastal Conservancy, \$200,000 from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, \$150,000 from the Habitat Conservation Fund, and unknown amounts at this time from the Wildlife Conservation Board, Los Carneros Mitigation Fund, and Goleta Valley Land Trust. The applicant was unsuccessful in seeking \$500,000 from the State Resources Grant Program in 2001.
- (+/-) **Criterion #6.** The Isla Vista Recreation and Park District will maintain the property using County of Santa Barbara Redevelopment Agency funds. The applicant states that it would most likely seek funding in future CREF cycles to develop the parcels.

- (+) **Criterion #7.** The applicant plans on seeking approximately 25% of the acquisitional funds from CREF and the remaining 75% from various sources (see *Criterion #5*).
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** The applicant states that the owners of all seven properties are willing sellers; however, a purchase price has not been negotiated as of yet. The applicant is currently updating a 2001 appraisal prepared for the five parcels and a 1996 appraisal for the other two parcels. Staff considers the proposal to have an uncertain probability of being successfully completed. The applicant has only secured \$250,000 aside from CREF in the past two years towards this project. However, the applicant states that it is beginning to aggressively seek additional funding.

Other Considerations: None.

PROJECT # 12
ACQUISITION FUND FOR GAVIOTA COAST CONSERVATION EASEMENTS

3rd District
Land Trust for Santa Barbara County
Requests \$230,000
Total Project Costs: Approximately \$1.5 million

Staff Recommendation: Award a challenge grant of \$230,000. Staff recommends the following preliminary terms and conditions:

- (a) All additional monies to acquire easements must be secured before the County releases all or part of the CREF grant.
- (b) The purchase price of the easements shall not exceed its fair market value.
- (c) The properties themselves cannot be used as collateral for any loans, including loans required to purchase easements over the properties.
- (d) If the grantee also employs loans to acquire the easements, this CREF grant shall be fully refunded in the event of default on the loan.
- (e) The easements shall preserve habitat onsite and/or coastal viewsheds for perpetuity. The easement shall be reviewed and approved by the County prior to release of the CREF grant.
- (f) The Board of Supervisors reserves the right to approve the specific natural and/or scenic resource easement once proposed, including specific terms of the easement, to ensure that the grant sufficiently enhances and protects the coastal resources addressed by CREF.

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests funds to appraise, negotiate and acquire conservation easements on ranchlands along the Gaviota Coast. The applicant stipulates that no less than \$207,000 of the request will go towards actual purchase of the conservation easements and the remaining \$23,000 would go towards transaction-related expenses and project management. The applicant states that it cannot divulge which property it is negotiating with at this time. However, the applicant does state that it is negotiating with a property owner of a large ranch and a proposed transaction may be very complex, including selling portions of the ranch to a public agency and selling other portions of the land with a conservation easement. In addition, the applicant states that

it plans to be negotiating with mid-sized agricultural landowners on the eastern end of the Gaviota area.

Background: The Board of Supervisors has awarded seven grants to the applicant in past CREF cycles, with a total of \$1,014,459, towards Gaviota Coast acquisitions:

- (a) a 1994 award for \$14,452 to conduct a one-on-one outreach to landowners to explain the benefits of agricultural conservation easements as estate-planning and cash-generating tools;
- (b) a 1997 award for \$32,810 to conduct preliminary title research and land appraisals in order to secure two demonstration conservation easements;
- (c) a 1998 award for \$25,000 towards purchasing conservation easements;
- (d) a 1999 award for \$100,000 towards purchasing conservation easements;
- (e) a 2000 award for \$303,268 towards purchasing conservation easements;
- (f) a 2001 award for \$208,929 towards purchasing Arroyo Hondo Ranch; and
- (g) a 2002 award for \$330,000 towards purchasing conservation easements.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (+/-) means partially satisfies; and (-) means it does not satisfy the criterion.]

- (+/-) **Criterion #1.** Conservation easements would be located along the Gaviota coast; separate County approval of specific easements, including terms and provisions, would consider consistency with the Local Coastal Program. Conservation easements along the Gaviota coast have the potential to help offset cumulative aesthetic and tourist impacts from oil and gas developments.
- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** Conservation easements along the Gaviota coast offer one means of preserving natural and scenic resources, thereby enhancing coastal aesthetics, tourism, and environmentally sensitive resources. However, staff cannot judge the extent to which this proposal meets this important criterion until a specific easement is proposed.
- (+/-) **Criterion #3.** Conservation easements offer a means of benefiting present and future generations; however, the extent of benefits remain unclear until specific properties are identified.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** Easements to conserve natural and scenic resources satisfy the higher priority of CREF: coastal acquisitions.
- (+) **Criterion #5.** For new conservation easements, the applicant has secured \$350,000 from the State Resources Grant Program (AB1431), a remaining \$130,000 from the 2002 CREF cycle, \$31,000 from John S. Kiewit Memorial Foundation, over \$13,000 in other donations, and \$6,000 as in-kind for legal services. The applicant states that it would seek additional funds from California Farmland Conservancy Program, Coastal Conservancy, and Wildlife Conservation Board, and Natural Heritage Preservation Tax Credit.

- (+) **Criterion #6.** There are no ongoing County operations or maintenance costs. The landowner will be responsible for specific management and improvements required by the easement (i.e., fencing to protect natural resources). The applicant will need to ensure compliance with the easement and pays for the monitoring and enforcement with its Stewardship Fund.

- (+) **Criterion #7.** This year's CREF request and last year's \$130,000 remaining CREF monies add up to approximately 25% of the total cost of the applicant's estimated costs for a conservation easement. The applicant plans on seeking the remaining 75% from other sources (see *Criterion #5*).

- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** The applicant has successfully completed the purchase of a conservation easement over the 660-acre Freeman Ranch along the Gaviota Coast, the purchase and restoration of the 9-acre Coronado Butterfly Preserve, and the purchase of the 782-acre Arroyo Hondo Ranch. It is also in negotiations with the landowners for the 745-acre La Paloma Ranch. In addition to its efforts along the Gaviota coast, the Land Trust successfully acquired land, such as the Sedgewick and Carpinteria Bluff properties. However, the high costs of many easements and uncertain willingness of other landowners to sell easements that satisfy obligated use of CREF funds renders future successes uncertain.

Other Considerations: The applicant explains that even though they don't have a landowner ready to sell a conservation easement at the moment, securing CREF monies now is not premature. Monies approved towards purchasing conservation easements along the Gaviota Coast prior to negotiations with landowners help motivate the landowners to sell easements.

PROJECT # 13
GAVIOTA COAST COMMON GROUND FACILITATION PROJECT

3rd District
County of Santa Barbara, Third Supervisorial District Office
Requests \$45,000
Total Project Costs: \$45,000

Staff Recommendation: Grant full request of \$45,000, with the provision for a refund equal to any amount the applicant receives from UCSB's Shoreline Preservation Fund, as stipulated by the applicant.

Applicant's Priority Ranking: The applicant submitted only this proposal.

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests \$45,000 for a facilitator to conduct a total of 34 Gaviota Coast Common Ground meetings (10 meetings in 2002 and 24 meetings in 2003).

Background: The National Park Service commenced the Gaviota Coast feasibility and suitability study in 2000. This study evaluates resource values and identifies management tools to preserve the Gaviota Coast, including possible designation of the area as a National Seashore. The applicant explains that while this national study was underway, various stakeholders expressed concern that they had not been adequately represented. A steering committee formed to propose a Common Ground process, which would develop a locally generated vision for the Gaviota Coast. The steering committee met for one year and then a \$15,000 CREF grant was used to hire a facilitator to help the committee craft a Common Ground process, including a list of members for the Common Ground Project. The members of the Common Ground Project have met three times since June of 2002, and the applicant reports that they are making good progress.

The National Parks Service continues with preparation of the study and anticipates unveiling a draft study and environmental review in early 2003.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (+/-) means partially satisfies; and (-) means it does not satisfy the criterion.]

- (+/-) **Criterion #1.** The proposed subject area is the Gaviota Coast, which is located within the coastal zone along the south coast. The proposal's goal is to develop a locally generated vision to preserve the Gaviota Coast. Since this vision has not been created, it is unknown if the proposal would help offset impacts from oil and gas developments.
- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** Since the locally generated vision of the Gaviota coast has not been created, it is unknown if the proposal would enhance coastal aesthetics, recreation, tourism, and environmentally sensitive impacts.

- (+) **Criterion #3.** This proposal's goal is to develop a locally generated vision to preserve the Gaviota Coast. Since this vision is unknown at this time, it is uncertain if the proposal would benefit present and future generations. However, this proposal provides a forum for some of the stakeholders and landowners that have felt disenfranchised from the National Park Service's feasibility study.
- (-) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is considered planning & research; it does not satisfy the higher priorities of CREF -- capital improvements and coastal acquisitions.
- (-) **Criterion #5.** The applicant seeks the total budget costs from CREF; however, the applicant states it will also seek approximately \$10,000 from the UCSB's Shoreline Preservation Fund. If successful with a grant from this fund, the applicant would lower the CREF request by the amount it secures.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The applicant states that the County would not be responsible for ongoing operational costs for the proposal.
- (-) **Criterion #7.** The applicant requests 100% of the total budget from CREF; however, the applicant states it will request approximately 22% of the total budget from one other funding source. If successful with this other funding source, the applicant would reduce its CREF request to approximately 78% of the total budget. The applicant received \$15,000 from CREF in the 2002 cycle.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** It is unknown if the project can be completed successfully because the issue is an extremely controversial one. However, the applicant states the members of the Common Ground Project represent the full range of Gaviota Coast stakeholders and that they made good progress during the three meetings that it has had.

Other Considerations: None.

PROJECT # 14
NATURE INTERPRETIVE CENTER AT OCEAN BEACH PARK

3rd District
Lompoc Housing and Community Development Corporation
and
County of Santa Barbara, Parks Department
Requests \$227,250
Total Project Costs: \$227,250

Staff Recommendation: Award a challenge grant of \$60,000, contingent upon the applicants submitting:

- (a) a revised and more detailed project description;
- (b) a revised and more detailed budget;
- (c) confirmation from at least three local organizations that they can design, fabricate, and maintain exhibits at the center for a minimum of five years; and
- (d) proof that all funds necessary to complete the revised project have been secured.

Since the proposal needs some revisions, staff recommends that this project be brought before the Board of Supervisors for approval prior to release of the grant monies.

Applicant's Priority Ranking: The Lompoc Housing and Community Development Corporation submits only this proposal, and the Parks Department ranks this project last of the five submitted.

Summary of Proposal: The applicants request CREF funding to construct a nature center and other visitor amenities at Ocean Beach County Park. The proposal includes a 1,500 square foot building, approximately 300 square-feet of viewing decks with spotting scopes, and 150 linear feet of display cases. The applicants state that various organizations would fabricate exhibits that describe the history of the surrounding area, local species, and the estuary/ocean habitat.

Background: The Board of Supervisors awarded the Parks Department a \$69,000 CREF grant in the 1999 cycle towards developing a host site and improving a ramp and stairway leading to the beach at Ocean Park. The Parks Department reports that the project has been on hold for a couple reasons: (1) Vandenberg Air Force Base (VAFB) closed Ocean Beach due to the Snowy Plover habitat; and (2) the County and VAFB are negotiating a new evacuation agreement, which may impact the beach access at this park. After negotiation of this agreement, the Parks Department will determine if and how to move forward with this project.

The Parks Department was unsuccessful in seeking monies to develop a wetlands boardwalk with an interpretative kiosk and panels at the end of the boardwalk for visitor viewing and education.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (+/-) means partially satisfies; and (-) means it does not satisfy the criterion.]

- (+) **Criterion #1.** Improvements to Ocean Park possess a strong coastal nexus. The proposal is consistent with the Local Coastal Program, which states that opportunities for low intensity recreational use are needed along the coast in the north county. Lack of roads, military restrictions, and beach closures due to the snowy plovers breeding season are principal barriers to expanding opportunities for access and recreation in this area.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposal enhances coastal recreation and environmentally sensitive coastal resources through informing visitors about the history of the area and the coastal ecosystem.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** This site provides a broad public benefit since it and Surf Beach are the only beach accesses for this area.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** As a proposed capital improvement to a coastal park, this proposal satisfies the higher priority use of CREF.
- (-) **Criterion #5.** The applicant does not seek funding from other sources nor offers in-kind services. The applicant does state that various local organizations will fabricate displays for the center; however, there were no specific displays described nor amount of in-kind contributions identified.
- (-) **Criterion #6.** The County already maintains the park and would take responsibility to maintain the center. The Parks Department stated that the facility's maintenance could be approximately \$15,000 a year. The applicants state that various organizations would be responsible for maintaining the exhibits; however, there is no confirmation of this in the proposal.
- (-) **Criterion #7.** The applicant seeks 100% of the total cost of the project from CREF and does not seek monies from other funding sources. Staff recommends the applicant seek additional monies from the various agencies overseeing distribution of the Torch Oil Spill Natural Resource Damage Assessment and penalty funds.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** There appears to be much enthusiasm for this proposal. With all the beach closures and other constraints at Ocean Beach, a nature center seems to be a good idea for this beach. The budget needs to be in more detail for staff to evaluate if the applicants can complete the project within the proposed budget. Staff also is concerned because the applicants state that local organizations would design, fabricate, and maintain the displays. The applicants have not identified if any of the organizations can financially undertake these responsibilities.

Other Considerations: In concept, the proposed project is an excellent idea. Sheltering visitors (and displays) from the wind while viewing the displays is beneficial. Moreover, the displays would help to inform visitors with what they would be seeing from the proposed viewing deck. However, details of this project require further massaging, which may than require a revised budget (e.g., viewing deck and/or boardwalk, size of building versus needs of building).

PROJECT # 15
SPACE EXPLORATION RESEARCH LIBRARY

4th District
The Lompoc Valley Chamber of Commerce & Visitors Bureau
Requests \$50,000
Total Project Costs: \$150,000

Staff Recommendation: Deny request. There appears to be no or very little direct relationship between coastal resources addressed by CREF and the proposed library for which the applicant requests funding. As a future potential plan for the library, the applicant also proposes to design, fabricate, and install a display for tourists that, among other things, would inform viewers about information gathered by NOAA and NASA satellites concerning our coastal environment. In staff's opinion, this future display possess a partial coastal nexus; however, the applicant has not requested CREF funds for this component nor expressed plans to install such an exhibit during the first phase of starting the library. The primary function of the proposed library is making historical documents about VAFB's space launches available to academics. Accordingly, staff recommends that any consideration of CREF funding be reserved to the portion of the tourist display planned for a future time that directly addresses the gathering of and application of information concerning our local marine and coastal resources by satellites.

Applicant's Priority Ranking: The applicant submits only this proposal.

Summary of Proposal: The applicant plans on starting up a space research library for the academic community in the Lompoc and Vandenberg Air Force Base (VAFB) areas. The applicant states the focus of the library would be to preserve historical documents from retired VAFB's engineers. The proposal's slogan is "From the Bottom of the Sea to the Upper Reaches of Space." Specifically, the applicant requests CREF monies to obtain furniture (e.g., desks, chairs, file cabinets, and shelving) and automated systems (e.g., three workstations, digital reader/copier/sending system).

Background: The applicant states that currently a private company operates the Air Force Technical Library on VAFB. The applicant would hire this private company to start up the proposed library. The applicant is negotiating with VAFB to transfer a 22,000 square foot modular building within the city of Lompoc. The applicant is in the process of identifying a location for the building in the city; until it finds a site, the applicant states it would rent a space.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (+/-) means partially satisfies; and (-) means it does not satisfy the criterion.]

- (-) **Criterion #1.** Staff does not considers this proposal to have much of a coastal nexus. The proposal focuses on preserving and making available retired VAFB's engineers' historical documents. Most of the information is unrelated to coastal resources, instead addressing such topics as antennas, artificial intelligence, ballistic missiles, chemistry, global positioning

systems, launch vehicles, range instrumentation, safety and telemetry. However, a small coastal connection exists, involving information collected by satellites about the oceans.

- (-) **Criterion #2.** The proposal would house historical space information in a library. Visitors to the library would learn about past VAFB's launches. Making this historical information accessible to researchers does not enhance environmentally sensitive coastal resources.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** There is currently a library at VAFB; however, the applicant explains that the information stored there is about current VAFB activities. The proposed library would house historical documents. In addition, the proposed library would have public access unlike the many restrictions on VAFB. The applicant explains that high school and college students and other interested persons researching space information would benefit from this proposed library.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** This proposal is considered a capital improvement, which satisfies the higher priorities of CREF.
- (+) **Criterion #5.** The applicant unsuccessfully sought \$100,000 from the state for start-up and operational costs for the first year. However, it is now seeking that amount from the Department of the Air Force.
- (+/-) **Criterion #6.** The applicant would not depend on the County for operational and maintenance costs. The applicant states that it is in the process of estimating operating costs and plans on generating revenue from user fees. Since both the estimates for operating costs and user fees are unavailable, it is unknown if the library can financially operate in the long-term.
- (+) **Criterion #7.** The applicant is seeking a third of its budget from CREF and has sought or is seeking the remaining two-thirds from two other funding sources.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** Once the applicant identifies a location, permits the facility, and secures all start-up costs, staff believes the applicant can complete the project successfully. The applicant states that it knows people who have historical documents for the library. The start-up costs would help fund someone to organize the documents in a user-friendly system. The applicant states that the revenue to pay for operating costs (e.g., monthly rent for the facility, utilities, etc.) would be from user fees. However, it is unknown if user fees will be sufficient to operate the library on a long-term basis.

Other Considerations: The proposal seems premature. The applicant has not identified a location for the facility yet. Depending on the site, the applicant may have to permit the use and make improvements to the facility. In addition, the applicant has not completed estimates on operating and maintaining the library. Without this information, it is unknown if the applicant can sustain the library for years to come.

4th District
City of Guadalupe
Requests \$119,100
Total Project Costs: \$249,100

Staff Recommendation: Deny request for the following two reasons:

- (a) All but one of the attributes of Guadalupe that the proposal seeks to promote for purposes of attracting tourists lack the necessary functional relationship to coastal resources (e.g., historical buildings, authentic Mexican and Asian restaurants, Mexican rodeo, Fourth of July Fireworks, bike race, inland wetlands, and nearby agricultural resources). The only attribute with a coastal relationship is promotion of the Guadalupe Dunes. However, staff believes CREF funds would more directly promote the dunes by funding another proposal (Project #17, below) submitted this cycle for the expansion of the Dunes Center in the amount of \$168,000; and
- (b) Some of the expenses listed in the proposed budget for this proposal are operational costs (i.e., fund for personnel salaries and fringe benefits) with no funds secured for continued operations beyond the first year. The Board has not funded operational costs because it establishes a dependency between the project and CREF for continued funding annually. Nor do operational costs (as opposed to projects or phases of projects with a clear beginning and end, and with a final product) constitute appropriate uses of mitigation fees such as CREF.

Applicant's Priority Ranking: The applicant submitted only one proposal.

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests CREF funds for one-year of start-up costs to promote tourism in Guadalupe, thereby stimulating economic development for this small city. CREF monies would specifically pay:

- (a) the salary for a coordinator, a special events coordinator, an instructor for the Arts and Education Center, and a person to update and coordinate websites for five organizations;
- (b) the cost to develop, print, and distribute an Agriculture Tourism brochure;
- (c) the cost for city banners and identification signs;
- (d) the cost for display cases for the Arts and Education Center exhibits;
- (e) the cost to supplement the funding for 12 major events; and
- (f) the cost for miscellaneous items, such as transportation, supplies, printing, and fliers.

Background: The Guadalupe Tourism Strategic Planning Committee, designated in early 2002 by the Guadalupe City Council, hopes to stimulate economic growth in the city. To do this, it plans on enticing tourist to Guadalupe through promoting the area's:

- (a) natural resources, such as the nearby Guadalupe Dunes and a wetland;
 - (b) historical town's buildings and cemetery;
 - (c) authentic Mexican and Asian restaurants;
 - (d) nearby agricultural resources; and
 - (e) various events, such as the Mexican Rodeo, a bike race, Fourth of July fireworks, an indigenous festival, holiday festivals, dance performances, and concerts.
-

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (+/-) means partially satisfies; and (-) means it does not satisfy the criterion.]

- (+/-) **Criterion #1.** The proposal has a small coastal nexus, with the Guadalupe Dunes area and the Dunes Center bearing most of the coastal connection. However, most of the events and activities planned (see *Background* above) do not provide the needed coastal nexus.
- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** The project would slightly enhance coastal recreation and coastal tourism by bringing more tourists to the Guadalupe Dunes area and the Dunes Center. However, the bulk of the proposal would not enhance coastal resources, but would enhance tourism in Guadalupe.
- (+/-) **Criterion #3.** The proposal has the potential to benefit the small retail businesses in the City of Guadalupe; however, realization of such benefit depends upon how successful this program will be in attracting tourists. Staff renders a neutral rating for this Criterion, given the high level of uncertainty in determining the program's potential success. The alternative use of CREF to directly enhance the Dunes Center (Project #17 below) appears to be a more direct manner to promote coastal tourism in this area, with broader benefit to the public.
- (-) **Criterion #4.** This proposal represents some planning & research and some operating costs, both of which do not satisfy the higher priority use of CREF.
- (+) **Criterion #5.** The applicant offers approximately \$130,000 as in-kind services, such as space, furniture, and computer for the tourism coordinator position, printing and distributing brochures, and volunteers helping out with various events. Some of these in-kind services are considered operational costs rather than matching funds for the proposal. The applicant has sought approximately \$350,000 from six sources, including the County's Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC); however, EDAC denied the applicant funding. Some of the requested monies would be used for other items related to promoting tourism and not be applied to the proposed budget for this CREF request. For example, the applicant secured \$80,000 from California Council for Humanities. A portion of this grant, \$5,000, would go towards working with local residents to determine what is needed in the community. The remaining \$75,000 than would help pay for implementing ideas that were generated from the discussion. Of the six sources that the applicant requested funding, the applicant was only anticipating a \$53,590 grant from the Hutton Foundation. The applicant states that if it is successful with this grant, it could reduce the CREF request. The applicant expects to hear about the grant soon.
- (+/-) **Criterion #6.** The project would not require any additional ongoing County operational or maintenance costs. Since the CREF funds would pay for one-year of promoting tourism, the applicant states it would need to solicit grants for continuing the efforts.
- (+) **Criterion #7.** Aside from CREF, the applicant has sought funding from six other sources.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** Staff believes there is much enthusiasm for promoting tourism in Guadalupe, with the creation of the Guadalupe Tourism Strategic Planning Committee. The committee has been busy with planning various events throughout the city. However, it is uncertain if

the efforts to promote tourism in Guadalupe would reach beyond a year. The applicant states that it would need to fund-raise operational costs annually. Additionally, the potential success of the program is uncertain at this time as well.

Other Considerations: Essentially, uses of CREF to enhance coastal tourism are directed at enhancement of coastal resources that, in turn, attract tourists, such as capital improvements at the Dunes Center in Guadalupe or the Sea Center at Stearns Wharf.

PROJECT # 17
THE DUNES CENTER EXHIBIT HALL

4th District
Dunes Center
Requests \$168,000
Total Project Costs: \$2,300,860

Staff Recommendation: Grant full request of \$168,000 contingent on the applicant securing all additional monies in two years. A two-year period should give the applicant sufficient time to raise the substantial budget.

Applicant's Priority Ranking: The applicant submitted only one proposal.

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests funds to: (a) construct a 10,500 square foot exhibit hall that would be divided up into 12 exhibit areas; and (b) design, fabricate and install ten exhibits and displays. The applicant states the previous exhibits it has fabricated from CREF grants will be incorporated into the new exhibit hall.

Background: The Dunes Center is a visitor education and research center supporting the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes. The Dunes Center (and the Nature Conservancy) have received a number of CREF grants in the past, for a total of \$224,222:

- (a) a \$33,222 grant in the 1994 cycle to update the Guadalupe Dunes master plan;
- (b) a \$120,000 grant in the 1995 cycle to design and fabricate exhibits and displays for the Dunes Center;
- (c) a \$5,000 grant in the 1996 cycle to purchase an interpretative trailer;
- (d) a \$22,500 grant in the 1999 cycle to develop and implement an educational package for teachers and students to visit the Dunes Center;
- (e) a \$22,000 grant in the 1999 cycle to produce a 20-minute video of the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes; and
- (f) a \$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.

In addition, the Board awarded a \$50,000 grant in the 1994 cycle to construct a building to house the Dunes Center. However, the Dunes Center could not secure the necessary additional funds within two years and had to give the money back to the CREF program; the \$50,000 grant was reallocated in the 1997 CREF cycle. The Dunes Center received a \$166,836 grant in the 2000 cycle to construct

a building to house exhibits. During the planning process, the Dunes Center decided to design the building with specific exhibits, which increased the cost from \$350,000 to \$2.3 million. The latter amount is approximately \$1.1 million for the building and \$1.2 million for exhibits. Pursuant to the CREF contract, the Dunes Center returned the \$166,836 to CREF because the Center could not secure the additional monies prior to the contract termination date. The County will reallocate that CREF grant in this 2003 cycle.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (+/-) means partially satisfies; and (-) means it does not satisfy the criterion.]

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposal has a coastal relationship since it would permanently house exhibits that educate the public about the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes environment. 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, tourism, and environmentally sensitive coastal resources by providing a permanent center to house the exhibits that focus on the environmentally sensitive habitats at Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The applicant states that the center serves many visitors a year, especially local residents, tourist, and school groups.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** This project is a capital improvement, which satisfies the higher priority use of CREF.
- (+) **Criterion #5.** The applicant secured over \$400,000 from five sources and seeks approximately \$1.9 million from seven other sources.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The project would not require any ongoing County operational or maintenance costs. Although not enough to cover all expenses, the applicant established an endowment of \$500,000 towards operational costs and it seeks more funding to add to the endowment.
- (+) **Criterion #7.** The applicant secured 17% of the total project costs and seeks 7% from CREF. The applicant seeks the remaining amount from seven other funding sources.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** The applicant has purchased the property and renovated a building onsite. In addition, it has secured approximately \$500,000 towards an endowment for operational costs and is aggressively pursuing more monies towards the endowment. The applicant has successfully operated the Dunes Center for a number of years and has successfully completed a number of exhibits, funded by CREF, that have won national awards. However, the applicant still needs to secure approximately \$2 million towards this exhibit hall project. This is a large amount; staff does not know if this amount can be secured in the next two years.

Other Considerations: None.

APPENDIX B

At-a-Glance

CREF Allocations by Supervisorial District

(1988-2002)

Table 1: First District²

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Andree Clark Bird Refuge	\$ 170,000	1988	Cap. Improv. ³
Carpinteria Swimming Pool	150,000	1988	Cap. Improv.
Carpinteria Marsh Land Acquisition	83,000	1990	Acq. ⁴
Carpinteria Marsh Land Acquisition	150,000	1993	Acq.
Carpinteria Marsh Land Acquisition	25,000	1995	Acq.
Carpinteria Marsh Nature Park Interpretative Signs	38,500	2002	Cap Improv.
Santa Barbara Zoo -- Sea Lion Exhibit	25,000	1990	Cap. Improv.
Santa Barbara Harbor Boat Launch	150,000	1990	Cap. Improv.
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 Creek Appraisals	5,000	1992	Acq.
Loon Point Beach Access Easement	2,872	1990	Acq.
Loon Point Beach Access Easement	66,000	1994	Cap. Improv.
Lookout Park Accessibility Modifications	30,000	1994	Cap. Improv.
Carpinteria Lions Community Building	25,000	1995	Cap. Improv.
Careaga Open Space Acquisition	200,000	1995	Acq.
Channel Drive Beautification	27,000	1995 (1999 ⁵)	Cap. Improv.
Coastal Bikeway, North Jameson Lane	95,000	1995	Cap. Improv.
Summerland Greenwell Park	20,000	1996	Cap. Improv.
Summerland Greenwell Park	16,000	2001	Cap. Improv.
Bikeway Studies: Santa Claus Lane/Carp. Ave & Ortega Hill	50,000	1996	Cap. Improv.
Hammonds Meadows Beach Access Stairs	10,500	1996	Cap. Improv.
Ocean Recreation Center	60,000	1997	Cap. Improv.
Rincon Beach Access	29,000	1997	Cap. Improv.
Rincon Beach Day Use Area Planning	28,500	2001	Cap. Improv.
Rincon Beach Day Use Area Implementation	7,720	2002	Cap. Improv.
Finney Street Access	21,413	1997	Cap. Improv.
Surfrider Extension Trail	51,500	2000	Acq.
Santa Claus Lane Preliminary Beach Access	26,000	2000	Acq.
Design Guidelines for Hwy 101 Landscaping and Structures	10,000	1998	Plan/Rsch. ⁶
Carpinteria Creek Watershed Outreach	15,036	2002	Edu ⁷
Total	\$2,088,041		

² Grants awarded between 1988-1991, 1992-2001 and 2002 on all reflect different district boundaries.

³Capital improvement

⁴Acquisition

⁵Reissued in 1999

⁶Planning & Research

⁷Education

	Amount		
Audubon Goleta Slough Restoration	\$ 15,500	2000	Cap. Improve.
Atascadero Mutt Mitt Stations	4,800	2002	Cap. Improve.
Shade Structure for Native Plants ⁸	15,000	2002	Cap. Improve.
Lifeguard Towers at Arroyo Burro, Goleta, and Jalama Beaches ⁹	57,505	2002	Cap. Improve.
Total	\$3,006,680		

⁸ Benefits both the Second and Third Districts.

⁹ Benefits both the Second and Third Districts.

Table 3: Third District

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 Master Plan (Land Swap)	10,300	1996	Acq.
Five parcels Ocean Bluff Acquisition,	57,500	2001	Acq.
Camino Corto Master Plan & Implementation	17,355	1994	Plan/Rsch.
Camino Corto and Del Sol Vernal Pool Reserve	30,311	1996	Cap. Improv.
Camino Corto and Del Sol Vernal Pool Reserve – Irrig.	30,000	1997	Cap. Improv.
Estero Park Lathhouse for Propagating Natives	24,000	1998	Cap. Improv.
Pescadero Blufftop Improvement	25,000	1999	Cap. Improv.
Del Playa Pelican Park – Water Meter	10,000	2001	Cap. Improv.
Camino del Sur Stairway Improvements	25,000	2001	Cap. Improv.
Goleta Valley Transfer Development Rights	10,500	1988	Plan/Rsch.
Goleta Beach Slough Revetment	100,000	1988	Cap. Improv.
Santa Barbara Shores Acquisition	1,000,000	1988	Acq.
Santa Barbara Shores Acquisition	140,000	1991	Acq.
Santa Barbara Shores Improvements	280,000	1991	Cap. Improv.
Santa Barbara Shores Improvements	49,981	1991	Cap. Improv.
Santa Barbara Shores Improvements	201,724	1991	Cap. Improv.
Santa Barbara Shores Debt Repayment	115,217	1996	Acq.
Santa Barbara Shores Improvements	46,351	1997	Cap. Improv.
Ellwood Mesa/Devereux Slough Regional Plan	50,000	2000	Plan/Rsch.
Ellwood Mesa/Devereux Slough Regional Plan	50,000	2002	Plan/Rsch.
More Mesa Appraisal and Hazardous Waste Survey	25,000	1990	Acq.
More Mesa Management Plan	10,000	1991	Plan/Rsch.
Conservation Efforts Along the Gaviota Coast			
Phase IV: Coop. Permanent Coastal Preservation	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	330,000	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.
Arroyo Hondo Ranch Acquisition	208,929	2001	Acq.
Mission Santa Ines and Its Harbors Project	8,723	1995	Edu.
Phase II – El Capitan Bikeway and Trail	50,000	1996	Cap. Improv.
Gaviota Creek Fish Passage	50,000	1991 (1996) ¹⁰	Cap. Improv.
Gaviota Creek Fish Passage	20,000	1993 (1996) ¹¹	Cap. Improv.
Gaviota Creek Fish Passage	30,000	1996	Cap. Improv.

¹⁰Reallocated in 1996

¹¹Reallocated in 1996

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Jalama Beach County Park Expansion	\$ 10,000	1996	Acq.
Coronado Acquisition	43,005	1998	Acq.
Coronado Acquisition and Restoration	25,000	1999	Acq.
Ponds and Aviaries -- Animal Hospital	0	1998	Cap. Improv.
San Pedro Creek Class I Bike Path	75,000	1998	Cap. Improv.
Total	\$4,296,426		

Table 4: Fourth District

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Leroy Park Recreational Center	\$ 75,000	1988	Cap. Improv.
Leroy Park Recreational Center	75,000	1990	Cap. Improv.
Leroy Park Recreational Center	75,000	1991	Cap. Improv.
Point Sal Acquisition	125,000	1988	Acq.
Ocean Park Improvements	400,000	1988	Cap. Improv.
Ocean Park Improvements	100,000	1990	Cap. Improv.
Host Site & Ramp	69,000	1999	Cap. Improv.
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. Improv.
Construction	77,943	1998	Cap. Improv.
Construction	123,335	2000	Cap. Improv.
Outreach Program	11,724	1995	Edu.
Technology/Media Exhibit	71,142	2001	Edu.
Santa Ynez River Enhancement Plan ¹²	36,088	1995	Plan/Rsch.
Surf Beach Pedestrian Crossing	120,000	1997	Cap. Improv.
Santa Ynez River Open Space/Park	25,000	1998	Acq.
Burton Mesa Chaparral Garden	2,271	2000	Cap. Improv.
Snowy Plover & Coastal Access Pilot Program ¹³	25,000	2001	Edu.
Guadalupe Dunes Vehicle Barrier to Protect Snowy Plovers	13,450	2002	Cap. Improv.
Lompoc Aquatic Center	67,126	2002	Cap. Improv.
Total	\$2,322,271		

¹² Benefits both the Third and Fourth Districts.

¹³ Benefits both the Third and Fourth Districts.

Table 5: Fifth District

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Waller Park Water Conservation	\$ 125,000	1988	Cap. Improv.
Allan Hancock Theater Expansion	175,000	1990	Cap. Improv.
Peregrine Falcon Reintroduction	5,000	1992	Plan/Rsch.
S.M./Guadalupe Dunes Bikeway			
Bikeway Study	30,000	1992	Plan/Rsch.
General Plan Amendment	374	1996	Plan/Rsch.
Construction of Bikeway, Phase IV	0	1997	Cap. Improv.
Guadalupe Dunes County Park			
Kiosk Staffing	0	1993	Edu.
Management Plan Update	33,222	1994	Plan/Rsch.
Trailer	5,000	1996	Cap. Improv.
Phase II, Master Plan for Road Repairs	23,705	1996	Plan/Rsch.
Implementation Plan	104,065	1998	Cap. Improv.
Implementation Plan	22,935	1999	Cap. Improv.
Guadalupe Dunes Education Center (Dunes Center)			
Construction of Center	0	1994	Cap. Improv.
Construction of Exhibit Hall	0	2000	Cap. Improv.
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	20,000	2002	Edu.
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. Improv.
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. Improv.
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	9,070	2000	Edu.
Exploring the Seashore Exhibit	26,000	2001	Edu.
Total	\$ 921,280		

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. Improv.
Snowy Plover Video	8,930	1998	Edu.
Upgrades to Seabird Rehabilitation Facility	1,580	2000	Cap. Improv.
Waves on Wheels Van	25,000	2001	Edu.
Total	\$199,353		

Table 7: Amounts Allocated by Districts

District	Amount
First	\$ 2,088,041
Second	\$ 3,006,680
Third	\$ 4,296,426
Fourth	\$ 2,322,271
Five	\$ 921,280
Three or More Districts	\$ 199,353
Total	\$12,834,051