



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AGENDA LETTER

Agenda Number:

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

Department Name: Planning &
Development
Department No.: 053
For Agenda Of: June 1, 2010
Placement: Departmental
Estimated Tme: 1 hour
Continued Item: Yes
If Yes, date from: April 6, 2010
Vote Required: Majority

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Department Glenn Russell, Planning and Development, 568-2084
Director(s)
Contact Info: Doug Anthony, Deputy Director, Energy Division, 568-2046

SUBJECT: Hearing to Allocate Year 2010 Coastal Resource Enhancement Fund Grants

County Counsel Concurrence

As to form: N/A

Auditor-Controller Concurrence

As to form: N/A

Recommended Actions:

That the Board of Supervisors:

- A. Receive staff's recommended options for CREF awards and take public testimony;**
- B. Select an option and approve CREF awards for General Allocation in the 2010 CREF cycle on page 10 in the attached staff report, along with the specific preliminary conditions of awards in Appendix A of the staff report;**
- C. 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;**
- D. Set a hearing on September 7, 2010 to consider staff recommendations for awarding grants to fund coastal acquisitions.**

Summary Text:

A total of \$1,073,275.75 is available in the 2010 Coastal Resource Enhancement Fund (CREF) cycle:

- \$378,076.87 of which is devoted only to coastal acquisitions per CREF Guidelines; and
- \$695,198.88 of which is available for both general allocation and acquisitions.

At the April 6, 2010 Board of Supervisors hearing, the Board directed Energy Division staff to commence the 2010 CREF cycle and bring the recommendations for grant allocation before the Board on June 1, 2010 prior to the fiscal year 2010/2011 budget hearings. The Board directed staff to notify eligible CREF applicants that the County will be giving preference to County projects over non-County projects during this 2010 CREF cycle because of the County's difficult budget in 2010-2011. However, the Board directed solicitation of proposals from the public so that it would not preclude consideration of non-County projects. The Board also directed that no 2010 CREF fees be deferred for acquisitions in order to provide additional flexibility in allocating CREF grants, whether for acquisitions or general allocations.

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

- Information on the CREF 2010 cycle,
- Funding recommendations for the CREF 2010 cycle,
- Evaluations of CREF proposals for this year, and
- Past CREF awards.

A copy of each proposal has been filed with the Clerk of the Board and is also available at the Energy Division.

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

Fiscal and Facilities Impacts: The Coastal Resource Enhancement Fund is funded by mitigation fees paid by developers of offshore oil and gas reserves. Fees to fund grants are received annually. CREF is included in the Energy Division Mitigation Program Cost Center (5090) in the Planning & Development Department's FY 09/10 Budget on page D-320 (sections "Source of Funds Summary – Offshore Oil and Gas Mitigation" and section "Use of Prior Fund Balances" for revenue, and "Use of Funds Summary – Mitigation Programs"). Staff costs to administer the fund are offset by interest accrued to the Coastal Resource Enhancement Fund.

Authored by:

Kathy McNeal Pfeifer

Attachments:

Staff Report: 2010 CREF Cycle

**2010 CYCLE
COASTAL RESOURCE ENHANCEMENT FUND
(CREF)**

**Board of Supervisors Hearing
June 1, 2010**

**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, CREF 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 261 CREF grants for a total of \$18,060,297. Table 1 shows the distribution of past CREF dollars among coastal acquisitions, capital improvements, education, equipment purchases, and planning and research (including land management plans that may be associated with acquisitions).¹

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.

Table 1: CREF Allocations by Type of Project

PROJECT CATEGORIES	DOLLAR AMOUNT	PERCENTAGE
Acquisitions	\$9,133,135	51%
Capital Improvements	\$7,050,736	39%
Planning & Research	\$1,056,200	6%
Educational	\$683,839	4%
Equipment	\$136,387	< 1%
Total	\$18,060,297	

¹ Prior to 1990, rating criteria in the CREF Guidelines rated capital projects as the highest priority use of CREF. In 1990, the Board amended the criteria to add coastal acquisitions as a higher priority use of CREF and devoted at least one half of each year's CREF fees to such acquisitions. In 1994, the Board amended the criteria once again to give higher priority to both coastal acquisitions and coastal-related capital improvements.

Table 2: CREF Allocations by Type of Grantee*

GRANTEE	DOLLAR AMOUNT	PERCENTAGE
Cities	\$1,469,686	8%
County Agencies	\$7,778,839	43%
Non-Profit Agencies	\$8,181,911	45%
State & Federal Agencies	\$5,000	<1%
Educational Institutions	\$624,861	3%
Total	\$18,060,297	

* 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	\$532,931	36%
Carpinteria	\$414,629	28%
Santa Maria	\$55,000	4%
Lompoc	\$142,126	10%
Guadalupe	\$25,000**	2%
Goleta	\$300,000	20%
Total	\$1,469,686	

** 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	\$4,590,829	59%
Public Works	\$1,336,389	17%
Comprehensive Planning/Long Range Planning	\$1,340,571	17%
County Administrator	\$281,162	4%
General Services	\$120,000	2%
Fish & Game Commission	\$3,000	<1%
Third District Supervisor	\$45,000	<1%
Ag. Commissioners Office	\$61,888	<1%
	\$7,778,839	

FUTURE REVENUES

In February of 2008, the Board of Supervisors approved the fifth five-year (2008-2012) assessment of payments that are required of the three oil and gas projects that currently contribute to CREF. The CREF fee schedule for 2011 and 2012 appears in Table 5. Additional monies sometimes become available for allocation in future years if previously approved CREF awards do not materialize or move forward in a timely manner. In such cases, these awards revert back to the uncommitted CREF balance. The grantee may request that the Board reinstate these grants during the next competitive cycle.

Staff will assess the sixth five year (2013-2017) assessment of payments beginning of spring 2013.

Table 5: CREF Fees* for 2011 and 2012

PROJECT	2011	2012
Point Arguello	\$231,400	\$231,400
Santa Ynez Unit	\$213,600	\$213,600
Point Pedernales	\$178,000	\$178,000
CREF Fees Per Year	\$623,000	\$623,000

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 a percentage of each year's contributions to fund coastal acquisitions; however, this year only, the Board of Supervisors directed that no 2010 CREF fees be deferred for acquisitions in order to provide itself with additional flexibility in allocating CREF grants, whether for acquisitions or general allocation.

- (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).

This year only, the Board decided to alert the public that it would be giving preference to County projects over non-County projects. However, the Board did not want to close the solicitation process to the public because it did not want to preclude consideration of non-County projects.

2010 CREF CYCLE

Monies Available. The 2010 cycle represents the 23rd CREF cycle. A total of 1,073,275.75 in CREF fees is available for grants. As shown in Table 6, \$378,076.87 is available for acquisitions and \$695,198.88 is available for general allocation projects as well as acquisitions.

Table 6: Funds Available in the 2010 CREF Cycle

SOURCE OF FUNDING	ACQUISITION	GENERAL ALLOCATION/ ACQUISITION
From 2009 CREF Cycle	\$ 378,076.87	\$ 72,189.88
2010 CREF Fees	\$ 0	\$ 623,000.00
TOTAL AVAILABLE PER CATEGORY	\$ 378,076.87	\$ 695,198.88

Monies Requested. The County received 13 proposals for this cycle. These requests seek cumulative awards of approximately \$2,092,311:

- Ten (10) proposals seek a total of approximately \$1,021,235 in general allocation funds to: (a) improve coastal parks and beach accesses, (b) enhance protection of environmentally sensitive coastal species and their habitats, (c) develop exhibits that educate the public about coastal resources, and (d) plan for coastal communities and coastal lands. There is \$695,198.88 available for general allocation. This money can also be spent on coastal acquisition.
- Three (3) proposals seek a total of \$1,071,076 in acquisitional funds to help purchase and preserve open space along the coast. There is \$378,076.87 available for exclusively for coastal acquisitions.

Tables 7 and 8 show types of projects and types of applicants, respectively. Table 9 lists the proposals, applicants, and amounts requested in the 2010 cycle.

Table 7: Type of Proposal in the 2010 CREF Cycle

CATEGORIES	AMOUNT	PERCENTAGE
Acquisitions	\$1,071,076	51%
Capital Improvements	\$ 274,500	13%
Planning & Research	\$ 637,101	31%
Education	\$ 109,634	5%
Total	\$2,092,311	

Table 8: Type of Applicant in the 2010 CREF Cycle

CATEGORIES	AMOUNT	PERCENTAGE
County Agencies	\$ 670,601	32%
Non-Profit Agencies	\$ 1,056,710	51%
Cities	\$ 365,000	17%
Total	\$2,092,311	

Table 9: 2010 CREF Proposals

DISTRICT	NO.	PROPOSAL TITLE	APPLICANT	AMOUNT REQUESTING	TYPE OF PROPOSAL
County-Wide	1	Wildlife Care Center, Seabird Care Compound	Santa Barbara County Wildlife Care Network	\$ 191,000	Capital Improvement
1st	2	Rincon Creek Arundo Removal Project	County's Agricultural Commissioner's Office	\$ 25,000	Capital Improvement
	3	Santa Claus Lane Streetscape and Beach Parking Plan	County's Office of Long Range Planning	\$ 267,600	Planning & Research
	4	Lookout Park Arundo Removal Maintenance Project	County's Agricultural Commissioner's Office	\$ 8,500	Capital Improvement
	5	Summerland Community Plan Update	County's Office of Long Range Planning	\$ 73,791	Planning & Research
2nd	6	Oil in the Channel Exhibit	Santa Barbara Maritime Museum	\$ 75,000	Educational
	7	Shoreline Park Improvement Project	City of Santa Barbara	\$ 50,000	Capital Improvement

< Table Continues >

DISTRICT	NO.	PROPOSAL TITLE	APPLICANT	AMOUNT REQUESTING	TYPE OF PROPOSAL
3rd	8	Ocean Meadows Acquisition	The Trust for Public Land	\$ 378,000	Acquisition
	9	Mathilda Drive Parcels Acquisition	City of Goleta	\$ 315,000	Acquisition
	10	Gaviota Coast Plan	County's Office of Long Range Planning	\$ 295,710	Planning & Research
	11	The Gaviota Ranch/Brinkman Family Trust	The Land Trust for Santa Barbara County	\$ 378,076	Acquisition
4th	12	Three Exhibits: Solid Terrain Model Map, Discovery Boxes, and Lost City of DeMille	Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Center	\$ 22,325	Educational
5th	13	Shore Bird Collection Exhibit	The Natural History Museum	\$ 12,309	Educational
Total Requests				\$ 2,092,311	

RECOMMENDED OPTIONS FOR FUNDING

The Board stated that in this 2010 CREF cycle, it would be giving preference to County projects over non-County projects because of the County's difficult budget in 2010-2011. However, the Board directed solicitation of proposals from the public so that it would not preclude consideration of non-County projects.

Staff presents two options for funding 2010 CREF awards from the general allocation funds. Table 10 shows recommended CREF awards if the Board of Supervisors wants to solely fund County proposals. Table 11 shows recommended CREF awards with a preference to County proposals but including some non-County proposals.

Both of these options fully subscribe the general allocation funds to non-acquisition projects. The Board does have the ability to defer some of the general allocation funds for coastal acquisitions, considering the three acquisitional proposals received.

Staff recommends that the Board defer its decision on acquisitions to a later date, September 7, 2010. All three applicants anticipate having secured option agreements with land owners they are negotiating with by that time. The Land Trust for Santa Barbara County and the Trust for Public Land stated that the delay would not hurt their negotiations. The City of Goleta stated that it would rather not delay the decision since it hopes to be entering into purchasing agreements with three property owners by end of July and August; the City indicated that the negotiations would be more effective if the City had the money secured prior to entering into the purchasing agreements.

An evaluation of each of the thirteen proposals seeking funds from CREF appears in Appendix A. Appendix B lists all past CREF awards between 1988 and 2009.

Table 10: Option 1
Recommendations to Fund All County Proposals
for 2010 CREF Cycle

Proposal Title	Applicant	Gen. Allocation
Rincon Creek Arundo Removal Project	County Agricultural Commissioner's Office	\$25,000.00
Santa Claus Lane Streetscape and Beach Parking Plan	County Office of Long Range Planning	\$267,600.00
Lookout Park Arundo Removal Project	County Agricultural Commissioner's Office	\$8,500.00
Summerland Community Plan Update	County Office of Long Range Planning	\$73,791.00
Gaviota Coast Plan	County Office of Long Range Planning	\$295,710.00
TOTAL		\$670,601.00
Balance to go to non-County proposals or defer to acquisition		\$24,597.88

Table 11: Option 2
Recommendations to Fund County and Non-County
for the Year 2010 CREF Cycle

Proposal Title	Applicant	Gen. Allocation
Seabird Care Compound	Santa Barbara Wildlife Care Network	\$191,000.00
Rincon Creek Arundo Removal Project	County Agricultural Commissioner's Office	\$25,000.00
Santa Claus Lane Streetscape and Beach Parking Plan	County Office of Long Range Planning	\$78,888.88
Lookout Park Arundo Removal Project	County Agricultural Commissioner's Office	\$8,500.00
Summerland Community Plan Update	County Office of Long Range Planning	\$73,791.00
Shoreline Park Improvements	City of Santa Barbara	\$10,000
Gaviota Coast Plan	County Office of Long Range Planning	\$295,710.00
Shore Bird Collection Exhibit	Natural History Museum in Santa Maria	\$12,309.00
TOTAL		695,198.88

Appendix A

Proposal Evaluations

2010 CREF Cycle

PROJECT # 1
WILDLIFE CARE CENTER
SEABIRD CARE COMPOUND

County-Wide
Santa Barbara Wildlife Care Network
Requests \$191,000
Total Project Costs: \$3 million for entire Wildlife Care Center

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests funds to complete the seabird care compound as part of the seabird care center (see *Background* section below) that the applicant is developing on 1.5 acres of land in the Goleta foothills. To complete the seabird care compound, the applicant requests monies to fund the following tasks:

- Excavating a dump onsite and removing the debris;
- Installing additional water lines, meter and associated fees with the Goleta Water District.
- Paving for wheelchair accessible walkways; and
- Constructing interior component and fixtures for the Seabird Building (e.g., insulation, electrical, plumbing, cabinets, bathroom, appliances, flooring, etc.)

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

Background: The applicant rescues and rehabilitates injured wildlife, and the applicant states it successfully rehabilitates 60% of the animals. The applicant purchased a 1.5-acre parcel and is constructing a seabird care center onsite. The applicant received three CREF grants towards this project:

- \$31,800 in the 2005 CREF cycle;
- \$120,000 in the 2006 CREF cycle; and,
- \$150,000 in the 2007 CREF cycle.

The Board of Supervisors executed a contract with the applicant for \$301,800 in August of 2009. The applicant is almost complete with the project outlined in the contract. Currently, the following components are complete onsite: drainage system with bioswales, on- and off-site sewer system, fencing around the property, landscaping and irrigation, large pelican pond, and flight aviary, pelagic bird pool and flight aviary, pelican and duckling cages, and holding tank for contaminated wash water from oiled seabirds.

The applicant is requesting an extension to the current contract to complete the paving for the parking area. The applicant hasn't completed the parking portion of the project because monies were diverted to some unexpected costs. While grading the site, the applicant unknowingly came upon a dump. The applicant spent almost \$20,000 on excavating the dump and removing the debris. In addition, the applicant spent almost \$60,000 that it was not anticipating on additional water lines, meter and associated fees and Letter of Credit with the Goleta Water District. The applicant is seeking in its 2010 CREF request to reimburse a portion of these costs.

The applicant also received a couple small CREF grants:

- a \$1,580 grant in the 2000 cycle to purchase an above ground pool, a baby scale to weigh birds, an ultraviolet light, a freezer, and an aviary; and,
- a \$1,037 grant in the 2004 cycle to purchase a net to discourage visiting birds to the existing sea bird facility.

The applicant relinquished a \$25,000 grant from the 1998 CREF cycle towards a wildlife care center since it could not commence the project within the allotted two years.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (-) means doesn't satisfy; (+/-) means partially satisfies]

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposal contains a strong coastal nexus by constructing a long-term care facility for rescuing, rehabilitating, and releasing injured or oiled seabirds.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** This proposal would enhance environmentally sensitive coastal resources, specifically various seabird species.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** This proposal will benefit injured and oiled seabirds. In addition, the sight of an injured or oiled bird affects most people; knowing the birds were being cared for would have a broad public benefit.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is considered a capital improvement, which satisfies the higher priority of CREF.
- (+) **Criteria #5 and #7.** The applicant states that the entire budget for the seabird care center is approximately \$3 million (this includes the \$1.5 million used to purchase the 1.5-acre property). With the approximate \$300,000 CREF grant and the 2010 CREF request of \$191,000, the applicant seeks approximately 16% of the total costs from CREF.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** There would be no ongoing County operations or maintenance involved with this proposal. The applicant has been successfully operating a few smaller facilities for over 20 years. The applicant states that its operating and maintenance budget would come from its annual fund-raising program.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** Staff anticipates that the applicant will complete the project successfully since the applicant is requesting funding for the remaining monies to complete the project. The applicant has not successfully completed all the components under the current contract; however, some unexpected items diverted time and resources away from this phase of the seabird care compound (see Background section above).

The applicant was able to use the site and onsite facilities for an emergency with caring for pelicans this winter. However, the items remaining will allow it to be a stand-alone seabird care facility. The applicant has successfully been rescuing and rehabilitating birds for over 20 years.

Other Considerations: The State Oiled Wildlife Care Network has been advising SBWCN on the design of the Seabird Care Compound and is anxious for the Seabird Care Compound to be completed so it can help with cleaning and care of oiled birds in the event of an oil spill.

PROJECT # 2
RINCON CREEK ARUNDO REMOVAL PROJECT

1st District
Santa Barbara County Agricultural Commissioner's Office
Requests \$25,000
Total Project Costs: \$90,236

Summary of Proposal: The applicant proposes to use CREF monies to remove *Arundo donax*, also known as giant reed or simply Arundo, in nine locations along the riparian corridor of Rincon Creek. Each patch of Arundo is approximately 100 square feet in size; the furthest patch of Arundo is located 1.3 miles from where Rincon Creek flows into the ocean. The applicant proposes three types of treatment: (1) spraying herbicides on the plants' leaves; (2) cutting the plants down to the stumps and spraying the stumps; and (3) on properties that prefer non-herbicidal methods, clumps will be dug out. The applicant estimates five consecutive years of follow-up treatment for complete control of the invasive, non-native plant.

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

Background: Arundo, an invasive non-native noxious weed, invades riparian channels, especially in disturbed areas. It is very competitive, difficult to control, and has a detrimental impact on biodiversity, water quality, water quantity, flood risk, and fire risk. Arundo displaces native vegetation and associated wildlife. Arundo is not a good river bank stabilizer; in a storm event, Arundo can be uprooted and undercut the river bank. Uprooted Arundo gets deposited along the shoreline, increasing the chance of propagating the invasive plant in new areas.

The entire length of Rincon Creek was surveyed for Arundo and the nine patches are the only locations along the entire creek. Eradication of Arundo is part of the overall plan to improve the biological health of Rincon Creek. Rincon Creek was ranked eighth out of 24 south coast creeks for steelhead recovery.

The Board of Supervisors has awarded the applicant the following CREF grants that are associated with invasive species removal:

- \$40,000 in the 2007 CREF cycle at Lookout Park to remove Arundo; and,
- \$21,888 in the 2003 CREF cycle along Arroyo Burro Creek to remove Pampas Grass.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (-) means doesn't satisfy; (+/-) means partially satisfies]

- (+) **Criterion #1.** Staff considers the project to have a coastal nexus. Arundo is detrimental to the health of Rincon Creek, which supports steelhead trout. In addition, Arundo is invasive and has the potential to spread more along the riparian corridor and at Rincon Beach.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposal enhances an environmentally sensitive coastal resource, steelhead trout habitat and the beach ecosystem. Arundo displaces native vegetation and associated wildlife

because of the massive stands it forms. Removal of Arundo enhances biodiversity and habitat quality.

- (+) **Criterion #3.** The proposal benefits the ecosystem along Rincon Creek and at Rincon Beach.
- (+) **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 and Criterion #7.** The applicant has secured \$53,816 from the California Department of Fish and Game’s Fisheries Restoration Grant Program. The County’s Agricultural Commissioner’s Office is supplying \$11,420 of in-kind service for permitting and project management for five years. Therefore, the applicant has secured 72% of the project costs and seeks 28% from CREF.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The applicant will perform upkeep on the project for five years to obtain successful eradication of Arundo; this upkeep is considered a part of the restoration efforts. Any maintenance efforts after this time would be considered minimal. Removing the Arundo now is cost-effective since the patches of Arundo would only get larger and spread to other areas, which would increase the cost in the future.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** Staff believes the initial project can be completed successfully. The applicant understands that it needs to perform, at least, five years of follow up work to completely eradicate the Arundo. The applicant has successfully completed two projects that were funded by CREF that involved eradicating invasive species.

Other Considerations: The applicant proves to be a good CREF applicant, sending in detailed invoices and alerting staff of any project scope or budget changes.

PROJECT # 3
SANTA CLAUS LANE STREETScape
AND BEACH PARKING PLAN

1st District
Santa Barbara County Office of Long Range Planning
Requests \$267,600
Total Project Costs: \$267,600

Summary of Proposal: The applicant plans to prepare a Project Study Report for street parking and streetscape improvements along Santa Claus Lane, fronting the business area and Santa Claus Beach. The applicant's objectives for the project are to:

- Enhance public input by conducting a workshop for the design phase;
- Work with the Santa Claus Lane business owners' conceptual streetscape plan, unifying the streetscape ideas along the entire length of Santa Claus Lane (business area and beach area);
- Enhance all modes of transit (e.g., cars, bicyclists, wheelchairs, and pedestrians), including 3,000 linear feet of sidewalk, connecting the beach area with the business area and a traffic circle near the on-ramp for southbound Highway 101;
- Formalize approximately 160 parking spaces for beach users and 120 spaces for visitors to the business area along Santa Claus Lane;
- Secure additional beach parking (i.e., negotiate with Caltrans for use of maintenance lot);
- Identify capital improvement costs and potential funding sources;
- Conduct environmental review on the Project Study Report; and,
- Obtain Board of Supervisors adoption of the Project Study Report.

Applicant's Priority Ranking: The applicant ranks this project third out of three submitted.

Background: Since 2000, the County has been working on securing an at-grade railroad crossing for safe beach access along Santa Claus Lane. The applicant reports that a location for the crossing has been determined and the County is in the process of acquiring that property. A preliminary design for the crossing has been prepared; however, the County is working with the Public Utilities Commission to approve the plan.

The Board of Supervisors has awarded two CREF grants towards safe beach access along Santa Claus Lane:

- \$26,000 in the 2000 CREF cycle to the Parks Department to survey eight properties along Santa Claus Lane; and
- \$22,500 in the 2004 CREF cycle to the applicant (formerly Comprehensive Planning Division) to survey mean high tide line and obtain appraisals on the eight properties.

In addition, the Parks Department received \$72,000 from AB1431 to prepare railway easement documents and engineering studies to support the provision of beach parking. The applicant states that the Parks Department prepared parking designs along the street in front of the beach area and at the Caltrans

maintenance lot with this grant. The applicant plans on working off of this parking design and stated that the plans may be modified, depending on negotiations with Caltrans.

The business owners have prepared a conceptual streetscape plan for the area in front of the commercial area, which the applicant would work with also.

The Santa Claus Lane Streetscape plan has been a potential project in the Work Program since 2008-2009.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (-) means doesn't satisfy; (+/-) means partially satisfies]

- (+) **Criterion #1.** Staff considers the project to have a coastal nexus since it is the first step towards enhancing lateral beach access. It is consistent with the Local Coastal Plan, which encourages public beach access. Staff believes the portions of the project that are associated with beach parking, safe transportation circulation, and linking the business area to the beach area possess the strongest coastal nexus.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The project is the first step towards securing formal parking and lateral beach access along the railroad at Santa Claus Beach. Once implemented, the capital improvements would enhance coastal recreation and tourism.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The Santa Claus Lane beach is very popular for mainly south coast residents and tourists. Once implemented, the organized parking and walkways along the railroad to the proposed beach access would be a benefit to beach goers. The physically disabled will benefit with sidewalks where none exist currently. In addition, visitors to the business area will be benefitted by enhanced parking and an aesthetically pleasing streetscape.
- (+/-) **Criterion #4.** In and of itself, the proposal is considered to be a Planning & Research project and is not considered to be a high priority of CREF. However, the plan is a necessary first step towards capital improvements.
- (+/-) **Criteria #5 and #7.** The applicant seeks the entire budget from CREF. The applicant submitted a grant proposal for \$207,900 to the Caltrans Community Based Transportation Planning Grant Program and expects to hear by September of 2010 if they are successful or not. The applicant states that if successful, it would still need \$154,655 from CREF to complete the project outlined in its work program. The Caltrans grant would not fund some of the tasks outlined in the work program, such as environmental review and adoption hearings.

The business owners along Santa Claus Lane have developed their own conceptual streetscape plan; this effort cost approximately \$17,500 and can be considered as in-kind services.

- (+/-) **Criterion #6.** The County would be responsible for maintenance of the entire project for the first two years. The applicant states that the business owners may be responsible for maintaining the landscaping that fronts the business area after the landscaping has established. The applicant would be responsible for the streetscape that fronts the beach area.

- (+) **Criterion #8.** Staff believes the initial planning project can be completed successfully. Much has been done up to this point (see Background section) and it appears the remaining tasks are mostly to unify the two areas (beach and business) and to prepare detail engineering plans.

Other Considerations: None.

PROJECT # 4
LOOKOUT PARK ARUNDO REMOVAL
MAINTENANCE PROJECT

1st District
Santa Barbara County Agricultural Commissioner's Office
Requests \$8,500
Total Project Costs: \$17,280

Summary of Proposal: The applicant has removed Arundo donax from Lookout Park and requests CREF funds to pay for follow-up Arundo eradication during the fifth and sixth years at this County park. Specific tasks include removing Arundo by hand or herbicide and planting native species in bare hillside spots.

With help from a 2007 CREF grant, the applicant has removed Arundo from Lookout Park. The applicant states that complete control of Arundo is anticipated after five consecutive years of follow-up treatment but some treatments may need to be continued beyond five years. The initial Arundo removal project at Lookout Park and the second and third years of follow up treatment were paid for with the 2007 CREF award. The applicant is paying for the fourth year of treatment with monies from the California Department of Food and Agriculture. However, the applicant states monies for the fifth year are being diverted to other things due to the economy, and in addition, Lookout Park needs a sixth year of treatment.

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

Background: Arundo, an invasive non-native noxious weed, invades riparian channels, especially in disturbed areas. It is very competitive, difficult to control, and does not provide high quality food or nesting habitat for native animals.

The applicant received a \$40,000 CREF grant in the 2007 cycle to remove 1.7 acres of Arundo donax from Lookout Park. The applicant cut the stumps of a mature stands of Arundo, applied an herbicide, and replanted areas with native plants and erosion control material.

Additionally, the Board of Supervisors awarded the applicant a \$21,888 grant in the 2003 CREF cycle to remove Pampas Grass along Arroyo Burro Creek.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (-) means doesn't satisfy; (+/-) means partially satisfies]

- (+) **Criterion #1.** Staff considers the proposal to possess a coastal relationship since it is following up on keeping Arundo off the beach at Lookout Park.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposal enhances an environmentally sensitive coastal resource, the beach ecosystem. Arundo displaces native vegetation and associated wildlife because of the massive stands it forms. Removal of Arundo enhances biodiversity and habitat quality.

- (+) **Criterion #3.** The proposal benefits the coastal ecosystem at Lookout Beach County Park. Removing the Arundo now is cost-effective; if the Arundo returned, it would be more costly in the future.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is considered restoration, which is a capital improvement, which satisfies the higher priority of CREF. The applicant states that complete control of Arundo is anticipated after five consecutive years of follow-up treatment but some treatments may need to be continued beyond five years.
- (+/-) **Criteria #5 and#7.** The applicant is seeking 49% of the project’s funding from CREF and offers the remaining 51% as in-kind services. The applicant offers in-kind services, valued at \$8,780 for project management, some herbicides and plant material costs, and labor costs. The applicant is paying for the fourth year of treatment from the California Department of Food and Agriculture.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** If follow-up treatment beyond six years is needed, costs are considered minimal.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** The initial treatment and planting was completed successfully. The proposal is follow up work to ensure continued success. The applicant successfully implemented its pampas grass removal project, funded by a 2003 CREF grant.

Other Considerations: The applicant proves to be a good CREF applicant, sending in detailed invoices and alerting staff of any project scope or budget changes.

PROJECT # 5
SUMMERLAND COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE

1st District
Santa Barbara County Office of Long Range Planning
Requests \$73,791
Total Project Costs: \$90,423

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests CREF monies to complete the Summerland Community Plan Update. The monies would specifically pay for staff's time to:

- Conduct environmental review of the Plan; and,
- Prepare for and attend adoption hearings in front of the Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors and Coastal Commission.

The applicant states with adoption of the plan, the policies, standards and guidelines would be brought current with the goals of the Summerland area. Among other things, the Plan's major components include: commercial and residential design guidelines, lighting ordinance, and improvements to the vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation of the area.

Applicant's Priority Ranking: The applicant ranks this proposal second of three submitted.

Background: The Summerland Planning Advisory Committee formed and the update on the Summerland Community Plan began in November of 2007.

The Board of Supervisors have identified preparation of the Summerland Plan Update as a project in the Planning & Development Department, Office of Long Range Planning's Work Program since 2007.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (-) means doesn't satisfy; (+/-) means partially satisfies]

- (+) **Criterion #1.** Summerland is a seaside town that affords sweeping ocean views and attracts beach-goers and tourists, especially in the summer months. The Summerland Plan update has both coastal-related and non-coastal related aspects to it. However, since the planning area's characteristics, views, and proximity are closely associated with the ocean, it is considered to have a sufficient coastal nexus.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The applicant's proposal partially enhances coastal tourism and coastal recreation. Summerland is a beach community and a tourist destination. One component of the proposed plan is to improve vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle circulation for this area, which could enhance both access and parking to the beach and the nearby business area.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The project would especially benefit residents of Summerland (population 1,600), beach-goers and tourists.

- (-) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is considered to be a Planning & Research project, which does not qualify as the higher priorities for CREF (capital improvements and acquisitions).
- (+) **Criteria #5 and #7.** The total project costs for the Summerland Plan Update is \$471,904. The applicant has secured (and used) approximately \$381,000 from the Santa Barbara County's General Fund and hopes to secure another approximate \$17,000 from the General Fund in the next fiscal year. The CREF request of \$73,791 equates to 16% of the total project costs. In addition, involvement from Summerland community members can be considered in-kind services toward the project.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** Once the proposed plan is adopted, the applicant states that there will be minor costs anticipated for document publication and staff training on the new provisions. Existing procedures and review bodies are already in place for implementation of the plan, ordinance and guidelines.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** The applicant states that 80% of the project is already completed. The applicant has drafted proposed policies, ordinances and guidelines, and the Summerland community has been actively involved in the development of these policies and guidelines. With funding, staff believes the applicant can successfully adopt the plan.

Other Considerations: None.

PROJECT # 6
OIL IN THE CHANNEL

2nd District
Santa Barbara Maritime Museum
Requests \$75,000
Total Project Costs: \$113,241

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests funds to fabricate and install an exhibit that informs the public about oil and gas development offshore California in its Santa Barbara Maritime Museum. Specifically, the exhibit would include:

- (a) A panel describing how oil is created and a textured geological strata;
- (b) A panel and model of a tomol, describing how the Chumash used beach tar for caulking;
- (c) Panel and models on oil drilling and oil platforms;
- (d) Two videos, depicting:
 - (e) Santa Barbara's present clean beaches;
 - (f) Life on an oil rig;
- (g) Panel of the 1969 oil spill;
- (h) Panels and models of Clean Seas and cleaning equipment
- (i) Rigs to Reef; and,
- (j) New oil extraction technology.

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

Background: The Santa Barbara Maritime Museum is an organization that formed in 1994 to bring our community's maritime history to Santa Barbara County. The maritime museum is located at the harbor in the City of Santa Barbara and opened its doors to the public in July of 2000.

The Board of Supervisors has awarded four grants to the applicant:

- 1996 CREF grant for \$30,000 towards construction of specific maritime exhibit cases;
- 1998 grant for \$15,172 towards construction of an auditorium;
- 1999 CREF grant for \$8,850 towards the museum's library; and
- 2009 CREF grant for \$50,000 towards a surf exhibit.

In the 2002 CREF cycle, the applicant unsuccessfully sought a CREF grant for this exhibit. However, the exhibit idea was just in the preliminary stages at the time.

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 possesses a coastal relationship in that it focuses on oil development offshore California.

- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** The proposed exhibit enhances coastal recreation and tourism by providing information about offshore oil and gas development – a subject with considerable controversy and differing opinions. When reviewing the 2002 proposal that the applicant submitted, Energy Division staff at that time wrote “The extent to which the proposal will meet this criterion ultimately depends on the ability to present a balanced perspective of this rather controversial topic.” This 2010 exhibit does not seem to sufficiently balance perceived benefits of offshore oil development against its impacts (e.g., air pollution, oil spill risks, etc.).
- (+/-) **Criterion #3.** The exhibit would likely attract members of the public interested in details of offshore oil and gas development.
- (-) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is considered educational and therefore, does not satisfy the higher priorities of CREF (capital improvements and acquisitions).
- (+/-) **Criteria #5 and #7.** The applicant has secured \$20,000 from five sources: Western States Petroleum Association, ExxonMobil Foundation, Venoco Community Partnership, PXP Explorations and PPP and some individuals. The applicant requests 66% of the project costs from CREF. The applicant is seeking the remaining \$18,241 from various individuals and companies. The applicant states that it has approximately \$27,500 as in-kind services from interns, environmentalists, Venoco and DiNapoli Design.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** There would be no ongoing County operations or maintenance involved with this proposal.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** The Museum’s overall fund-raising activities have been successful. The applicant has successfully completed four CREF grants in the past. Staff believes this proposal can be implemented.

Other Considerations: None.

PROJECT # 7
SHORELINE PARK IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

2nd District
City of Santa Barbara
Requests \$50,000
Total Project Costs: \$235,160

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests funding towards Phase 1 of the City of Santa Barbara’s Shoreline Park Improvement Project. Phase 1 includes:

- replacing 2,000 square feet of sidewalk;
- replacing 240 lineal feet of chain-link fencing;
- replacing eight pole light fixtures;
- installing two new benches;
- replacing four and installing two new interpretive signs; and,
- installing 5,500 square feet of native landscaping.

The applicant is not proposing to address the landslide area through this project. Phase 2, which is not included in this funding request, includes reconstruction of MacGillivray Point, renovation of the two park restrooms, storm drain improvements, expansion of the group picnic areas to provide wheelchair access, and replacement of the wall that surrounds the playground.

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

Background: Shoreline Park was constructed in 1967 and is a 14.6 acre coastal bluff park with grassy areas, walkways, beach access, group picnic areas, barbeques and viewing benches. In winter of 2008, a landslide occurred along the bluff top and resulted in the loss of the sidewalk and chain-link fencing that would be replaced in Phase 1 of the Improvement Plan. The applicant states that the light fixtures, benches, and interpretive signs are old and in need of replacement.

The City has received \$532,931 in past CREF grants. Associated with Shoreline Park, the City received:

- a \$50,281 CREF grant in the 2000 cycle towards developing a half-mile linear park along Shoreline Drive from the eastern portion of Shoreline Park to the western edge of Leadbetter parking lot; and
 - a \$30,000 CREF grant in the 2002 cycle towards replacing the beach access stairs from Shoreline Park.
-

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 is located at a coastal bluff top park. It is consistent with the City of Santa Barbara's Local Coastal Plan, enhancing recreational opportunities and lateral beach access. The proposed project would help to mitigate cumulative recreational impacts due to the oil and gas developments.

- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposal enhances coastal recreation, coastal tourism and coastal aesthetics by improving amenities at a coastal park. Currently, the sidewalk abruptly ends at safety fencing around the landslide. The proposed sidewalk and fence will allow for pedestrians and people bound to wheelchairs to enjoy passive recreation at this park.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The park is used by many south coast residents and tourists. The proposed improvements would benefit the many visitors to the park. The interpretative signs would inform visitors of the Channel Islands, whale migration and coastal geology. The benches would allow visitors to relax and enjoy the coastal views. The light fixtures would add to the safety of the area in the evening. The sidewalk, fence, and landscaping would enhance those who use the walkways up and down the park.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** As a proposed capital improvement, this proposal satisfies the higher priority of CREF.
- (+) **Criterion #5 and Criterion 7.** The applicant secured \$100,000 towards funding of this proposal and has received preliminary approval for \$85,160 from the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Final approval would occur once the design and permitting of the project is complete. The applicant estimates \$2,400 as in-kind services for volunteers who would attend a community planting day to install the landscaping. The applicant seeks \$50,000 from CREF, which represents 21% of the project costs.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** There would be no ongoing County operations or maintenance involved with this proposal; the City would maintain the improvements.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** The project can be completed successfully; the project is a straight-forward capital improvement project. The applicant is mostly replacing aged or landslide-damaged improvements. With a couple CREF grants, the applicant has completed two projects successfully at or near Shoreline Park.

Other Considerations: None.

PROJECT # 8 OCEAN MEADOWS ACQUISITION

*3rd District
The Trust for Public Land
Requests \$378,000
Total Project Costs: \$7.8 Million*

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests monies to purchase the 63-acre Ocean Meadow property, located north of Devereux Slough and Coal Oil Point, adjacent to the City of Goleta. Acquisition of the property would be the first step towards restoring the property, which is currently developed with a golf course onsite, to its historic 57-acre wetland and 6-acre upland and transitional habitat. Once restored, the property would be preserved in open space for perpetuity and managed for environmental education and research and passive public recreation.

Currently, the property is approximately 70 acres, and there was a conceptually approved project onsite that would:

- subdivide the 70 acres into three parcels of 63.0 acres, 5.9 acres, and 1.1 acres,
- rezone the 63 acres from Planned Unit Development to Recreation,
- develop 32 market rate units on the 5.9 acres, and,
- develop 21 condos, 5 market-rate townhouses, and a club house on the 1.1 acres.

The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors conceptually approved that project. The County believes the developer will be submitting their plans to the County for final approval; however, the County does not know when or if the project may be revised.

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

Background: Ocean Meadow property is mostly surrounded by protected open space. To the south and west of the property is the 69-acre South Parcel, held in a conservation easement by The Land Trust for Santa Barbara County. Beyond the South Parcel to the west is the 230-acre Sperling Preserve at Ellwood Mesa, owned by the City of Goleta. To the south and east is the 170-acre Coal Oil Point Reserve, which is part of the University of California's Natural Reserve System. To the north is an area slated for University housing development. Ocean Meadow is located within the Devereux Slough watershed, with Devereux Creek running through its property as a channelized stream. Most of the historic wetland was filled with soil in 1965 to construct a golf course onsite.

A golf course currently exists onsite, and the site is currently zoned "Planned Residential Development." However, the current owner has received approvals from the County to upgrade the golf course, construct a 4,700 square foot (s.f.), two-story clubhouse/restaurant, a 1,600 s.f. barn and additional parking.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (-) means doesn't satisfy; (+/-) means partially satisfies]

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposed property has a coastal nexus. Acquiring the property is the first step towards restoring the natural wetland habitat that once covered most of the site. It is a critical part of the Devereux Slough. Many publications and policy work support the restoration of this property: Joint Proposal for the Ellwood-Devereux Coast, Ellwood-Devereux Coast Open Space and Habitat Management Plan, University of California, Santa Barbara Campus Wetlands Management Plan, Southern California Wetlands Recovery Project Regional Strategy and Work Plan, UCSB Natural Areas Plan: Classification, Inventory and Management Guidelines, Devereux Slough Restoration Plan, Coal Oil Management Plan, and Santa Barbara County Conservation Element.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** Purchase of the proposed property would enhance environmentally sensitive coastal resources and coastal recreation onsite. The property once had a 57-acre wetland and six acres of upland and transitional habitat. Acquiring the property is the first step towards restoring this historical coastal habitat. Eight wetland communities would be restored onsite, including mudflats, open water, salt marsh and emergent wetland habitat. Restoring the site would benefit a number of special status species, including federally-listed endangered, federally-listed threatened and State-listed endangered species. The property would be preserved in open space for perpetuity and managed for environmental education and research and passive public recreation (walking, birding, and painting). Purchasing the property and ceasing the golf course onsite alone would enhance the downstream Devereux Slough since herbicides and fertilizers would not be applied on the Ocean Meadow site and flow downstream to the slough.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The project would benefit present and future users of this site. The site would be open for passive recreation and linked with adjacent open space areas (e.g. Sperling Preserve at Ellwood Mesa and Coal Oil Point).
- (+) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is a coastal acquisition, which satisfies the higher priority of CREF.
- (+) **Criteria #5 and #7.** The applicant seeks 5% of the total budget costs from CREF. The applicant, in partnership with the California Coastal Conservancy, will seek funding from federal, state, and local agencies, along with some private organizations.
- (+/-) **Criterion #6.** The applicant would transfer the ownership of the property to either the University of California or the County of Santa Barbara. The University's Cheadle Center for Biodiversity and Ecological Restoration is leading the restoration and management of the sites north and south of the property. A potential joint venture between both the University and County may also be pursued.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** The applicant expects to have a signed option agreement with the current owner by June 1, 2010. The applicant recently commissioned an appraisal for the site. There is a significant amount of money needed to be raised for this purchase (almost \$8 million). However, the applicant has identified three federal funding sources to solicit \$7 million. In addition, the applicant is skilled at raising funds to preserve open space property. The applicant has been successful in many open space purchases throughout the state, including several local purchases: Sperling Preserve in Goleta, and Gaviota Village and El Capitan Ranch on the Gaviota Coast. A CREF grant helped the applicant's fundraising with the Sperling Preserve and Gaviota Village, showing local interest and support.

Other Considerations: The applicant states the current owner has received approvals from the County to upgrade the golf course, construct a 4,700 square foot (s.f.), two-story clubhouse/restaurant, a 1,600 s.f. barn and additional parking. If the money cannot be raised within two years, the site may be slated for this development.

PROJECT #9
MATILDA DRIVE PARCELS ACQUISITION

3rd District
City of Goleta
Requests \$315,000
Total Project Costs: \$641,000

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests monies to purchase 6-8 parcels, north of the Sperling Preserve Ellwood Mesa open space in Goleta. There are 17 separately owned parcels that total 6.77 acres in this area that the City hopes to buy and add to the Sperling Preserve. There are no structures on any of the sites and no street access. The applicant has identified three parcels which it states the property owners are ready to sell and the applicant is just working on final negotiations for the purchase. The three parcels are not contiguous but are separated by other parcels. The applicant states that there are two more properties where the property owners have expressed strong interest in selling but negotiations have not begun on these two parcels. These two parcels are located next to two of the three parcels that the applicant is working on final negotiations.

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

Background: In February of 2005, the City of Goleta acquired the 137-acre Sperling Preserve from the Trust for Public Lands. The Sperling Preserve and the adjacent Santa Barbara Shores are known as the Ellwood Mesa Open Space area. The subject properties were not included in the preserve since that purchased involved one owner and a land swap deal.

The Goleta Community Plan, which was adopted in 1993 by the County, stated that the subject parcel sites were located next to ecosystems of regional importance and are “key components of remaining local blocks of coastal open space which experience heavy public use.”

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (-) means doesn't satisfy; (+/-) means partially satisfies]

- (+/-) **Criterion #1.** The proposed properties have a coastal nexus. Past documents identify the parcels as being important because they are located next to coastal ecosystems with regional importance. However, staff is uncertain of how strong the coastal nexus is without knowing how many and which parcels would be purchased. The applicant has identified three parcels that it is in final purchasing negotiations; however, these parcels are not contiguous. If the other parcels around them are not purchased and preserved in open space, the purchased parcels would not possess a strong coastal nexus.
- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** Purchase of the proposed properties could enhance coastal recreation and environmentally sensitive coastal resources. As stated above, past documents identify the parcels as being important because they are located next to coastal ecosystems with regional importance. The applicant states there are numerous informal trails on some of the sites, many leading to the coast. The applicant has identified three parcels that it is in final purchasing negotiations; however, these

parcels are not contiguous. If the other parcels around them are not purchased and preserved in open space, the purchased parcels would not fully enhance coastal recreation and environmentally coastal ecosystems.

- (+/-) **Criterion #3.** Purchasing the entire 17 parcels would benefit present and future users of this site. Historically, many people walk, jog, bike, horseback-ride, bird-watch, and use the site for beach access. However, the extent of the benefit is uncertain without knowing which parcels and how many parcels would be purchased. The applicant states that 6-8 parcels would be purchased. The applicant has identified three parcels that it is in final purchasing negotiations; however, these parcels are not contiguous. If the other parcels around them are not purchased and preserved in open space, the purchased parcels would not have a strong public benefit.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is a coastal acquisition, which satisfies the higher priority of CREF.
- (-) **Criteria #5 and #7.** The applicant seeks 49% of the total budget costs from CREF. The applicant offers 51% towards purchasing the parcels. However, staff is unsure how many parcels would be purchased with this amount of money.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The applicant states that the properties would be maintained with the applicant's current management of the adjoining Sperling Preserve. The applicant states that it has \$158,000 annually budget for the Sperling Preserve, which the applicant characterizes as adequate funding.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** The applicant has sent letters to all 17 property owners and is currently undergoing discussions with some of the property owners who have expressed interest in selling their properties. The applicant states that it is in final purchasing negotiations with three property owners and thinks it will have a final negotiated purchase price within 60-90 days; it says that two others have expressed strong interest but the applicant has not entered into negotiations yet. Also, the applicant states that there are 2-3 other property owners that the applicant has had initial conversations. Since the applicant is still in the process of talking to the owners and there are no final purchase prices or updated appraisals yet, staff believes it is too early to determine if the parcels can be acquired successfully.

Appraisals were prepared in March of 2008. Eleven parcels' values ranged from \$110,000 to 145,000; five parcels' values ranged from \$150,000 to \$200,000 and one parcel was valued at \$610,000. The applicant believes the values may be high since there was difficulty in finding comparison sales and real estate prices have fallen over the last two years. The applicant averaged each cost of the parcels at \$100,000. Staff thinks this average may be a little low for two-thirds of the parcels and is not sure if the total cost of the project, \$641,000 will purchase 6-8 parcels. A CREF grant often helps fundraising efforts by showing local interest and support.

Other Considerations: The parcels are zoned residential but are designated as Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas in the City of Goleta's General Plan/Local Coastal Plan. The parcels' environmental constraints include wetlands or Monarch Butterfly habitat. The applicant states the environmental constraints reduce but do not eliminate the development potential onsite. The appraisal of the properties notes many physical constraints to developing the parcels: environmentally sensitive location, extension of streets would require extensive grading and soil fill, some parcels would need a bridge over Devereux Creek to gain access, setback requirements for creek and wetlands, and small size of the parcels. The appraisal goes on and states "Given the factors discussed above, development of most of the individual subject sites with single-

family residences would be extremely costly and the entitlement process would be lengthy and extremely difficult with an uncertain outcome.” (Appraisal Report by Lea Associates, March 28, 2008, p.9).

PROJECT # 10 GAVIOTA COAST PLAN

3rd District
Santa Barbara County Office of Long Range Planning
Requests \$295,710
Total Project Costs: \$1,095,658

Summary of Proposal: The applicant proposes to prepare a Gaviota Coast Plan. The applicant states goals for the proposed Gaviota Plan would include policies supporting agricultural stewardship and protecting significant coastal resources. The applicant plans to evaluate and update existing policies and regulations in the County’s Coastal Plan, Comprehensive Plan, Grading Ordinance, and Land Use and Development Code and determine the policies effectiveness in protecting Gaviota Coast coastal resources. Where needed, the applicant plans to develop new resource-protection policies and design standards appropriate for the rural character of the Gaviota Coast. The design standards would address size, bulk, scale, and visual impact of new development along the Coast. The applicant states that it will identify areas for restoration and develop policies that would streamline the permitting process for restoration projects. The applicant states that it would plan for additional coastal access, a coastal trail, and connector trails into Los Padres National Forest.

During preparation and development of the proposed plan, the applicant plans to collaborate with Gaviota Coast stakeholders (e.g., landowners, community groups, and local, state and federal agencies).

The applicant’s boundaries for the Gaviota Coast Plan encompasses approximately 100,000 acres along 38 miles of Santa Barbara County’s coast: (1) East boundary is the western urban limit line of unincorporated lands around the City of Goleta; (2) West boundary is Vandenberg Air Force Base; (3) North boundary is the ridgeline of the Santa Ynez Mountain; and (4) South boundary is the Pacific Ocean.

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

Background: There has been much planning activity on the Gaviota Coast in the past. The Board of Supervisors has awarded eight CREF grants towards various agencies and non-profit groups for a total of \$176,452 to help plan for the Gaviota Coast. Below is a summary of those grants.

(1) 1992 Cycle, \$30,000 CREF Grant - Coastal Access Implementation Plan ~ The Planning & Development Department prepared a Coastal Access Implementation Plan, which provides a database of existing recorded offers to dedicate public access.

(2) 1994 Cycle, \$14,452 CREF grant - Phase IV, Cooperative Permanent Coastal Preservation ~ The Land Trust for Santa Barbara County contacted 62 landowners along the Gaviota Coast and held a number of workshops to inform the landowners about conservation easements, transfer of development rights, governmental deductions, agricultural preserve status, and charitable trusts to help preserve the Gaviota Coast in its rural state. Since then, three landowners have entered into either a conservation easement or an outright land purchase with the Land Trust.

(3) 1997 Cycle, \$20,000 CREF grant; and (4) 2000 Cycle, \$27,000 CREF grant - *Perspective on the Gaviota Coast Resources* ~ In July of 2003, the Planning & Development Department, Comprehensive Planning Division compiled an inventory and digital mapping of natural resources along the Gaviota Coast.

(5) 1999 Cycle, \$10,000 grant; and (6) 2002 Cycle, \$15,000 grant - *Gaviota Coast Suitability/Feasibility Study* ~ The National Park Service evaluated resource values and methods to preserve the Gaviota Coast. The National Park Service released the study in April of 2003 (see below for description of the report).

(7) No Cycle, \$15,000 CREF grant; and (8) 2003 Cycle, \$45,000 CREF grant - *Gaviota Coast Common Ground Facilitation* ~ As the National Park Service was conducting its Gaviota Coast Suitability/Feasibility Study (see above), various stakeholders expressed concern that they had not been adequately represented. A steering committee formed to create a Common Ground process, which would develop a locally generated vision for the Gaviota Coast. The two awards paid for a professional facilitator to facilitate a total of 44 meetings during the Gaviota Coast Common Ground process in 2002 through 2004.

There are three documents that have been generated from various planning activities on the coast:

(1) *A Perspective on Gaviota Coast Resources* – This document was prepared by a consulting firm (EDAW) for the Planning and Development Department as a part of the then-ongoing newsletter series. The document was first published in June of 2002 with the purpose “to serve as an informational document and planning tool for the public, decision-makers, and County staff as they face difficult land use decisions for this unique coastal area, now and in the future.” The document focuses on physical resources, and discusses governance and land use, as well as conservation techniques.

(2) *Gaviota Coast Draft Feasibility Study and Environmental Assessment* – This document was prepared and released in April of 2003 by the National Park Service as a result of authorization by Congress in 1999 to study the feasibility of including all or a portion of the Gaviota Coast in the national park system. The feasibility study provided a discussion of the resources and their significance and looked at a variety of management options. Management options included local and state management, National Park Service management, National Reserve, National Seashore and National Preserve. Federal management options were determined to be infeasible due to insufficient land available from willing sellers and strong opposition from area landowners. Only local and state management either as currently managed or with enhanced programs, was considered feasible. In response to the study, the Board of Supervisors held a public hearing on July 1, 2003 and sent a public comment letter concurring with the National Park Service’s conclusions about the importance of the area and feasible management options.

(3) *Respecting Our Heritage, Determining Our Future: Gaviota Coast Study Group Report and Recommendations* – This document was the result of a collaborative effort between Gaviota ranch, farm and landowner interests, local environmental and conservation interests, staff

observers from local, state and elected officials, and occasional public or private advisors. The self-stated purpose of the group “is to discuss and develop a land planning process and strategies that can preserve the character and values inherent in public and private land on the Gaviota Coast in a manner that is acceptable to both property owners and the community as a whole.” The report includes a number of recommendations, including:

- Keeping Agriculture on the Land
- Stewarding the Land and Resources
- Developing Land Use Policy with Equity and Ecology
- Creating Public Access on the Coast
- Providing Effective Local Governance and Finance

Imbedded in these recommendations are a number of actions, including an update to the General Plan and Local Coastal Plan for the Gaviota Coast and the placement of a voter referendum on the ballot for a countywide vote to establish a rural planning area for the Gaviota Coast. The referendum would limit land use and zoning to rural uses for a period of 30 years.

At its March 17, 2009 hearing, the County Board of Supervisors identified preparation of the proposed Gaviota Coast Plan as a high priority project for funding in the 2009-2010 Annual Work Program for Long Range Planning.

To date, the applicant has spent approximately \$221,062 on initiating the project, forming the GPAC and holding GPAC meetings. This money was secured from the County’s General Fund for the 2009-2010 fiscal year.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (-) means doesn’t satisfy; (+/-) means partially satisfies]

(+) **Criterion #1.** The proposed Gaviota Coast Plan has a coastal relationship in that the Gaviota Coast encompasses acreage along 38 miles of Santa Barbara County’s coast. Portions of this coast have been impacted by oil and gas development. The Point Arguello and Las Flores Canyon projects and their associated pipelines are located on the Gaviota Coast. Seven oil and gas platforms can be seen approximately 2-10 miles offshore the Gaviota Coast.

(+/-) **Criterion #2.** The Gaviota Coast possesses coastal resources:

Coastal Aesthetics. The Gaviota Coast is known to many for its scenic rural and coastline beauty. The applicant states that the visual and scenic resources along the Gaviota Coast are vulnerable to degradation through improper location and scale of development, impairment of coastal views, and alteration of natural landforms.

Environmentally Sensitive Coastal Resources. The Gaviota Coast is extremely rich in biological diversity of both terrestrial and marine plant and animal species. The area is home to many endangered and threatened species.

Coastal Recreation Coastal Tourism. The Gaviota Coast includes a wide variety of recreational activities for Santa Barbara County residents and tourists. El Capitan, Refugio, and Gaviota State Parks and Jalama County Park provide coastal access and recreational opportunities, including boating, surfing, swimming, fishing, camping, bicycling, etc. Hiking trails are found in privately owned areas, such as the Arroyo Hondo Preserve and El Capitan Canyon Campground.

The applicant envisions the proposed Gaviota Plan enhancing coastal resources – aesthetics, environmentally sensitive species, recreation, and tourism – through revision and development of new policies and design standards or guidelines. However, in past efforts, Gaviota Coast stakeholders have not always agreed on resource-protection policies or standards that limit development. The outcome of the process in terms of revisions or development of new policies and new design standards that would go beyond enhancing existing policy protection of coastal resources is uncertain.

- (+/-) **Criterion #3.** The proposed Gaviota Coast Plan is intended to provide a broad public benefit, through new resource-protection policies and design standards that would preserve the rural character of the Gaviota Coast. However, Gaviota Coast stakeholders have not always agreed on resource-protection policies or standards that limit development. The ultimate extent of the public benefit would be more clearly understood when the Board of Supervisor deliberates on a final product.
- (-) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is not a coastal acquisition or a capital improvement project; therefore, it does not satisfy the higher priorities of CREF.
- (+/-) **Criteria #5 and #7.** The applicant has spent approximately \$221,062 on initiating the project, forming the GPAC and holding GPAC meetings. This money was secured from the County's General Fund for the 2009-2010 fiscal year. The applicant seeks 27% of the project's estimated costs from CREF. The applicant has not identified how it plans to fund the remaining amount, \$571,886, of staff costs to prepare the plan for three additional fiscal years.
- (+/-) **Criterion #6.** There are no known operating costs at this time; however, such costs could result as part of a final product (e.g., Transfer of Development Rights program).
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** The applicant hopes to develop new resource-protection policies and design standards appropriate for the rural character of the Gaviota Coast. If funded, staff is confident that the applicant can produce a product(s) that will provide the required nexus for CREF mitigation fees. However, planning along the Gaviota Coast has always been an extremely controversial topic. In past efforts, Gaviota Coast stakeholders have not always agreed on resource-protection policies. It is uncertain if the applicant can revise or develop new policies and new design standards that would go beyond enhancing existing policy protection of coastal resources.

The outcome of the process in terms of revisions or development of new policies and new design standards that would go beyond enhancing existing policy protection of coastal resources is uncertain.

Other Considerations: Preservation of the Gaviota Coast has been helped substantially with CREF funding. Approximately 6,750 acres of land along the Gaviota Coast have been preserved to protect

agricultural, natural and cultural resources onsite and to maintain the rural coastline view shed. Approximately half of the 6,750 acres (3,465 acres) have been protected with conservation easements, which protect these resources onsite without allowing public access. However, with the high cost of land acquisition, policies that protect significant coastal resources along the Gaviota Coast may be a cost-effective tool in preserving the Gaviota Coast.

PROJECT # 11
GAVIOTA COAST CONSERVATION PROJECT
THE GAVIOTA RANCH/BRINKMAN FAMILY TRUST

3rd District
The Land Trust for Santa Barbara County
Requests \$378,076
Total Project Costs: \$6,826,000

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests funding towards acquisition on the 3,306-acre Brinkman Family Estate, which is located along the Gaviota Coast, east of the Gaviota Pass and west of Arroyo Hondo Preserve. There are two components to this proposal regarding this acquisition:

- Purchase agricultural and natural resource conservation easements and create two properties of approximately 650 acres each (1,300 acres total), located mainly on the eastern half of the property, which would be held by the applicant. The applicant states the conservation easements would restrict residential uses to a main residence and such accessory structure allowed by the County Zoning Ordinance and land use development code for Agricultural parcels. Each parcel would have a designated residential development envelope located to minimize visual impacts from Highway 101.

One of the 650-acre properties is already developed with a primary residence, agricultural dwelling, barn and other agricultural improvements. The second 650-acre property is undeveloped.

- Purchase approximately 2,000 acres in the west and northern portions of the property, with the intent of transferring this land to the California Department of Recreation and Parks for long-term ownership and management as an addition to Gaviota State Park. (There is a support letter from the State Department of Parks and Recreation in the applicant's application.)

The applicant states that the approximate 2,000 acres that would be transferred to the State Park system is steep and rugged. The proposed configuration of the property would allow for the entire northern portion of the property to be purchased and included in the 2,000 acres. This would connect Gaviota State Park, the Arroyo Hondo Preserve and the County-owned Baron Ranch, east of Arroyo Hondo. The applicant envisions an east-west trail to connect these areas and possibly loop around to the Gaviota Village site; the envisioned trail would follow mostly existing ranch roads and trails. The applicant did state the hike would be a "rigorous" one.

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

Background: The Gaviota Ranch/Brinkman Estate's 3,306 acres is mostly undeveloped land east of the Gaviota Pass. The Gaviota State Park abuts the property to its west, Los Padres National Park to its north, Arroyo Hondo Preserve to its east, and private ranches, oil and gas properties, a Chumash holding, Highway 101, the recently acquired Gaviota Village property and the ocean to its south. The property contains four significant perennial creeks and seven smaller creeks, sandstone and rock outcrops, and several valleys and coastal canyons. The property includes sensitive watershed habitats and connects the

coastal area to the Santa Ynez Mountains. The habitat onsite supports native trout, California newt, Southwester pond turtle, two-striped garter snake, and peregrine falcons.

In the 2003 and 2005 cycles, the Board of Supervisors awarded a total of \$285,000 to the applicant towards acquiring this property. The applicant had to relinquish the monies due to delays in negotiations with the Brinkman Family Estate.

The Board of Supervisors has awarded seven grants to the applicant in past CREF cycles towards Gaviota Coast acquisitions and has approximately \$125,000 unspent funds remaining from the seventh grant:

1. 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;
2. 1997 award for \$32,810 to conduct preliminary title research and land appraisals in order to secure two demonstration conservation easements;
3. 1998 award for \$25,000 towards purchasing conservation easements over the 660-acre Freeman Ranch;
4. 1999 award for \$100,000 towards purchasing conservation easements over the 660-acre Freeman Ranch
5. 2000 award for \$303,268 towards purchasing conservation easements over the 745-acre La Paloma Ranch;
6. 2001 award for \$208,929 towards purchasing Arroyo Hondo Ranch; and,
7. 2002 award for \$330,000 towards purchasing conservation easements (approximately \$205,000 of this grant went to the La Paloma Ranch and the remaining approximate \$125,000 has not been used to date).

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (-) means doesn't satisfy; (+/-) means partially satisfies]

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The Brinkman Estate is located along the Gaviota Coast, offering sweeping views of the Santa Barbara Channel. The property includes sensitive watershed habitats and connects the coastal area to the Santa Ynez Mountains. The habitat onsite supports native trout, California newt, and Southwester pond turtle. The proposal is consistent with preserving open space with the County's Local Coastal Plan.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposal for the Brinkman Estate would preserve open space along the coast, thereby enhancing coastal aesthetics and environmentally coastal habitat and species. San Onofre Creek, one of the four perennial streams onsite, has potential for steelhead trout recovery. Within three years, the applicant would transfer the land to the State to enlarge the Gaviota State Park, which would enhance coastal recreation and coastal tourism. The proposed configuration of the portion to be purchased and transferred to the State park system has great potential for public trails and camping accessed by foot, bicycle or horseback.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The Brinkman Estate proposal would benefit present and future generations. The portion of land to be purchased would open the property's scenic and recreational amenities to the hikers, mountain bikers, and horseback riders. It must be noted that the public portion of the property would be only accessible to very physically fit members of the public. The applicant states the land is very steep and rugged.

- (+) **Criterion #4.** Purchase of coastal land and easements to conserve natural and scenic resources satisfy the higher priorities of CREF, which include coastal acquisitions.
- (+) **Criteria #5 and #7.** The land and conservation easement purchase would cost approximately \$7 million. The applicant has secured approximately \$570,000 in its Gaviota Coast Land Conservation fund. It says that it will seek grant money from voter-approved bond acts and from federal grants. The applicant plans to raise approximately \$1.5 in private donations and foundations. The CREF request represents 6% of the total costs. The State Parks Department that the land would be transferred to has not yet contributed any funds towards acquisition.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** There are no ongoing County operations or maintenance costs. Regarding the Brinkman property, the landowner would be responsible for specific management and improvements required by the easement (i.e., fencing to protect natural resources) and the applicant would manage the easement. The applicant would hold onto the purchased land for three years, giving the State Parks Department time to plan and budget for accepting the transfer of the property. The applicant would work with the State Parks Department and UCSB's Bren School to preliminary plan for the property during those three years. The project budget includes raising \$500,000 for this initial planning, interim management and possible initial trail development.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** The applicant states that it should have an option agreement executed by June 30, 2010. If that is executed, the applicant then has a significant amount of money to raise. It is a hard economic time to be seeking funds for acquiring properties, and there are many properties competing for funds (e.g., Ocean Meadows). However, with past CREF awards, the applicant has successfully completed the purchase of: (a) a conservation easement over the 660-acre Freeman Ranch along the Gaviota Coast; (b) two conservation easements over the approximately 750-acre La Paloma Ranch; (c) the 9-acre Coronado Butterfly Preserve; and (d) the 782-acre Arroyo Hondo Ranch. A CREF grant helped the applicant's fundraising with these projects, showing local interest and support. In addition to its efforts along the Gaviota coast, the Land Trust successfully acquired land, such as the Sedgewick and Carpinteria Bluff properties.

Other Considerations: None.

PROJECT # 12
THREE EXHIBITS:
SOLID TERRAIN MODEL MAP
DISCOVERY BOXES
LOST CITY OF DEMILLE

4th District
Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Center
Requests \$22,325
Total Project Costs: \$25,675

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests funds to develop two new exhibits and update one existing exhibit in the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Center in Guadalupe:

- One of the new exhibits is a 3-dimensional, 3-foot long by 4-foot wide, Solid Terrain Model of the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes complex (from Point Sal to Pismo Beach) and associated watersheds. The applicant states that this model will be used to inform visitors of the ownership and management of the dunes system, various access points, geography and geology of the area. A set of interpretative panels will be associated with the model that inform the visitor of the collaborative efforts of all the agencies and non-profits involved in the stewardship of the dunes system and key challenges facing management of the dunes. (\$4,700 CREF request for the model and \$10,250 CREF request for the panels)
- A second new exhibit is the Dunes Discovery Workshop, which will consist of a series of discovery boxes. The discovery boxes will contain hands-on interpretative information that focuses on using your touching sense to learn, such as owl pellet dissection, soil types associated with the area, and predatory/prey relationships. (\$3,100 CREF request)
- Update of the existing Lost City of DeMille exhibit involves redesigning the display cases to display the artifacts in the exhibit and showing Peter Brosnan's video on the history of making of the movie and the burying of the site. (\$4,275 CREF request)

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

Background: The Dunes Center is a visitor educational 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:

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

- \$21,500 grant in the 2001 cycle to create an interactive computer program about the life history of Guadalupe Dune’s land and sea mammals.

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 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 almost \$3 million. The Dunes Center returned the \$166,836 to CREF because the Center could not secure the additional monies prior to the contract termination date. Although not currently fundraising, the Dunes Center still envisions building an extension onto their existing facility.

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (-) means doesn't satisfy; (+/-) means partially satisfies]

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposal possesses a functional coastal nexus by educating students about the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes habitat and its complex management team. 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 enhances environmentally sensitive coastal resources, coastal recreation, and coastal tourism by educating visitors about the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes habitat. In so doing, this education heightens the sensitivity, respect and enjoyment of this habitat.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The applicant states that the center serves many visitors a year, especially local residents, tourist, and school groups. It serves a community that is economically and educationally disadvantaged. It anticipates that the center will accommodate 13,000 visitors annually.
- (-) **Criterion #4.** This project is considered educational, which does not satisfy the higher priorities of CREF (capital improvements and acquisitions).
- (-) **Criteria #5 and #7.** The applicant seeks 87% of the proposed costs from CREF. The applicant secured the remaining 13% (\$3,350) from a Community Science Workshop Grant from Green Mountain College in Vermont. The applicant estimates \$3,550 as in-kind services from the various managing agencies and organizations for them to provide information about their organization and any graphics, images, and photos.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The project would not require any ongoing County operational or maintenance costs.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** The applicant has successfully completed six CREF grants in the past. The proposal is not elaborate, and staff believes it can successfully complete it. The applicant has successfully operated the Dunes Center for a number of years.

Other Considerations: Two of its CREF-funded educational CD ROMS, Mammalian Marvels and Avian Adventures, won awards from the National Association of Interpretation.

PROJECT # 13
SHORE BIRD COLLECTION EXHIBIT

5th District
The Natural History Museum
Requests \$12,309
Total Project Costs: \$16,909

Summary of Proposal: The applicant requests funds to purchase and transport an existing shore bird exhibit from the High Desert Natural History Museum in Twenty-Nine Palms to The Natural History Museum in Santa Maria. The funds would specifically go towards:

- Purchasing 30 taxidermy shore birds (including sand pipers, gulls, whimbrel, great blue heron, cormorants, scoups, etc.), background exhibit art work, a cabinet, a case, a television, stools, lighting and hardware; and,
- Transporting and installing the exhibit.

The exhibit would be installed in the Hart Home Seashore and Sea Life Exhibit Room of the museum. Next to the exhibit, a television would run a snowy plover video (funded by a past CREF grant) and the Disney's Ocean video (when it becomes available).

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

Background: The Natural History was incorporated in 1996 and received a location for its museum with free rent and utilities from the City of Santa Maria in 1999. The museum's mission is to enhance public school science curriculum. The museum is open four days a week, leads school tours free of charge, and hosts an annual Earth Day event.

The applicant has received three CREF grants in the past:

- \$26,000 grant in the 2001 CREF cycle for an exhibit that depicts a local seashore habitat;
 - \$30,000 grant in the 2004 CREF cycle for an outdoor marine learning area; and
 - \$50,000 grant in the 2006 CREF cycle towards an undersea video, tidal zone exhibit and plate tectonic movement kiosk.
-

Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:

[(+) means the proposal satisfies the criterion; (-) means doesn't satisfy; (+/-) means partially satisfies]

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposal possesses a functional coastal relationship by educating students and visitors about shore birds (including sand pipers, gulls, whimbrel, great blue heron, cormorants, scoups, etc.).

- (+) **Criterion #2.** The project enhances environmentally sensitive coastal resources and coastal recreation by educating visitors about the shore birds and their habitat. In so doing, this education heightens the sensitivity, respect and enjoyment of these birds.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The proposal would benefit mostly residents of Santa Maria. The applicant states that it services under privileged, Spanish-speaking families. The museum is open five days a week (both weekend days), is free to the public, and has Spanish speaking docents and Spanish translation subtitles on some of the videos and exhibits. The museum focuses on enhancing the public science education.
- (-) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is considered educational, which does not satisfy the higher priority use of CREF (capital improvements and acquisitions).
- (+/-) **Criteria #5 and #7.** The applicant requests a small CREF grant, which represents 73% of the project costs. The applicant secured \$4,600 as in-kind donations and services from five sources. In-kind services range from project management, lighting and hardware, labeling of shore birds, and a television set.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The project would not require any additional ongoing County operational or maintenance costs. The applicant has successfully operated the museum now for 13 years and states that volunteers and docents will operate and maintain the exhibit.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** Staff believes the proposal will be completed successfully. The applicant has successfully completed three projects funded by CREF.

Other Considerations: This proposal is time critical in that the applicant has an opportunity to purchase a collection of taxidermy shore birds that another museum wants to sell.

Appendix B

Past CREF Awards by District

1988-2009

Table 1: First District²

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
ANDREE CLARK BIRD REFUGE	\$ 170,000	1988	Cap. Improve. ³
Carpinteria Swimming Pool	150,000	1988	Cap. Improve.
Carpinteria Salt Marsh Land Acquisition	83,000	1990	Acq. ⁴
Carpinteria Salt Marsh Land Acquisition	150,000	1993	Acq.
Carpinteria Salt Marsh Land Acquisition	25,000	1995	Acq.
Carpinteria Salt Marsh Nature Park Interpretative Signs	38,500	2002	Cap Improve.
Carpinteria Salt Marsh, Basin I and So. Marsh Improve. Plan	50,000	2003	Cap Improve.
Santa Barbara Zoo – Sea Lion Exhibit	25,000	1990	Cap. Improve.
Santa Barbara Harbor Boat Launch	150,000	1990	Cap. Improve.
Carpinteria Bluffs Appraisals	20,000	1991	Acq.
Carpinteria Bluffs Appraisals	15,000	1992	Acq.
Carpinteria Bluffs Appraisals	15,000	1997	Acq.
Carpinteria Bluffs Acquisition	100,000	1998	Acq.
Carpinteria Bluffs Acquisition	350,000	1999	Acq.
Carpinteria Bluffs Restroom/Storage Facility	30,000	2004	Cap. Improve.
Carpinteria Creek Appraisals	5,000	1992	Acq.
Loon Point Beach Access Easement	2,872	1990	Acq.
Loon Point Beach Access Easement Realignment	66,000	1994	Cap. Improve.
Lookout Park Accessibility Modifications	30,000	1994	Cap. Improve.
Lookout Park Arundo Removal	40,000	2007	Cap. Improve.
Carpinteria Lions Community Building	25,000	1995	Cap. Improve.
Oceanview Park (Careaga) Acquisition	200,000	1995	Acq.
Channel Drive/Butterfly Beach Stair Refurbishment	27,000	1995 (1999 ⁵)	Cap. Improve.
Pedestrian Improvements at Butterfly Beach	0	2005	Cap. Improve.
Coastal Bikeway, North Jameson Lane	95,000	1995	Cap. Improve.
Summerland Greenwell Park Improvements			
Phase 1	20,000	1996	Cap. Improve.
Phase 2	16,000	2001	Cap. Improve.
Seed Storage/Demonstration Garden	10,000	2005	Cap. Improve.
Bikeway Studies: Santa Claus Lane/Carp. Ave & Ortega Hill	50,000	1996	Cap. Improve.
Hammonds Meadows Beach Access Stairs	10,500	1996	Cap. Improve.
Ocean Recreation Center	60,000	1997	Cap. Improve.
Rincon Beach Access	29,000	1997	Cap. Improve.
Rincon Beach Day Use Area Planning	28,500	2001	Cap. Improve.
Rincon Beach Day Use Area Implementation	7,720	2002	Cap. Improve.
Rincon Beach Day Use Area, Phase I	37,037	2003	Cap. Improve.
Rincon Beach Day Use Area, Phase II	40,000	2006	Cap. Improve.
Rincon Beach Day Use Area, Phase II	92,000	2007	Cap. Improve.
Finney Street Beach Access	21,413	1997	Cap. Improve.
Surfrider Extension Trail	6,440	2000	Acq.

< Table Continues >

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

³Capital improvement

⁴Acquisition

⁵Reallocated in the 1999 cycle

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Santa Claus Lane Preliminary Beach Access	\$ 26,000	2000	Acq.
Santa Claus Lane Beach Access, Phase I	22,500	2004	Acq.
Design Guidelines for Hwy 101 Landscaping and Structures	10,000	1998	Plan/Rsch. ⁶
Carpinteria Creek Watershed Outreach	14,671	2002	Edu ⁷
Carpinteria-Rincon Coastal Multi-Use Trail, Feasibility Study	49,622	2003	Plan/Rsch
Harbor Seal Sanctuary Improvement	12,629	2004	Cap. Improve.
Lifeguard Facility at Ash Avenue/Beach	20,000	2005	Cap. Improve.
Carpinteria Old Town (Palm to Linden) Trail Segment	24,500	2006	Plan/Rsch
Franklin Trail	0	2007	Cap. Improve.
Total	\$ 2,470,904		

⁶Planning & Research

⁷Education

Table 2: Second District⁸

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

< Table Continues >

⁸ Grants awarded between 1988-1991, 1992-2001 and 2002 on all reflect different district boundaries.

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Santa Barbara Maritime Museum			
-- Museum Construction	\$ 30,000	1996	Cap. Improve.
-- Auditorium Construction	15,172	1998	Cap. Improve.
-- Outreach Library	8,850	1999	Cap. Improve.
-- Increase Visibility Project	0	2004	Edu.
-- Surf Exhibit	50,000	2007	Cap. Improve.
Santa Barbara County Veterans Memorial	20,000	1996	Cap. Improve.
Lower Westside Bikeway	29,720	1997	Cap. Improve.
South Coast Watershed Resource Center (WRC)	50,000	2000	Cap. Improve.
WRC & Arroyo Burro Firehydrant/Underground Utilities	29,883	2001	Cap. Improve.
WRC Improvements and Exhibits	19,861	2003	Edu
Shoreline Drive Enhancement	50,281	2000	Cap. Improve.
Shoreline Park Stairs Beach Access	30,000	2002	Cap. Improve.
Audubon Goleta Slough Restoration	15,500	2000	Cap. Improve.
Atascadero Mutt Mitt Stations	4,800	2002	Cap. Improve.
Atascadero Creek Trail Bridge Decking (bridge near Patterson Ave.)	5,118	2004	Cap. Improve.
Atascadero Creek Trail Bridge Decking (bridge near Turnpike Road)	19,000	2006	Cap. Improve.
Shade Structure for Native Plants ⁹	15,000	2002	Cap. Improve.
Lifeguard Towers at Arroyo Burro, Goleta, and Jalama Beaches ¹⁰	57,505	2002	Cap. Improve.
San Jose Creek Bikeway	0	2004	Cap. Improve.
Total	\$3,444,822		

⁹ Benefits both the Second and Third Districts.

¹⁰ Benefits both the Second and Third Districts.

Table 3: Third District¹¹

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Isla Vista			
Camino Corto Acquisition	\$ 550,000	1988	Acq.
Isla Vista Redevelopment Agency -- \$250,000 Loan	0	1991	Acq.
Del Playa Land Swap	10,300	1996	Acq.
Bluff top Acquisition	57,500	2001 (2005) ¹²	Acq.
Bluff top Acquisition	493,159	2003 (2005) ¹³	Acq.
Camino Corto Master Plan & Implementation	17,355	1994	Plan/Rsch.
Camino Corto and Del Sol Vernal Pool Reserve	30,311	1996	Cap. Improve.
Camino Corto and Del Sol Vernal Pool Reserve – Irrig.	30,000	1997	Cap. Improve.
Estero Park Lathhouse for Propagating Natives	24,000	1998	Cap. Improve.
Pescadero Bluff top Improvement	25,000	1999	Cap. Improve.
Del Playa Pelican Park – Water Meter	10,000	2001	Cap. Improve.
Camino del Sur Stairway Improvements	25,000	2001	Cap. Improve.
Bathrooms, Preliminary Planning & Permitting	30,000	2003	Cap. Improve.
Bluff top Acquisition	215,350	2005	Acq.
Improvements to Three Beach Accesses	210,000	2006	Cap. Improve.
Improvements to Walter Capps Park	54,305	2007	Cap. Improve.
Improvements to Walter Capps Park	130,800	2008	Cap. Improve.
Improvements to Walter Capps Park	90,125	2009	Cap. Improve.
Goleta Valley Transfer Development Rights	10,500	1988	Plan/Rsch.
Goleta Beach Slough Revetment	100,000	1988	Cap. Improve.
Santa Barbara Shores/Ellwood Mesa			
Acquisition (Santa Barbara Shores)	1,000,000	1988	Acq.
Acquisition (Santa Barbara Shores)	140,000	1991	Acq.
Improvements	280,000	1991	Cap. Improve.
Improvements	49,981	1991	Cap. Improve.
Improvements	201,724	1991	Cap. Improve.
Debt Repayment (on Santa Barbara Shores loan)	115,217	1996	Acq.
Improvements	46,351	1997	Cap. Improve.
Regional Plan	50,000	2000	Plan/Rsch.
Regional Plan	50,000	2002	Plan/Rsch.
Acquisition (Ellwood Mesa/Sperling Preserve)	367,963	2004	Acq.
Acquisition (Ellwood Mesa/Sperling Preserve)	50,000	2005	Acq.
More Mesa Appraisal and Hazardous Waste Survey	25,000	1990	Acq.
More Mesa Management Plan	10,000	1991	Plan/Rsch.
Mission Santa Ines and Its Harbors Project	8,723	1995	Edu.
Phase II – El Capitan Bikeway and Trail	50,000	1996	Cap. Improve.
Gaviota Creek Fish Passage	50,000	1991 (1996) ¹⁴	Cap. Improve.
Gaviota Creek Fish Passage	20,000	1993 (1996) ¹⁵	Cap. Improve.
Gaviota Creek Fish Passage	30,000	1996	Cap. Improve.

<Table Continues>

¹¹ Grants awarded between 1988-1991, 1992-2001 and 2002 on all reflect different district boundaries.

¹² Reallocated in the 2005 cycle

¹³ Reallocated in the 2005 cycle

¹⁴ Reallocated in the 1996 cycle

¹⁵ Reallocated in the 1996 cycle

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
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.
Facilitation of Common Ground Process	45,000	2003	Plan/Rsch.
Arroyo Hondo Ranch Acquisition	208,929	2001	Acq.
Gaviota Ranch/Brinkman Estate Conservation Easement	0	2003 (2005) ¹⁶	Acq.
Gaviota Ranch/Brinkman Estate Conservation Easement	0	2005	Acq.
Jalama Beach County Park Expansion	616	1996	Acq.
Coronado Acquisition	43,005	1998	Acq.
Coronado Acquisition and Restoration	25,000	1999	Acq.
Ponds and Aviaries -- Animal Hospital	0	1998	Cap. Improve.
San Jose Creek Class I Bike, Planning	74,266	1998	Cap. Improve.
Snowy Plover & Coastal Access Pilot Program	24,989	2001	Edu.
Ocean Beach Nature Center	50,000	2003	Cap. Improve.
Surf Beach Snowy Plover Docent Wind Shelter	0	2004	Cap. Improve.
Doty Property Acquisition	300,000	2007	Acq.
Gaviota Village Property	1,360,938	2008	Acq.
Total	\$7,708,937		

¹⁶ Reallocated in the 2005 cycle

Table 4: Fourth District¹⁷

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Leroy Park Recreational Center	\$ 75,000	1988	Cap. Improve.
Leroy Park Recreational Center	75,000	1990	Cap. Improve.
Leroy Park Recreational Center	75,000	1991	Cap. Improve.
Point Sal Acquisition	125,000	1988	Acq.
Point Sal Road Reopening, Alternative Analysis Report	50,000	2005	Plan/Rsch
Ocean Park Improvements	400,000	1988	Cap. Improve.
Ocean Park Improvements	100,000	1990	Cap. Improve.
Host Site	19,000	1999	Cap. Improve.
Mission Vieja Site Acquisition	50,000	1990	Acq.
Burton Mesa Management Plan	19	1988	Plan/Rsch.
Burton Mesa Management Plan	76,320	1992	Plan/Rsch.
Burton Mesa Management Plan	40,000	1994	Plan/Rsch.
Burton Mesa Acquisition	281,162	1996	Acq.
Burton Mesa Acquisition	72,691	1996	Acq.
Burton Mesa Acquisition	210,000	1997	Acq.
Cabrillo High School Aquarium			
Construction	100,000	1994	Cap. Improve.
Construction	77,943	1998	Cap. Improve.
Construction	123,335	2000	Cap. Improve.
Outreach Program	11,724	1995	Edu.
Technology/Media Exhibit	71,142	2001	Edu.
Santa Ynez River Enhancement Plan ¹⁸	36,088	1995	Plan/Rsch.
Surf Beach Pedestrian Crossing	120,000	1997	Cap. Improve.
Santa Ynez River Open Space/Park	25,000	1998	Acq.
Burton Mesa Chaparral Garden	2,271	2000	Cap. Improve.
Guadalupe Dunes Vehicle Barrier to Protect Snowy Plovers	13,450	2002	Cap. Improve.
Guadalupe Dunes Tractor	89,000	2004	Equipment
Lompoc Aquatic Center	67,126	2002	Cap. Improve.
Dunes Center			
Exhibit Hall/Visitor Center	0	2003 (2005) ¹⁹	Cap. Improve.
Exhibit Hall/Visitor Center	0	2005	Cap. Improve.
Pioneer Space Center's Coastal Display	11,942	2004	Equipment
The Natural Ways Exhibit at La Purisima	63,531	2006	Cap. Improve.
Total	\$2,461,744		

¹⁷ Grants awarded between 1988-1991, 1992-2001 and 2002 on all reflect different district boundaries.

¹⁸ Benefits both the Third and Fourth Districts.

¹⁹ Reallocated in the 2005 cycle

Table 5: Fifth District²⁰

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Waller Park Water Conservation	\$ 125,000	1988	Cap. Improve.
Allan Hancock Theater Expansion	175,000	1990	Cap. Improve.
Peregrine Falcon Reintroduction	5,000	1992	Plan/Rsch.
S.M./Guadalupe Dunes Bikeway			
Bikeway Study	30,000	1992	Plan/Rsch.
General Plan Amendment	374	1996	Plan/Rsch.
Construction of Bikeway, Phase IV	0	1997	Cap. Improve.
Guadalupe Dunes County Park			
Kiosk Staffing	0	1993	Edu.
Management Plan Update	33,222	1994	Plan/Rsch.
Trailer	5,000	1996	Cap. Improve.
Phase II, Master Plan for Road Repairs	23,705	1996	Plan/Rsch.
Implementation Plan	104,065	1998	Cap. Improve.
Implementation Plan	22,935	1999	Cap. Improve.
Guadalupe Dunes Education Center (Dunes Center)			
Construction of Center	0	1994	Cap. Improve.
Construction of Exhibit Hall	0	2000	Cap. Improve.
Exhibits	120,000	1995	Edu.
Ecosystem Education Unit Package	22,500	1999	Edu.
Video of Dunes	22,000	1999	Edu.
Land & Sea Mammals Interactive Computer Program	21,500	2001	Edu.
Santa Maria Valley Discovery Museum			
SEA IT!	24,550	1994	Edu.
SEA IT! Phase II	13,444	1997	Edu.
Ocean Supermarket Exhibit, Phase I	20,000	2002	Edu.
Ocean Supermarket Exhibit, Phase II	79,000	2005	Edu.
Marine Exhibit, Phase I	115,000	2004	Cap. Improve.
Marine Exhibit, Phase II	47,750	2006	Cap. Improve.
Tide & Seek Exhibit	45,000	2007	Cap. Improve.
Belly of the Whale, Phase I	75,000	2008	Cap. Improve.
Belly of the Whale, Phase II	75,000	2009	Cap. Improve.
Point Sal Appraisals	5,000	1995	Acq.
Point Sal Acquisition	33,415	1999	Acq.
Pioneer Park	25,000	1996	Acq.
Santa Maria YMCA Pool	0	1997	Cap. Improve.
Santa Maria Valley Beautiful Earth Week	10,000	1998	Edu.
Salmon & Trout Educational Program	3,000	1998	Edu.
Guadalupe Community Park Ball Fields	25,000	1998	Cap. Improve.
Van for the Environmental Education on Wheels	0	1999	Edu.
Van for the Environmental Education on Wheels	16,500	2001	Edu.
Marine Science Curriculum, Pilot Program	8,332	2000	Edu.
Santa Maria Natural History Museum			
-- Exploring the Seashore Exhibit	26,000	2001	Edu.
-- Sand & Sea Learning Area	30,000	2004	Cap. Improve.
-- From the Beginnings Under the Sea	50,000	2006	Cap. Improve.
Total	\$ 1,437,292		

²⁰ Grants awarded between 1988-1991, 1992-2001 and 2002 on all reflect different district boundaries.

Table 6: Grants Benefiting Three or More Districts

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Earth Day 1990	\$ 10,000	1990	Edu.
Earth Day 1995	10,000	1995	Edu.
Open Space and Recreation Element	50,000	1991	Plan/Rsch.
Coastal Access Implementation Plan	30,000	1992	Plan/Rsch.
Offers to Dedicate Coastal Access	37,843	1996	Plan/Rsch.
South Coast Water Quality – Education Component	26,000	1998	Edu.
California Central Coast Birding Trail	0	1998	Cap. Improve.
Snowy Plover Video	8,930	1998	Edu.
Santa Barbara Wildlife Care Network:			
Upgrades to Seabird Rehabilitation Facility	1,580	2000	Cap. Improve.
Seabird Net Enclosure	1,037	2004	Equipment
Seabird Care Compound	31,800	2005	Cap. Improve.
Seabird Care Compound	120,000	2006	Cap. Improve.
Seabird Care Compound	150,000	2007	Cap. Improve.
Waves on Wheels Van	25,000	2001	Edu.
Marine Mammal Rescue Project	24,408	2004	Equipment
Marine Mammals Rescue Project	10,000	2005	Equipment
Santa Barbara Beaches Hazards Removal Project	0	2004	Cap. Improve.
Total	\$536,598		

Table 7: Amounts Allocated by Districts²¹

District	Amount
First	\$ 2,470,904
Second	\$ 3,444,822
Third	\$7,708,937
Fourth	\$ 2,461,744
Five	\$ 1,437,292
Three or More Districts	\$ 536,598
Total	\$18,060,297

²¹ Grants awarded between 1988-1991, 1992-2001 and 2002 on all reflect different district boundaries.