

# SANTA BARBARA COUNTY BOARD AGENDA LETTER



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

## Agenda Number:

**Prepared on:** November 9, 2005  
**Department Name:** Planning & Development  
**Department No.:** 053  
**Agenda Date:** Monday, November 21, 2005,  
3:00 p.m.  
**Placement:** Special Hearing  
**Estimate Time:** Staff: 10 mins; Total: 2.5 hours  
**Continued Item:** Yes  
**If Yes, date from:** July 12, 2005  
**Document File Name:** g:\group\energy\wp\policy\cref\06\  
cycle\staffreport06.doc

---

**TO:** Board of Supervisors

**FROM:** Dianne Meester, Assistant Director  
Planning & Development

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

**SUBJECT:** Hearing to Allocate Year 2006 Coastal Resource Enhancement Fund Grants

---

## Recommendation(s):

That the Board of Supervisors:

- A. Receive staff's recommendations and take public testimony;
- B. Continue this hearing to December 6, 2005 for final action on recommendations C and D;
- C. Approve CREF awards and staff recommendations for the 2006 CREF cycle on page 18 of the attached staff report, along with the specific preliminary conditions of awards in Appendix A of the staff report; and
- D. Direct staff to prepare the required contractual agreements with grantees, including final grant conditions required, for approval by the Board of Supervisors of the non-County CREF awards.

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

## Alignment with Board Strategic Plan:

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

**Executive Summary & Discussion:**

A total of \$1,279,415 is available in the 2006 CREF cycle:

- \$629,634 of which is devoted only to coastal acquisitions per CREF Guidelines;
- \$398,449 of which is available for both general allocation and acquisitions; and
- \$251,332 of CREF interest, which is available for both general allocation and acquisitions.

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

- Information on the CREF 2006 cycle,
- Evaluations of CREF proposals for this year,
- Funding recommendations for the CREF 2006 cycle, and
- Past CREF awards.

**Mandates & Service Levels:**

**Mandates** – The California Coastal Act and the Santa Barbara County Local Coastal Program require that approval of coastal-dependent industrial uses be mitigated to the maximum feasible to protect coastal resources. CREF provides mitigation for residual impacts that cannot be mitigated through direct measures.

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

**Fiscal & Facilities Impact:**

**Fiscal** – CREF comprises fees collected by the County from four offshore oil and gas projects to mitigate residual impacts to coastal resources. These fees are deposited into a dedicated fund (No. 0063). The allocations recommended in this report involve disbursement of those fees, along with, \$251,332 of accrued interest. Administrative costs are offset by remaining interest earned on annual fees prior to disbursement. For fiscal year 2005-2006, these revenues and expenditures appear on page D-305 of the County’s approved budget: revenues are listed under the line item “Offshore Oil & Gas Mitigation” and expenditures under the line item “Mitigation Programs.”

**Table A: CREF Fees for 2006**

<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Point Arguello</b>	\$223,500
<b>Santa Ynez Unit</b>	\$208,600
<b>Gaviota Terminal</b>	\$ 89,400
<b>Point Pedernales</b>	\$149,000
<b>CREF Fees Per Year</b>	<b>\$670,500</b>

**Facilities** – Specific benefits to County facilities/properties would result or potentially result due to awards of CREF grants to County agencies as recommended. Specific benefits include:

- day use improvements to Rincon Beach County Park;
- new bridge decking to one of the bridges along Atascadero Creek Trail; and
- enhanced stairs at three beach accesses in Isla Vista.

**Attachments:**

Staff Report: 2006 CREF Cycle  
Appendix A: Evaluations of Year 2006 CREF Proposals  
Appendix B: 1988-2005 CREF Awards by District

**2006 CYCLE  
COASTAL RESOURCE ENHANCEMENT FUND  
(CREF)**

**Board of Supervisors Hearing  
November 21, 2005**

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

**BACKGROUND**

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

Since 1988, the Board of Supervisors has awarded 237 CREF grants and one loan for a total of \$15,452,300. Table 1 shows the distribution of past CREF dollars among coastal acquisitions, capital improvements, education, and planning and research (including land management plans that may be associated with acquisitions). Prior to 1990, rating criteria in the CREF Guidelines 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.

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**

<b>PROJECT CATEGORIES</b>	<b>DOLLAR AMOUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
<b>Acquisitions</b>	\$7,802,257	50%
<b>Capital Improvements</b>	\$5,797,728	38%
<b>Planning &amp; Research</b>	\$1,032,078	7%
<b>Educational</b>	\$683,850	4%
<b>Equipment</b>	\$136,387	< 1%
<b>Total</b>	\$15,452,300	

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

<b>GRANTEE</b>	<b>DOLLAR AMOUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
<b>Cities</b>	\$1,027,880	7%
<b>County Agencies</b>	\$7,227,792	47%
<b>Non-Profit Agencies</b>	\$6,566,767	42%
<b>State &amp; Federal Agencies</b>	\$5,000	<1%
<b>Educational Institutions</b>	\$624,861	4%
<b>Total</b>	\$15,452,300	

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

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

<b>CITY</b>	<b>DOLLAR AMOUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
<b>Santa Barbara</b>	\$457,931	43%
<b>Carpinteria</b>	\$347,823	32%
<b>Santa Maria</b>	\$55,000	5%
<b>Lompoc</b>	\$142,126	13%
<b>Guadalupe</b>	\$25,000*	2%
<b>Total</b>	\$1,027,880	

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

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

<b>COUNTY DEPT.</b>	<b>DOLLAR AMOUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
<b>Parks</b>	\$4,223,059	58%
<b>Public Works</b>	\$1,137,389	16%
<b>Planning &amp; Development</b>	\$1,396,294	19%
<b>County Administrator</b>	\$281,162	4%
<b>General Services</b>	\$120,000	2%
<b>Fish &amp; Game Commission</b>	\$3,000	<1%
<b>Third District Supervisor</b>	\$45,000	<1%
<b>Ag. Commissioners Office</b>	\$21,888	<1%
	\$7,227,792	

**FUTURE REVENUES**

In October of 2002, the Board of Supervisors approved the fourth five-year (2003-2007) assessment of payments that are required of the four oil and gas projects that currently contribute to CREF. The Board amended this assessment last fall, reducing the obligation of the Gaviota Oil Terminal in anticipation of its abandonment in 2005. The CREF fee schedule for 2007 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.

Beginning of spring 2007, Energy Division staff will assess the fifth five year (2008-2012) assessment of payments.

**Table 5: CREF Fees\* for 2007**

<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Point Arguello</b>	\$223,500
<b>Santa Ynez Unit</b>	\$208,600
<b>Gaviota Terminal**</b>	\$0
<b>Point Pedernales***</b>	\$134,100
<b>CREF Fees Per Year</b>	<b>\$566,200</b>

\* Assessed at \$29,800 per point, pursuant to CREF Guidelines to reflect 1988 dollars.

\*\* The CREF assessment eliminates GTC points, commencing the quarter following removal of all six tanks onsite. (In this table, we are assuming removal will occur prior to the end of 2006, for illustrative purposes only.)

\*\*\* The reduction in fees assumes that, by the end of 2006, the planted trees around the Surf electrical substation are established, thriving, and of adequate growth to screen the facility. The project did not meet this criterion, so the 2006 CREF fees do not reflect a reduction in points.

## **EVALUATION PROCESS**

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

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

The following criteria guide CREF recommendations:

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

Along with these criteria, staff weighs the following factors in determining its recommendations for CREF funding:

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

## **2006 CREF CYCLE**

**Monies Available.** The 2006 cycle represents the seventeenth CREF cycle. A total of \$670,500 in CREF fees will be available in February, 2006, for grants. Pursuant to the Fund Deferral Program in the CREF Guidelines, half of this amount, or \$335,250 is designated for exceptional acquisitions while the other half is available to fund all types of proposals that enhance coastal recreation, visual aesthetics, tourism, and environmental resources, including coastal acquisitions.

As shown in Table 6, an additional \$62,500 is available in the general allocation fund and designated as Relinquished grants. Three CREF applicants from previous cycles relinquished their grants because they were unable to commence their proposals within two years.<sup>1</sup> Two applicants that

---

<sup>1</sup> *Three relinquished grants:* (a) The Santa Barbara Maritime Museum relinquished a 2004 CREF award of \$10,000 to work with interested parties to try to increase the number of visitors to the harbor area. The applicant stated that it was unable to secure the required matching funds prior to the two-year deadline.

(b) The Comprehensive Planning Division relinquished a 2004 CREF award of \$7,500 to erect a bench and wind shelter for volunteer docents at Surf Beach during the Snowy Plover nesting season. The applicant stated that it did not think the wind shelter was a viable stand-alone project without secured funding for the on-going docent program. (c) The City of Goleta relinquished a 2004 CREF award of \$45,000 to construct the San Jose Bikeway in the second district.

completed their projects refunded an additional \$699, which now is available in the general allocation fund and designated as Refunded monies.

An additional \$294,384 is available in the acquisition fund: \$9,384 was relinquished,<sup>2</sup> and the Land Trust seeks renewal of a 2005 grant in the amount of \$285,000 to fund acquisition of a conservation easement that protects natural resources on a portion of the Brinkman Family Ranch. The Board stipulated that this award shall return to CREF for reallocation if the Land Trust is unsuccessful in negotiating this conservation easement prior to the time that the County considers 2006 CREF allocations. The Land Trust has not yet entered into any agreements for such acquisition. This money is available for reallocation if the grant is not reinstated.

This year staff is releasing \$251,332 that has accumulated in CREF interest; this money is available for either of the two categories (coastal land acquisitions and other types of coastal enhancements).

**Table 6: Funds Available in the 2006 CREF Cycle**

SOURCE OF FUNDING	ACQUISITION	GENERAL ALLOCATION
2006 CREF fees (\$670,500)	\$ 335,250	\$ 335,250
Relinquished monies	\$ 9,384	\$ 62,500
Refunded monies		\$ 699
Eligible for renewal or reallocation	\$ 285,000	
<b>TOTAL AVAILABLE PER CATEGORY</b>	<b>\$ 629,634</b>	<b>\$ 398,449</b>
<b>TOTAL AVAILABLE FOR EITHER CATEGORY</b>	<b>\$ 251,332</b>	

---

<sup>2</sup> The Parks Department relinquished \$9,384 from its 1996 \$10,000 grant to purchase a small portion of the Bixby Ranch to expand the Jalama Beach County Park. The Parks Department reports that the Bixby family is selling a portion of their ranch, which includes the land that Parks Department had hoped to purchase.

**Monies Requested.** The County received 19 proposals for this cycle and one request to reinstate a past grant. These requests seek cumulative awards of just less than \$3.5 million:

- Eighteen proposals seek a total of approximately \$2.8 million in general allocation monies to: (a) improve coastal parks and beach accesses, (b) enhance protection of environmentally sensitive coastal species and their habitats, and (c) enhance facilities that educate the public about coastal resources.
- One new proposal and one request to reinstate a past CREF award seek a total of \$700,000 in acquisitional monies.

Therefore, in the general allocation fund, there is \$2,792,180 worth of requests and only \$398,449 available for allocation. And in the acquisition fund, there is \$700,000 worth of requests and \$629,634 available for allocation. An additional \$250,000 can be added to the amount available in either category.

Table 7 lists the proposals, applicants, and amounts requested. Tables 8 and 9 show types of projects and types of applicants, respectively, in the 2006 cycle.

**Table 7: 2006 CREF Proposals**

<b>DISTRICT</b>	<b>NO.</b>	<b>PROPOSAL TITLE</b>	<b>APPLICANT</b>	<b>AMOUNT REQUESTING</b>	<b>TYPE OF PROPOSAL</b>
<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	<b>1</b>	Rincon County Park Day Use Improvements, Phase II	County Parks Department	\$ 132,000	Capital Improvement
	<b>2</b>	Carpinteria Old Town Trail Segment	City of Carpinteria	\$ 24,500	Capital Improvement
<b>1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup></b>	<b>3</b>	Pharmaceutical Disposal Public Outreach Program	City of Santa Barbara	\$ 25,000	Educational
<b>2<sup>nd</sup></b>	<b>4</b>	El Estero Drain Site Mitigation	City of Santa Barbara	\$ 250,000	Capital Improvement
	<b>5</b>	West Beach Outdoor Showers	City of Santa Barbara	\$ 9,400	Capital Improvement
	<b>6</b>	Arroyo Burro Estuary and Mesa Creek Restoration Project	City of Santa Barbara	\$ 75,000	Capital Improvement
	<b>7</b>	Atascadero Creek Trail Bridge Recycle Plastic Lumber Bridge Decking	County Public Works Department	\$ 19,000	Capital Improvement

<b>DISTRICT</b>	<b>NO.</b>	<b>PROPOSAL TITLE</b>	<b>APPLICANT</b>	<b>AMOUNT REQUESTING</b>	<b>TYPE OF PROPOSAL</b>
<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	<b>8</b>	Replace/Repair Three Beach Accesses in Isla Vista	Isla Vista Rec. & Park District and County Public Works Department	\$ 210,000	Capital Improvement
	<b>9</b>	Acquisition of the Gaviota Ranch/Brinkman Family Trust <sup>3</sup>	The Land Trust for Santa Barbara County	\$ 285,000	Acquisition
	<b>10</b>	Jalama Beach Chumash Demonstration Village	Wishtoyo Foundation	\$ 50,000	Capital Improvement
	<b>11</b>	Jalama Beach County Park Water System Improvements	County Parks Department	\$ 60,000	Capital Improvement
<b>4<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>12</b>	Pool at Righetti High School	Santa Maria Valley Junior High School District	\$1,400,000	Capital Improvement
	<b>13</b>	The Natural Way and Traditional Skills Exhibit	Prelado de los Tesoros de la Purisima	\$ 63,531	Capital Improvement
	<b>14</b>	Seascape Mural	The Dunes Center	\$ 75,000	Capital Improvements

<sup>3</sup> The Land Trust for Santa Barbara County requests a reinstatement of the 2005 \$285,000 CREF grant towards the Gaviota Ranch/Brinkman Family Trust acquisition project. This money is available for reallocation if not reinstated.

<b>DISTRICT</b>	<b>NO.</b>	<b>PROPOSAL TITLE</b>	<b>APPLICANT</b>	<b>AMOUNT REQUESTING</b>	<b>TYPE OF PROPOSAL</b>
<b>5<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>15</b>	Acquisition of land along Santa Maria River for a Nature Center/Trails	City of Santa Maria	\$ 415,000	Acquisition
	<b>16</b>	Marine Exhibit, Phase II	Santa Maria Valley Discovery Museum	\$ 47,750	Capital Improvement
	<b>17</b>	Enhancements/Development of Four Exhibits	Santa Maria Natural History Museum	\$ 114,000	Capital Improvement
<b>County-Wide</b>	<b>18</b>	Wildlife Care Center, Seabird Care Compound	Santa Barbara County Wildlife Care Network	\$ 150,000	Capital Improvement
	<b>19</b>	Beach Park Arundo Removal Project (except 5 <sup>th</sup> District)	Agricultural Commissioner's Office	\$ 42,100	Capital Improvement
	<b>20</b>	Land-to-Sea Agriculture Lands and Coastal Waters Field Tours (except 2 <sup>nd</sup> District)	Community Environmental Council and So. SLO and SB Counties Agricultural Watershed Coalition	\$ 34,699	Educational
<b>Total Requests</b>				<b>\$3,481,980</b>	

**Table 8: Type of Proposal in the 2006 CREF Cycle**

<b>CATEGORIES</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
<b>Acquisitions</b>	\$ 700,000	20%
<b>Capital Improvements</b>	\$2,722,281	78%
<b>Education</b>	\$ 59,699	1%
<b>Total</b>	\$3,481,980	

**Table 9: Type of Applicant in the 2006 CREF Cycle**

<b>CATEGORIES</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
<b>County Agencies</b>	\$ 463,100	14%
<b>Non-Profit Agencies</b>	\$ 819,980	23%
<b>Cities</b>	\$ 798,900	23%
<b>Special District</b>	\$1,400,000	40%
<b>Total</b>	\$3,481,980	

**PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

At the direction of the County Executive Office, staff has adjusted its typical approach to making recommendations for CREF grants. Commencing this year, we offer a more strategic approach that considers potential capital-funding needs within a three-year horizon, somewhat similar to the approach used in the County’s five-year Capital Improvement Program and its three-year Work Program for comprehensive planning. Accordingly, this year’s staff’s recommendation for 2006 grants considers options of deferring some proposals to the 2007 or 2008 funding cycle. Next year, we envision that this approach would evolve to a point where we would provide projected demand for CREF three years into the future.

This 3-year approach allows the Board to consider assignment of funding priorities to pressing needs over a longer period of time, other than the single-year approach typically taken by CREF with regard to general allocation. For 2006, as you will see below, it means shifting resources to funding replacement of Isla Vista stairways, while capital improvements at Rincon Beach and Jalama Beach, as well as others, are revisited in the 2007 cycle, as opposed to funding each proposal for an amount less than the funding requested and needed to carry out each project.

Table 10 shows staff’s recommendations for the 2006 CREF awards, while Table 11 shows preliminary funding options for the 2007 and 2008 CREF cycles. Staff recommends the Board’s approval of recommendations in Table 10 in light of the additional projections provided in Table 11.

We anticipate that Table 11 represents only a snapshot at this point in time, and will likely be refined and augmented prior to funding decisions on the 2007 and 2008 CREF cycles.

*Recommendations for General Allocation Monies.* Staff recommends nine proposals that provide exceptional benefits to different communities and the coastal environment throughout the County in a timely manner. All nine are considered capital improvements. Specifically, the recommended proposals would enhance:

- coastal parks and beaches (Rincon Beach County Park, Carpinteria State Beach, and beaches below the Isla Vista cliffs);
- California Coastal Trail (new bridge decking);
- educational centers with a marine-themed exhibit (La Purisima Mission, Santa Maria Valley Discovery Museum, and Santa Maria Natural History Museum); and
- environmentally sensitive coastal species (Arroyo Burro estuary and injured and oiled seabirds).

Regarding capital improvements proposed by County agencies, the recommendations herein place highest priority on improvements to stairways that connect Isla Vista to its beaches. The Isla Vista Recreation and Park District has expressed interest in owning and maintaining these stairways in the future, once the improvements are completed. A tentative agreement for transferring ownership includes payment of a \$65,000 endowment from the County to the District, the interest from which would fund maintenance in future years. The proposed improvements cost an estimated \$600,000. Public Works has raised \$390,000 and requires another \$210,000 to complete the project, which it is requesting from CREF.

We also have two proposals from County Parks, one to improve water supplies at Jalama Beach and the other to improve recreational amenities at Rincon Beach Park. Staff has recommended funding Rincon Beach park improvements in the 2006 cycle for \$40,000 of the requested \$132,000, while carrying the balance of \$62,000 - \$92,000 over to the 2007 cycle for consideration.<sup>4</sup> Similarly, staff also recommends carrying the entire requested amount of \$60,000 to improve water supplies at Jalama Beach and the Agricultural Commissioner's request to remove Arundo, to the 2007 or 2008 cycle.

*Recommendations for Acquisitional Monies.* There are two entities negotiating with landowners on the Gaviota Coast for acquisition of land in fee and conservation easements. As stated above, the Land Trust for Santa Barbara County requests an extension of its 2005 CREF grant in the amount of \$285,000 towards a conservation easement on the Brinkman estate or another conservation easement along the Gaviota Coast. The Land Trust reports that negotiations remain delayed; however, the trustees and beneficiaries of the Brinkman estate are currently considering a confidential proposal from the Land Trust. In addition, the Land Trust reports that it is negotiating with three other landowners along the Gaviota Coast for conservation easements over their properties. Negotiations with another entity remain confidential at this time. Neither of these entities have an acquisition at this moment but both have the potential to have a negotiated offer within a year. Therefore, staff recommends earmarking the \$285,000 for acquisitions along the Gaviota Coast for one year but not limiting this recommendation to a certain entity. If an entity negotiates a Gaviota Coast conservation easement or land acquisition, staff will bring the

---

<sup>4</sup> The Parks Department has stated that it could seek \$30,000 from the Southern California Wetlands Recovery Small Grants Program towards the bioswale portion of the proposal.



proposal before the Board of Supervisors for consideration. Staff also recommends deferring the remaining acquisition monies, \$344,634, to next year's cycle since no other coastal acquisitions are requesting monies in this cycle.

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

**Table 10: Staff Recommendations for the Year 2006 CREF Cycle<sup>5</sup>**

<b>Proposal Title</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Gen. Allocation</b>	<b>Acquisition</b>
Rincon County Day Use Improvements	County Parks Department	\$ 40,000	
Carpinteria Old Town Trail Segment	City of Carpinteria	\$ 24,500	
Arroyo Burro Estuary Restoration	City of Santa Barbara	\$ 75,000	
Atascadero Creek Trail, Bridge Decking	County Public Works Dept.	\$ 19,000	
Replace Three Isla Vista Beach Accesses	County Public Works Dept.	\$ 210,000	
The Natural Way and Traditional Skills Exhibit	Prelado de los Tesoros de la Purisima	\$ 63,531	
Marine Exhibit, Phase II	S.M. Valley Discovery Museum	\$ 47,750	
Exhibits at the Natural History Museum	Santa Maria Natural History Museum	\$ 50,000	
Seabird Care Compound	Santa Barbara Wildlife Care Network	\$ 120,000	
Earmark Acquisition for the Gaviota Coast (1 year)	No entities		\$ 285,000
Defer for future cycle(s)			\$ 344,634
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$649,781</b>	<b>\$629,634</b>
		<b>\$1,279,415</b>	

**Table 11: Staff Recommendations for Board to Consider in Year 2007 CREF Cycle**

<b>Proposal Title</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Gen. Allocation</b>
Rincon County Day Use Improvements	County Parks Department	\$ 62,000 - \$92,000
Jalama Beach County Park, Water System Improvement	County Parks Department	\$ 60,000
Seascape Mural	Dunes Center	\$ 75,000
Exhibits at the Natural History Museum	Santa Maria Natural History Museum	\$ 64,000
Seabird Care Compound	Santa Barbara Wildlife Care Network	\$ 30,000
Arundo Removal at County Beaches	County Agricultural Commission	\$ 42,100
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$333,100 – 363,100</b>

<sup>5</sup> Specific staff recommendations and preliminary conditions of awards can be found in Appendix A of the staff report.



**Appendix A**

**Proposal Evaluations  
2006 CREF Cycle**

**PROJECT # 1**  
**RINCON COUNTY PARK DAY USE IMPROVEMENTS**  
**PHASE II**

*1<sup>st</sup> District*  
*Santa Barbara County Parks Department*  
*Requests \$132,000*  
*Total Project Costs: \$183,000*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant is seeking funds to complete improvements to Rincon County Park's day use area. The remaining tasks are considered Phase II of the park's improvements:

- installing six family picnic sites;
- installing two individual seating areas;
- installing additional walkways from parking lot to picnic areas and restrooms;
- installing a bioswale for run-off from the parking lot;
- removing non-native invasive plants along beach access stairs and ramp;
- planting various plants, shrubs and trees; and
- installing an irrigation system.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends awarding a partial award of \$40,000 towards the proposal. If the applicant can fund stand-alone portions of this proposal, the award does not have to be contingent on the applicant securing all additional monies. The partial award allows the Park Department to proceed with Rincon Park improvements, while focusing a larger amount of funds on improving the Isla Vista beach stairways. Funding the remaining balance to complete Phase II improvements at Rincon Park could be given higher priority in the 2007 cycle. Staff encourages the applicant to seek \$30,000 from the Southern California Wetlands Recovery Small Grants Program towards the bioswale.

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

**Background:** In the 2001 CREF cycle, the applicant received a \$28,500 grant to prepare engineering, landscape, and irrigation designs, conduct a Phase 1 archaeological report, and obtain permits for the park improvements. The applicant received \$7,720 and \$37,037 from the 2002 and 2003 CREF cycles, respectively. These two grants, along with a \$69,480 AB1431 grant, went towards the park's Phase I improvements. The applicant completed the Phase I improvements in May of 2005; improvements included: walkways from restrooms to stairs and ramp, a 75-person group picnic area, and a new lawn area and irrigation system.

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

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

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

- (+) **Criterion #1.** Rincon Beach Park is located on the bluffs, overlooking the ocean. It is a popular beach access for surfers and beach-goers.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposal would enhance coastal recreation and tourism by adding more amenities to be used at this beach park. In addition, the bioswale would enhance the water quality at the mouth of the Rincon Creek and the ocean.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The proposal would increase the benefit to the approximately 400,000 people who visit the beach park annually. The improvements would offer amenities that the park doesn't have already, including individual viewing areas, family picnic areas, and more landscaping.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** This project is a capital improvement, which along with coastal acquisitions is one of the highest priorities of CREF.
- (+/-) **Criterion #5 and Criterion #7.** In its 2003 proposal, the applicant stated that it would seek monies for Phase II from future CREF cycles and from Prop 12 and 40 grant programs. However, the applicant explained that this proposal was not a priority for Prop 12 and 40. The applicant also seeks \$40,000 from the South Coast East Quimby and Development Trust Fund. The Park Commission recommended the use of these funds at its meeting in August of 2005. The applicant offers \$11,000 as in-kind project management and inspection services. The applicant states that it could also seek up to \$30,000 from the Southern California Wetlands Recovery Small Grants Program for the bioswale portion of the project, which is estimated to cost \$45,000. If the applicant seeks a \$30,000 grant from this funding source, it would reduce its CREF request to 56% of the total budget for Phase II.
- (+/-) **Criterion #6.** Maintenance responsibilities and costs will increase a little once the project is completed.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** Staff believes the applicant can successfully complete the proposal since the applicant has: (a) completed construction plans and specifications for the proposal; (b) secured the necessary Coastal Development permits; and (c) successfully completed Phase I.

**Other Considerations:** The applicant states that the proposal is identified within the County's Five Year Capital Improvement Program, which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in fiscal year 2005-2006. This document does not rank proposals.

---

---

**PROJECT # 2**  
**CARPINTERIA OLD TOWN TRAIL SEGMENT**

*1<sup>st</sup> District*  
*City of Carpinteria*  
*Requests \$24,500*  
*Total Project Costs: \$36,500*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests funds to develop plans and specifications for the Carpinteria Old Town Trail; components of the proposal include designing:

- a trail that will extend from Linden Avenue east to Palm Avenue, connecting downtown Carpinteria to Carpinteria State Beach campground;
- a phytoremediation system along the trail, whereby plants clean pollutants from urban runoff before the water flows into the Carpinteria Salt Marsh; and
- interpretative signs along the proposed trail to inform users of the plants historical uses by the Chumash Indians and the plants current uses with phytoremediation.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends full funding in the amount of \$24,500.

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

**Background:** Currently, when campers from the State beach campground want to access downtown Carpinteria, they do so by the corridor along the railroad tracks (which is illegal and dangerous) or along Sixth Street, which has no sidewalks.

The surface water from approximately 25 blocks of urban area runs through the proposal site before it enters an underground inlet that flows to the Carpinteria Salt Marsh.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

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

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The plans and specifications are considered a first step towards a capital improvement with a coastal nexus. The coastal nexus is trail and educational improvements to a beach campground and water quality improvements to the Carpinteria Salt Marsh.
- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** The plans and specifications would be the first step towards providing beach campers a safe and interesting route to downtown. If and when the trail and interpretative signs are developed, they could, in a limited way, enhance a beach camper's experience, thereby partially enhancing coastal recreational and tourist impacts. The proposal's phytoremediation portion would also enhance environmentally sensitive coastal resources, which are the Carpinteria Salt Marsh and, ultimately, the ocean.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The proposal is a first step; therefore, if and when the proposal materializes, the population who would benefit is a portion of the 500,000 - 800,000 annual visitors to the State Park. In addition, the Carpinteria Marsh's ecosystem would benefit, too.

- (+) **Criterion #4.** This project is a first step towards a capital improvement, which along with coastal acquisitions is one of the highest priorities of CREF.
- (+/-) **Criterion #5 and Criterion #7.** The CREF request represents 67% of the total budget costs, and the applicant offers \$11,000 (33%) as in-kind services for costs associated with environmental review, architectural review, and planning commission meetings.
- Although not apart of this proposal, the applicant does lists several funding sources for implementation of this proposal: itself, the California Coastal Conservancy, Transportation Enhancement Fund, Recreational Trails Grant Program, and the Habitat Conservation Fund Program. For a proposal to be funded through the latter two sources, the proposal has to have had environmental review completed on it.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The plans and specifications are the first step towards installing a trail segment; the applicant plans on seeking funds from other sources (not CREF) to install the trail. In addition, maintenance of the trail would fall under the applicant's responsibility.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** Staff believes the plans and specifications can be completed successfully. The applicant has already received an estimate for the plans and specifications. The State Department of Parks and Recreation, who owns the proposal site's land, is supported of the project and has submitted a letter (dated September 27, 2005) to that effect. In addition, the applicant has successfully installed over a mile of various trail segments for the Carpinteria Coastal Vista Trail. However, once the plans and permits are secured, successful installation of the proposal will be dependent on the applicant's fund raising efforts.

**Other Considerations:** The proposal site is zoned Commercial Planned Development. The City's General Plan has the property zoned Open Space Recreation. This trail segment is part of the proposed trail system in the City's draft downtown specific plan.

The land is owned by the State but outside the Carpinteria State Beach boundaries. The applicant states Carpinteria State Beach General Plan encourages improvement of facilities for hiking, walking, jogging or biking. Specifically listed in the plan is linking the City to the State beach with biking trails.

---

---



**PROJECT # 3**  
**PHARMACEUTICAL DISPOSAL PUBLIC OUTREACH PROGRAM**

*1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> Districts*  
*City of Santa Barbara*  
*Requests \$25,000*  
*Total Project Costs: \$60,000*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The City of Santa Barbara is requesting funds to participate in a “No Drugs Down the Drain” public outreach program. The outreach material will focus on informing people to not flush unused medications down drains and to take the medications to the County’s household hazardous waste collection center. Outreach material would include:

- two-sided bilingual postcards, distributed to Santa Barbara City residents;
- informational letters to be stapled on prescription bags, distributed to pharmacies;
- informational letters, distributed to retirement facilities and medical professionals;
- website, designed to include detailed information about the problems of flushing medications down the drains; and
- newspaper and radio ads.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends denial of this project. The proposal is an important one; however, staff believes it would have a much greater chance of success if the program established convenient sites for the public to drop off unused medication prior to undertaking the outreach (see *Other Considerations* below). In addition, improvements to ocean water quality would seemingly require a broader geographic focus, such as the south coast or the entire county.

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

**Background:** Little is known about the effects of pharmaceutical waste on marine organisms. However, the applicant states that low concentrations of pharmaceutical waste have the potential to exert profound effects on aquatic life. The City of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles County and Orange County Sanitation Districts are embarking on a similar outreach program to inform the public about proper handling of unused pharmaceuticals.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

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

- (+) **Criterion #1.** Staff considers the proposal coastal-related since its focus is the ocean’s water quality.
- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** The applicant proposes an educational program that informs the public, pharmaceutical companies, and medical professional businesses about impacts to ocean water quality caused by flushing medications down the drains. In addition, the proposal will inform the subject audience of proper handling of unused pharmaceuticals. If the targeted audience follows proper handling of unused pharmaceuticals, environmentally sensitive coastal resources (aquatic life) and coastal recreation and tourism can be enhanced.

- (+/-) **Criterion #3.** The proposal is educational, targeting the City of Santa Barbara residents, pharmacies, and medical professionals. However, unless people take action on the informative subject (e.g., properly dispose of unused pharmaceuticals), the public will not benefit from cleaner ocean water. It appears that for the modest CREF request, it could have large implications on the targeted audience. In addition, the material generated from this proposal could be transferred to other jurisdictions for wider distribution.
- (-) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is considered educational, which does not satisfy the higher priority of CREF (capital improvements and acquisitions).
- (+/-) **Criterion #5 and Criterion #7.** The applicant seeks 42% of the proposal costs from CREF and has secured 58% of the total budget. Specifically, the applicant has secured \$35,000 of in-kind services: (a) \$10,000 to prepare and distribute information letters/cards from itself; and (b) \$25,000 for use of existing graphic material, websites, and program development from the City of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles and Orange Counties Sanitation Districts.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** There would be no ongoing County operational or maintenance costs. The applicant states that after one year, it will evaluate the program. If the applicant believes the cards are effective, it will budget the cost of reprinting the cards in its next year budget.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** Staff believes the applicant can successfully complete the tasks it describes in the proposal. The applicant is working with the City of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles and Orange Counties Sanitation Districts who have existing material that the applicant can use.

**Other Considerations:** The applicant has identified the household hazardous waste collection center as one drop off; however, that facility does not accept controlled substances. (Controlled substances are medications that have potential for addiction and/or abuse; commonly controlled substances include codeine, Phenobarbital, morphine, and anabolic steroids.) The applicant is working with the police department to identify options for dropping off controlled substances. The applicant also plans to work with the Pharmaceutical Association and the drug stores to establish an unused medication drop off at the local drugs stores. (The California Pharmaceutical Association supports the program, letter dated October 12, 2005).

---

---

**PROJECT # 4**  
**EL ESTERO DRAIN SITE MITIGATION**

*2<sup>nd</sup> District*  
*City of Santa Barbara*  
*Requests \$250,000*  
*Total Project Costs: Approximately \$800,000*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests funds to mitigate onsite contaminated soil on an approximate acre, located between El Estero Wastewater Treatment Plant's southern border and the railroad tracks (see *Background* section below). Although the feasibility and restoration reports – that will identify specific mitigation for the site – have not been completed yet, the applicant is seeking an estimated amount of money to remove and dispose contaminated soils in a landfill.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends denial of this project, noting that the applicant ranked its three other proposals as higher priorities, and staff consider the three other proposals to exhibit a stronger coastal nexus.

**Applicant's Priority Ranking:** The applicant ranks this proposal fourth among the four it submitted.

**Background:** In 1998, the City purchased the subject site to possibly process biosolids from the treatment plant. Water runoff from development surrounding the site, passes through the site and empties into the Laguna Channel and then, ultimately, the ocean. In 2002, the site was designated as an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area with a species of concern inhabiting wetlands in the nearby vicinity. The applicant designed mitigation and restoration plans, which were required under the Local Coastal Plan. During restoration efforts, the proposal site's soil was found to contain elevated concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons and metals. The applicant had to halt restoration efforts while the County of Santa Barbara's Protection Services Division prepares a feasibility analysis and identifies on-site mitigation. The applicant states that these feasibility and remediation reports should be completed by March of 2006. The reports will either identify removal and disposal of contaminated soil to bring it back to a wetland state or identify capping the soil and use the site for industrial uses.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

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

(+/-) **Criterion #1.** The proposal has a partial coastal nexus; the site was designated as an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area due to the presence of the Southwestern Pond Turtle, which is considered to be partially dependent on a coastal habitat. Pending feasibility reports will either identify removal and disposal of contaminated soil or it will identify capping the soil. If the solution is the latter, the applicant states that it would not seek CREF funding since the site's future use would not be a wetland, thus it would not have a coastal nexus.

- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** The proposal would partially enhance an environmentally sensitive coastal resource since the Southwestern Pond Turtle is partially dependent on coastal streams.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The proposal could help clean up water that, ultimately, empties into the ocean at East Beach. Therefore, beach goers at East Beach would benefit mostly.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is considered a capital improvement, thereby satisfying the higher priorities of CREF (capital improvements and coastal acquisitions).
- (+/-) **Criterion #5 and Criterion #7.** Currently, the total budget for the proposal is unknown; however, the costs of cleaning up the onsite soils will be known after the County of Santa Barbara's Protection Services Division completes an analysis report in March of 2006. The applicant estimates the costs for the proposal will be high; therefore, the applicant is seeking monies in anticipation of this.

The applicant has already spent approximately \$475,000 on restoring the site to a wetland in the past six years. The applicant estimates that it may cost an additional \$350,000 to clean up the soils and restore the site. The CREF request is approximately 30% of the estimated total budget to clean up the onsite soils and restore the site. The applicant states that it plans to seek \$250,000 from the California Integrated Waste Management Board's Solid Waste Disposal Site Clean up Program, and it offers \$50,000 as in-kind services for administrative and project management.

- (+) **Criterion #6.** The proposal would not increase County ongoing costs or operations. The proposed site is owned by the City of Santa Barbara. Restoration efforts are the responsibility of the applicant (the City).
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** It is unknown if the applicant can successfully complete the proposal since the scope of the proposal has not been identified yet. Feasibility reports will identify removal and disposal of contaminated soil to bring it back to a healthy wetland state or it will identify capping the soil and use the site for industrial uses.

**Other Considerations:** None.

---

---

**PROJECT # 5**  
**WEST BEACH OUTDOOR SHOWERS**

*2<sup>nd</sup> District*  
*City of Santa Barbara,*  
*U'Hane Outrigger Canoe Club, and*  
*Santa Barbara Outrigger Canoe Club*  
*Requests \$9,400*  
*Total Project Costs: \$12,400*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicants request funds to install an outdoor beach shower between the harbor boat launch area and West Beach. The proposal consists of a ten-foot diameter concrete slab, an eight-foot by four-foot walkway, and a manufactured four-person column shower.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends denial of this request, noting that a \$75,000 grant is recommended for the applicant's highest priority project, Project #6.

**Applicant's Priority Ranking:** The City of Santa Barbara ranks this proposal second out of four it submitted. The two other applicants are submitting only this proposal.

**Background:** The applicants explain that the shower would be accessed from an existing public sidewalk, located within 10 feet of a city water supply, and would drain into existing beach sand.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

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

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposal has a coastal nexus in that it is an amenity to mostly those who are directly recreating at the beach or in the ocean.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposal would enhance coastal recreation by providing shower facilities for beach-goers, swimmers, youth sailors, kayakers, canoe outriggers, paddlers, surfers, and volleyball players.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The proposal would benefit beach-goers (see list of users in *Criterion #2*) in the West Beach area. The closest public shower facility is at Leadbetter, .75 miles away, and another facility exists at East Beach, 1.5 miles away.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is a capital improvement and satisfies the higher priorities of CREF.
- (+/-) **Criterion #5 and Criterion #7.** The applicants seek 76% of the budget from CREF and offers 24% (\$3,000) as in-kind construction labor services. The applicant does not seek funds from any other sources.

- (+) **Criterion #6.** There would not be any ongoing County operations or maintenance; the City of Santa Barbara would maintain the shower facility.
  
- (+) **Criterion #8.** Staff believes the applicants can successfully install the project; the applicants explain that the proposed type of shower is used at most county beaches, the water line is only 10 feet away, and shower water can drain into the existing sandy beach nearby.

**Other Considerations:** None.

---

---

**PROJECT # 6**  
**ARROYO BURRO ESTUARY AND MESA CREEK**  
**RESTORATION PROJECT**

*2<sup>nd</sup> District*  
*City of Santa Barbara*  
*Requests \$75,000*  
*Total Project Costs: \$1.6 million*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests funds to restore the Arroyo Burro estuary and the confluence of Mesa Creek. Specifically, the restoration activities include five components.

- First component is to naturalize the last 300 feet of Mesa Creek, which drains into the Arroyo Burro Estuary. This component includes:
  - Removing a 300-foot long, 72” wide concrete culvert that currently replaces the last 300 feet of Mesa Creek;
  - Regrading a natural open creek channel where the 300-foot culvert had been removed;
  - Installing seven rock weirs within the new creek channel to reduce erosion; and
  - Stabilizing the creek mouth with brush mattresses and the creek banks with coconut fiber netting and fiber rolls, ungrouted rock and native plantings.
  
- Second component includes removing all non-native vegetation, such as Arundo donax, fennel, castor bean, and pampas grass, from the entire project site and replanting with native species.
  
- Third component involves creation of a new emergent wetland terrace to enlarge the estuary. The applicant will remove existing riprap, excavate a disturbed estuary bank, and plant native species.
  
- Fourth component involves constructing new trails, connecting Arroyo Burro Beach County Park with the Douglas Family Preserve. A pedestrian bridge will be constructed over the newly naturalized Mesa Creek.
  
- Fifth component allows for passage of steelhead fish. This involves constructing three small step pools in the existing riprap and under the bridge that supports Cliff Drive.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends full funding in the amount of \$75,000, contingent on the applicant securing all necessary funds to complete the project.

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

**Background:** The applicant initiated this project a few years ago through public meetings and technical studies, funded by a grant from the Coastal Conservancy.

The Board of Supervisors awarded the applicant a \$12,930 CREF grant in the 2005 cycle. The applicant secured all the necessary funds, obtained all the necessary permits and was scheduled to construct the project in the summer of 2005. However, the budget increased by approximately \$250,000 due to increases in overall construction costs.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

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

- (+) **Criterion #1.** Staff considers the proposal to have a coastal relationship. In practice, the County has only funded creek restoration projects that provide a strong coastal relationship, limiting such CREF grants to areas closest to the coast or enhancement of ocean-related species. This proposal does both, enhancing the Arroyo Burro estuary, the habitat for the endangered tidewater goby, and passage for steelhead fish.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposal would enhance coastal resources, the Arroyo Burro estuary and Arroyo Burro beach, by enhancing the water quality and the habitat. The applicant explains that removing the culvert in Mesa Creek eliminates a potential breeding ground for bacteria; the natural wetland will remove bacteria and other pollutants from the water as it enters the estuary and the ocean. The proposed pedestrian trails would help enhance coastal recreation.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** Sensitive coastal plant species and wildlife, especially various bird species, dependent on the Arroyo Burro estuary benefit from this proposal. Beach-goers benefit from improved water quality at Arroyo Burro beach, and south coast residents, in general, benefit when the ecological functions of natural systems, such as the Arroyo Burro estuary, are enhanced. The applicant states that over a half million people visit Arroyo Burro County Park and the Douglas Family Preserve.
- (+) **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.** Towards the \$1.6 million budget, the applicant has secured \$1,122,000 from six sources: Coastal Conservancy (\$353,000), State Parks and Recreation Department's Habitat Conservation Fund (\$200,000), U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (\$120,000), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (\$25,000), CREF 2005 grant (\$12,930), and applicant's own funds (\$424,000). Secured monies equate to 70% of the proposal's budget. Last year's CREF grant equates to 1% of the proposal's budget, and this year's CREF request equates to 5% of the project's budget. It seeks 24% from one other funding source: \$390,000 from the California Wildlife Conservation Board. The applicant offers \$20,000 as in-kind services from various volunteers for a 2-year establishment period.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The proposal will not affect ongoing County maintenance. The applicant states that the Creeks Program 5-year budget includes \$30,000 a year for maintenance on the Arroyo Burro Estuary Restoration Project.



- (+) **Criterion #8.** Staff believes the project can be completed successfully since the applicant has secured 71% of the project's budget. In addition, the applicant has more realistic costs for the restoration work since it received bids during the summer. Whether these efforts alone can alter the water quality of the ocean at the Arroyo Burro estuary remains to be seen.

**Other Considerations:** None.

---

---

**PROJECT # 7**  
**ATASCADERO CREEK TRAIL BRIDGE**  
**RECYCLE PLASTIC LUMBER BRIDGE DECKING**

*2<sup>nd</sup> District*  
*Santa Barbara County Public Works Department*  
*Requests \$19,000*  
*Total Project Costs: \$30,500*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests funds to upgrade the decking on a bridge, located west of Puente Drive and adjacent to Hidden Oaks Golf course, that is a part of the Atascadero Creek multi-purpose trail. Currently, the 1-inch thick wooden decking is splintering, and the applicant proposes to replace it with a 2-inch thick, recycled plastic lumber. The new decking material would be weatherproofed and has a 50-year warranty.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends full funding in the amount of \$19,000, contingent on the applicant securing all necessary funds to complete the project.

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

**Background:** The subject bridge is 28 years old and serves all the pedestrian, equestrian, and bicycle traffic between Goleta Beach/UCSB/Isla Vista and the eastern portion of Goleta Valley and the City of Santa Barbara.

In the 2005 cycle, the applicant received a \$5,118 grant in the 2004 CREF cycle towards replacing the decking on a bridge that crosses over Maria Ygnacio Creek on the multi-use Atascadero Creek trail. The applicant used the same material it proposes in this year's request and states that the new decking material is extremely effective.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

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

- (+/-) **Criterion #1.** The proposal provides a partial coastal relationship in that it provides safe bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian access to Goleta Beach, the coastal-related portion and also access to non-coastal related destinations, such as UCSB, Isla Vista, eastern Goleta, and the City of Santa Barbara. It is consistent with the County's General Plan and Goleta Community Plan.
- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** The proposal partially enhances coastal recreation by improving the safety and access to the beach and other destinations that are not coastal related (see *Criterion #1*).
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The bridge is heavily used for recreational bicycling, walking, jogging, and horseback riding and for commuting. Staff considers this proposal to have a broad public benefit.

- (+) **Criterion #4.** As a capital improvement, this proposal satisfies the higher priority of CREF.
- (+/-) **Criterion #5 and Criterion #7.** The applicant requests 62% of the budget cost from CREF and offers 38% as in-kind administrative and environmental review services and labor services for installing the proposal. Aside from the \$11,500 in-kind value offered by the applicant, the applicant has not sought other outside funding sources; this is understandable given the relatively small budget.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The County maintains the bridge but the new, more durable decking material would reduce the maintenance costs.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** Once funded, staff believes the project can be completed successfully. The applicant successfully completed a similar project in October of 2004. In addition, the material has been successfully used in other projects, such as the bridge at Oso Flaco, and has a life-expectancy of approximately 50 year or more.

**Other Considerations:** None.

---

---

**PROJECT # 8**  
**REPLACE/REPAIR THREE BEACH ACCESSES**  
**IN ISLA VISTA**

*3<sup>rd</sup> District*  
*Santa Barbara County Public Works Department*  
*Requests \$210,000*  
*Total Project Costs: \$600,000*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests funds to make the following improvements to the three existing beach accesses in Isla Vista:

- Escondido Pass Stairway and Camino Del Sur Stairway
  - replace deteriorated wood stairways and corroded steel fasteners (steel bolts, plates, straps, and tread supports);
  - replace railings; and
  - slip-line approximately 450 feet of storm drain pipes that are located underneath the stairways and attach 90-degree turn downs (to prevent storm drain water from hitting the stairways during high flow).
  
- Camino Pescadero Stairway
  - replace deteriorated wood stairways and corroded steel fasteners;
  - replace railings;
  - repair concrete stair block; and
  - equip the lower portion of the stairway with stainless steel stairs.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends full funding in the amount of \$210,000 as a priority capital improvement in this 2006 CREF cycle.

**Applicant's Priority Ranking:** The Public Works Department ranks this proposal first of two submitted.

**Background:** The applicant owns three out of five beach accesses along the Isla Vista bluffs. Storm drain water and wave action have damaged the wooden stairways.

In the 2001 CREF cycle, the applicant received a \$25,000 grant to equip the lower portion of the Camino del Sur stairway with stainless steel stairs. The applicant completed the project in the summer of 2002 and states that stainless steel solution has been working well.

The applicant unsuccessfully sought a CREF grant in the 2005 cycle for a similar proposal.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

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

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposal is located along and below the Isla Vista coastal bluff top and focuses on beach access. It is consistent with the County's Local Coastal Plan, enhancing open space, recreational opportunities, and beach accesses.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposal enhances coastal recreation by improving the long-term viability of a vertical beach access.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The proposal provides a public benefit, mostly for the residents of Isla Vista and the students at UCSB.
- (+/-) **Criterion #4.** Some of the proposal is considered repair and maintenance (e.g., replace deteriorated wood stairways and corroded steel fasteners), which does not satisfy the higher priority of CREF, but the remaining and bulk of the proposal is considered a capital improvement, which does satisfy the higher priority use of CREF.
- (+) **Criterion #5 and Criterion #7.** The applicant states that it has secured \$390,000 from three sources: \$150,000 from the Coastal Conservancy, \$80,000 from the Shoreline Preservation Fund (UCSB), and \$160,000 from its own budget. This equates to 65% of the budget. The applicant seeks the remaining 35% (\$210,000) from CREF.
- (+/-) **Criterion #6.** The applicant states that the Isla Vista Recreation & Park District is willing to own and maintain these beach accesses, once improvements are completed; however, the District's operation and maintenance of the stairways will be funded through an endowment provided by the County.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** Staff believes the proposal has a high probability of being completed. The applicant has successfully implemented a similar project to the Camino del Sur stairway in the past.

**Other Considerations:** The County and the Isla Vista Recreation and Park District have an agreement that once the capital improvements (outlined in this proposal) are completed, the Isla Vista Recreation & Park District is willing to own and maintain these beach accesses. However as stated in *Criterion #6*, the District's operation and maintenance of the stairways will be funded through an endowment provided by the County.

---

---

**PROJECT # 9**  
**ACQUISITION OF THE GAVIOTA RANCH/BRINKMAN FAMILY TRUST**  
**OR A GAVIOTA COAST EASEMENT**

*3<sup>rd</sup> District*  
*The Land Trust for Santa Barbara County*  
*Requests \$285,000 (to be reinstated)*  
*Total Project Costs: approximately \$6 million*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests that its \$285,000 CREF grant from the 2005 cycle be renewed for one year towards acquisition of a conservation easement on the Brinkman Family Estate or for another Gaviota Coast conservation easement acquisition acceptable to the County.

The Brinkman Estate encompasses two parcels that make up 3,306 acres. There are two components to this proposal regarding this acquisition:

- On a portion of the property, purchase an agricultural and natural resource conservation easement, which would be held by the applicant; and
- On the remaining portion of the property, purchase the property, with the intent of transferring this land to the California Department of Recreation and Parks or Department of Fish and Game for long-term ownership and management.

The amounts of acreage and money for each portion are still under negotiation; however, the CREF request is just for the conservation easement portion.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends denying the applicant's request; however, staff does recommend earmarking the \$285,000 towards acquisition of land or conservation easements along the Gaviota Coast for one year. This amount would be available to any eligible entity and project acceptable to the Board of Supervisors.

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

**Background:** In the 2005 cycle, the Board of Supervisors awarded the grant to the applicant towards acquiring a conservation easement that protects natural resources on a portion of the Gaviota Ranch/Brinkman Family Trust. When awarding this grant, the Board stipulated that this \$285,000 grant shall return to CREF for reallocation if the applicant is unsuccessful in negotiating this conservation easement prior to the time that the County considers 2006 CREF allocations. The applicant states the Brinkman family is still interested but a complex estate settlement process has delayed the Brinkman's decision on the applicant's acquisition proposal.

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, 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.

The Board of Supervisors has awarded nine grants to the applicant in past CREF cycles towards Gaviota Coast acquisitions:

- a 1994 award for \$14,452 to conduct a one-on-one outreach to landowners to explain the benefits of agricultural conservation easements as estate-planning and cash-generating tools;
- a 1997 award for \$32,810 to conduct preliminary title research and land appraisals in order to secure two demonstration conservation easements;
- a 1998 award for \$25,000 and a 1999 award for \$100,000 towards purchasing conservation easements over the 660-acre Freeman Ranch;
- a 2000 award for \$303,268 towards purchasing conservation easements over the 745-acre La Paloma Ranch;
- a 2001 award for \$208,929 towards purchasing Arroyo Hondo Ranch;
- a 2002 award for \$330,000 towards purchasing conservation easements (\$205,000 of this grant went to the La Paloma Ranch and the remaining amount has not been used to date); and
- a 2003 award (this award merged with a 2005 award, see below).
- a 2005 award for \$285,000 towards purchasing a conservation easement on the Gaviota Ranch/Brinkman Family Estate property (this award merged a \$230,000 award from the 2003 cycle and a \$55,000 award from the 2005 cycle; this award is up for renewal this cycle).

---

**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. If the Brinkman Estate proposal does not occur, the applicant would seek another conservation easement located along the Gaviota coast. Separate County approval of specific easements, including terms and provisions, would consider consistency with the Local Coastal Program. Staff cannot judge the extent to which this proposal meets this important criterion until a specific easement is proposed.
- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** The proposal for the Brinkman Estate would preserve open space along the coast, thereby enhancing coastal aesthetics. Since specifics are not known about the portion of land to be acquired and maintained by the State Parks Department, it is unknown if the proposal would enhance coastal recreation, tourism, and environmentally sensitive resources. If the Brinkman Estate proposal does not occur, the applicant would seek another conservation easement along the Gaviota coast, which is one means of preserving natural and scenic resources. However, staff cannot judge the extent to which this proposal meets this important criterion until a specific easement is proposed.

- (+/-) **Criterion #3.** The Brinkman Estate proposal could benefit present and future generations. The portion of land to be purchased could open the property's scenic and recreational amenities to the public. If the Brinkman Estate proposal does not occur, other conservation easements may offer a means of benefiting present and future generations; however, the extent of benefits remain unclear until specific properties are identified.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** Easements to conserve natural and scenic resources satisfy the higher priority of CREF: coastal acquisitions.
- (+) **Criterion #5 and Criterion #7.** Due to confidential negotiations, the total amount of the proposal is unknown. The applicant states the conservation easement would cost somewhere between \$1 million and \$1.5 million. The applicant did not submit an estimate to purchase a portion of the land, but in last year's cycle, the applicant estimated it to be approximately \$4.8 million. For this proposal, the applicant has secured a total of \$481,268: \$125,268 unused balance from a 2002 CREF grant and \$350,000 from foundation grants and community donations. The applicant offers \$6,000 as in-kind legal services. The applicant states that it would seek additional funds from Coastal Conservancy, Wildlife Conservation Board, various foundations, and community supporters.
- (+) **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). The applicant intends to a portion of the land to a state agency.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** 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. In addition to its efforts along the Gaviota coast, the Land Trust successfully acquired land, such as the Sedgewick and Carpinteria Bluff properties. However, currently, the applicant does not have a willing seller for the Brinkman Estate or another conservation easement. In addition, the Land Trust has a large amount of money to raise to purchase a conservation easement and land (over \$6 million for the Brinkman Estate). The high costs of many easements and uncertain willingness of other landowners to sell easements that satisfy obligated use of CREF funds renders future successes uncertain.

**Other Considerations:** There are two entities negotiating with landowners on the Gaviota Coast for acquisition of land in fee and conservation easements. The Land Trust is negotiating with this proposal on the Brinkman Estate and with three other landowners along the Gaviota Coast for conservation easements over their properties. Negotiations with another entity remain confidential at this time. Neither of these entities have an acquisition at this moment but both have the potential to have a negotiated offer within a year.



**PROJECT # 10**  
**JALAMA BEACH CHUMASH DEMONSTRATION VILLAGE**

*3<sup>rd</sup> District*  
*Wishtoyo Foundation*  
*Requests \$50,000*  
*Total Project Costs: \$114,000*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests funds to create an area at Jalama Beach County Park to raise the awareness of Native American people's relationship with the environment through reenactments of life in a typical Chumash village/setting. Specifically, the proposal includes two phases.

- First phase is planning and research:
  - planning and designing the proposed Chumash village; and
  - researching and compiling historical data regarding Chumash life in the area for use of educational material.
- Second phase is constructing a Chumash demonstration village and interpretative center. The Center's components include:
  - a ceremonial circle;
  - a half-circle amphitheater made of wood and stone;
  - a native plant demonstration garden;
  - a traditional Chumash dwelling;
  - a tomol, a mural, and traditional poles; and
  - interpretative signage.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends denying the request. The applicant's project includes two phases: project planning/design as Phase I and implementation as Phase II. Staff recommends the applicant complete Phase I prior to any consideration of CREF funding. Phase I will most likely take more than a year. Jalama Beach is a very sensitive archaeological area and the design of the proposal will need to avoid disturbing any archaeological resources.

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

**Background:** The Parks Commission is supportive of the idea of the Chumash interpretative center.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

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

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposal is coastal-related in that the interpretative center and the programs would focus on how the Chumash Indians lived at the Jalama Beach area hundreds of years ago and the effect the coast had on their lives.

- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposal would enhance coastal recreation and coastal tourism by constructing an interpretative center and cultural programs for visitors to Jalama Beach, showing them how the Chumash lived hundreds of years ago in this area.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The proposal would benefit the visitors and campers to Jalama Beach by increasing the awareness of how the Chumash lived at Jalama Beach hundreds of years ago.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is a capital improvement, which satisfies the higher priority of CREF.
- (+/-) **Criterion #5 and Criterion #7.** The applicant seeks 44% of the proposal's budget from CREF and 56% from other funding sources. The applicant states that it will seek \$50,000 from the Chumash Santa Ynez Band of Mission Indians and \$14,000 from Marisla Foundation. The applicant states that it will seek in-kind services from various youth programs, educational institutions, tribal governments, and community members for activities ranging from curriculum planning to restoration biology.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The applicant hopes to maintain and operate the proposed facility and programs through long-term funding from the Santa Ynez Band of Mission Indians, grants from the National Park Service's Tribal Preservation Program, the Environmental Protection Agency's Environmental Education and Environmental Justice program, the Annenberg Foundation, the Marisla Foundation, and other state, federal and private funding programs. In addition, the applicant states that it expects to receive donations from visitors to the interpretative center. There are no ongoing County operational costs.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** After three years of planning and permitting, the applicant recently received approval from the Malibu Planning Commission for a similar Chumash demonstration village and stream restoration project at Nicholas Canyon. Staff believes the applicant can complete the proposal successfully with the support of the local Chumash.

**Other Considerations:** The applicant's originally CREF proposed included preparation of a Master Plan for Jalama Beach County Park, including a restoration plan for Jalama Creek. Staff alerted the applicant about the Master Plan the County Parks Department prepared in September of 1999. Subsequently, the applicant revised its proposal to what is described above.

The applicant has received a support letter from Vincent Armenta, Chairman of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians (dated November 3, 2005).

---

---

**PROJECT # 11**  
**JALAMA BEACH COUNTY PARK**  
**WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS**

*3<sup>rd</sup> District*  
*Santa Barbara County Parks Department*  
*Requests \$60,000*  
*Total Project Costs: \$70,000*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests funds to install a new water source for Jalama Beach County Park to be a back-up source of water when the existing water supply is depleted, which is an average of 14 days a year (see *Background* section below). Requested funds would specifically pay for:

- surveying the proposed 6,000-foot water line from the well source (on Vandenberg Air Force Base) to the park's existing water storage tanks;
- purchasing pipeline material (pipeline, fittings, conduits, pump system, electrical parts, and miscellaneous parts); and
- installing and connecting the water line.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends deferring this request for consideration in the 2007 CREF cycle in order to focus 2006 CREF dollars on the Isla Vista beach stairways.

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

**Background:** During drought periods and heavy summer peak use, the existing water supply for Jalama Beach County Park gets depleted; this situation occurs an average of 14 days a year. The applicant trucks water to the park on those days. Restroom facility use is restricted to conserve potable water for campers and visitors.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

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

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposal's coastal relationship is improving the water supply for an average of 14 days at a popular coastal park. Jalama Beach provides beach access and camping in a unique and isolated location along the coast. The proposal is consistent with the County's Local Coastal Program.
  
- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** The proposal would slightly enhance coastal recreation and coastal tourism by eliminating restrictions on beach amenities (e.g., restroom facilities). Staff considers this only a slight enhancement to the visitor's experience at the beach park because: (a) the proposal only affects an average of 14 days out of the entire year; and (b) during those 14 days, the visitors are not completely out of water; the applicant trucks in water to lessen the impact on visitors during those days.

- (+/-) **Criterion #3.** Approximately 14 days out of the year, the proposal would provide a small benefit to visitors and campers at Jalama Beach (see *Criterion #2* for reasoning on small benefit). The biggest benefit provided by the proposal would be a financial benefit to the County's budget (see *Criterion #6*).
- (+) **Criterion #4.** This proposal is a capital improvement, which along with coastal acquisitions is a high priority for CREF.
- (-) **Criterion #5 and Criterion #7.** The applicant seeks 86% of the budget from CREF and offers 14% as in-kind labor services to install the pipeline (valued at \$10,000). The applicant does not seek funding from other sources.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The proposal would reduce the need for trucking water to the beach park on an average of 14 days a year. The applicant states that it costs approximately \$4,200 annually (\$300 a day, with an average of 14 days a year) to deliver water when the water supply is depleted. Therefore, once this capital improvement is installed, the County would save approximately \$4,000 annually. Parks Department already maintains the beach park; maintenance and operation of the new water system would be minimal.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** The proposal is considered to have a good probability of being completed successfully. The water well exists, the water storage tanks exist, and the applicant explains that VAFB has preliminarily approved the easement location for the water line; however, the applicant cannot complete the easement until it surveys the land for the proposed water line.

**Other Considerations:** The County Park Commission approved the submittal of this application in August of 2005. The proposal is identified in the County's Five Year Capital Improvement Plan.

---

---

**PROJECT # 12**  
**POOL AT RIGHETTI HIGH SCHOOL**

*4<sup>th</sup> District*  
*Santa Maria Valley Junior High School District*  
*Requests \$1.4 million*  
*Total Project Costs: \$3.4 million*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests funds so that it can:

- enlarge the dimensions of its proposed pool at Ernest Righetti High School by 10 meters to accommodate a shallow end; and
- construct a building that houses changing rooms and restroom/shower facilities for the general public.

Currently, the applicant has enough funds to install a 25 meter by 25 yard pool at this school for its high school students; this size pool does not include a shallow end. However, to make the pool available to the public, the applicant needs to secure another approximate \$400,000 to build an additional 10 meters (to accommodate shallower water), thereby constructing a 35 meter by 25 yard pool. The applicant needs an additional \$800,000 - \$1 million to construct public changing facilities that are separate from the high school students' facilities.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends denial of this request. The applicant is not seeking additional monies from other sources besides the County and without any additional monies, CREF is not sufficiently large enough to make a meaningful contribution to this request.

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

**Background:** The Santa Maria Valley, which includes communities of Orcutt, Sisquoc, Casmalia, Guadalupe and the City of Santa Maria, has a population of over 100,000. There are only two swimming pools available to the public. To address this lack of pools, the applicant has made a commitment to build swimming pools at all of its high schools.

The regular size for a high school pool is 25 meters by 25 yards. At Pioneer Valley High School, the City of Santa Maria is seeking additional funding so that the applicant can enlarge the pool to 35 meters by 25 yards. The additional 10 meters would allow for the shallow water area, thereby making the pool available to the public.

Back in 1992, a group of citizens recognized the need for a community swimming pool in the Orcutt area. The citizens formed a non-profit organization, the Orcutt Aquacenter, to pursue funding for a public pool in Orcutt. The Orcutt Aquacenter organization submitted a proposal in the 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001 CREF cycles. The Board did not fund an award in any of the cycles because the site secured for the pool was situated in the no-build flight zone for the Santa Maria Airport.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

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

- (+/-) **Criterion #1.** The coastal relationship for this proposal is small since pools carry a very limited coastal nexus. This pool's coastal relationship consists of teaching children and adults how to swim so that they can use these skills safely in the ocean.
- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** A small portion of the proposal is considered to enhance coastal recreation by teaching the general public to swim. Once proficient in swimming, people may use this skill in the ocean.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** If the applicant is not successful with securing an additional \$1.4 million, a 25 meter by 25 yard pool will be built at Righetti High School, benefiting the students at that school. However, the pool would not be open to the public since it would not have a shallow end. Therefore, the benefit of the proposal is to the residents of the Orcutt area.

There are only two swimming pools available to residents in the communities of Orcutt, Sisquoc, Casmalia, Guadalupe and the City of Santa Maria. If a third pool is built soon and opened to the public at Pioneer Valley High School, the pool will mostly serve residents of Santa Maria.

- (+) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is a capital improvement, thereby satisfying the higher priorities of CREF.
- (+/-) **Criterion #5 and Criterion #7.** Towards the \$3.4 million budget, the applicant states it has secured \$2 million from the General Obligation Bond C 2004. The CREF request represents approximately 41% of the total budget amount. The applicant does not list other funding sources to seek the additional \$1.4 million.

Looking through similar past CREF proposals, staff suggests the applicant seeks monies from the following possible funding sources: Santa Barbara Foundation, J.M. Long Foundation, Lillybelle Foundation, Palmer Jackson, Alice Tweed Touhy Foundation, Weingart Foundation, Santa Ynez Foundation, Santa Maria Rotary Club, and the YMCA Foundation. In addition, staff recommends the applicant work with various individuals who were involved in the Orcutt Aquacenter organization (see *Background* section above); this organization was successful in raising some funds from various individual donors and various county-wide and national foundations.

- (+) **Criterion #6.** The pool's operation and maintenance would be the responsibility of the applicant. Therefore, there would be no ongoing operational or maintenance costs to the County.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** Since the applicant is not seeking funds from other funding sources and the CREF program does not have the requested \$1.4 million available in this cycle, it is uncertain if the additional 10 meters of the pool will be built. However, the applicant does have a few years to seek the additional monies (see *Other Considerations* below).

**Other Considerations:** The applicant hopes to start construction of this proposed pool in spring of 2007. The applicant states that by March of 2006, it would need to know the size of the pool to move forward with engineering designs and specifications plans.

---

---

**PROJECT # 13**  
**THE NATURAL WAY AND TRADITIONAL SKILLS EXHIBIT**

*4<sup>th</sup> District*  
*Prelado de los Tesoros de la Purisima.*  
*Request \$63,531*  
*Total Project Costs: \$78,674*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests monies for one out of its ten exhibits that will be installed in the new visitor center at La Purisima State Park (see *Background* section below). The specific exhibit, *The Natural Way and Traditional Skills Exhibit*, will provide an interactive opportunity for visitors to learn about the coastal resources (e.g., tar, chert – a glass-like rock, Burton Mesa Chaparral) that were used by the Purisimeno Chumash. Specifically, the exhibit will include:

- Graphic panels, depicting: (a) a Purisimeno Chumash village near the beach and tide pools; and (b) villagers engaging in activities, such as harvesting mussels and abalone, fishing, weaving a juncus basket, shaping a chert knife, and collecting tar.
- Display cases, containing various items, such as shell fish hooks, baskets, tools, and shell beads.
- A touch table, containing natural resources, such as abalone shells, chert, tar, mussel and shells. Information cards, describing each item, will sit in slots on the table.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends full funding in the amount of \$63,531.

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

**Background:** La Purisima Mission State Park allows visitors to sense what life may have been like during the mission period. Approximately a year ago, the State of California funded a building to serve as the Park's visitor center. In the newly built visitor center is a 3,000 square-foot area, where 10 exhibits will be installed. The 10 exhibits will move through California's history.

In 1973, a few docents at La Purisima Mission State Park formed a non-profit cooperative association called *Prelado de los Tesoros de la Purisima*; the name means Keeper of the Treasures of La Purisima. Over 100 volunteers contribute more than 30,000 hours each year, providing interpretative experiences for the park's visitors.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

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

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposal is coastal-related in that the exhibit focuses on the Purisimeno Chumash Indians and their dependency on the coastal environment. The applicant is installing nine other exhibits but is requesting money for the only exhibit that possesses a coastal nexus.



- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposal would enhance coastal tourism by creating an exhibit for students and tourists to learn about the Chumash's interaction with the coast.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The proposal will benefit the approximate 175,000 annual students and tourists visiting La Purisima State Park.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** This project is a capital improvement, which satisfies the higher priority use of CREF.
- (+) **Criterion #5 and Criterion #7.** The proposal's budget is \$78,674; the applicant seeks \$63,531 from CREF and has secured \$15,143 from another funding source. The CREF request equates to 81% of the budget costs. However, the applicant's budget for ten exhibits for the visitor center is approximately \$1.2 million. Out of this \$1.2 million budget, the applicant seeks 95% from other sources, including itself, the Park's gift shop, individual donations, Santa Barbara Foundation, Hutton Foundation, Cultural Stewardship Project and California Missions Foundation.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The project would not require any additional ongoing County operational or maintenance costs. The applicant and the State Parks Department jointly maintain and operate La Purisima State Park. The State Parks Department's responsibilities are ongoing maintenance and staffing for the new visitor center. The applicant helps staff the reception desk at the visitor center and conduct interpretative activities. The applicant hopes to set up a fund to set aside monies for future exhibits and updating of the proposed exhibits.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** Staff believes the applicant can complete the exhibit once funded. Staff further believes the applicant can install some, if not all, of the other nine exhibits over time. The State Parks Department has constructed a building to house the exhibits; this was completed approximately a year ago. The applicant has a comprehensive plan for the proposed ten exhibits for the visitor center. It has funded and is completing one of the exhibits by the end of this year. The applicant has secured approximately \$266,000 of the total budget for the ten exhibits. However, the applicant has a large amount remaining to fund-raise (approximately \$900,000). Staff believes that the applicant will install exhibits for the visitor center one-by-one as it fund-raises over the course of a few years.

**Other Considerations:** The applicant has received a support letter from Adelina Alva-Padilla, Chairwoman of the Tribal Elders Governing Board, Chumash Santa Ynez Band of Mission Indians (dated September 7, 2005).

---

---

**PROJECT # 14**  
**SEASCAPE MURAL**

*4<sup>th</sup> District*

*The Dunes Center*

*Requests \$75,000*

*Project Costs: \$75,000 (\$3 million for entire Dunes Center)*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests funds to create a 28' by 12' mural, depicting the dunes coastal environment, in the proposed Dunes Visitor Center (see *Background* section below). The mural, painted on a curved wall, would be the final exhibit in the exhibit hall. Panels and reading rails, describing the mural's scenes to the viewer, will blend into the foreground of the mural.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends deferring this request for consideration in the 2007 CREF cycle in order to focus 2006 CREF dollars on the Isla Vista beach stairways.

**Background:** The Dunes Center is a visitor educational and research center supporting the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes. The applicant has been fund raising for the construction of a new, 7,300-square-foot visitor center that would house the main exhibit hall, plus a gift shop, restrooms, the Alfred & Anna Multari Environmental Education Center, the Special Collections Gallery, and a 45-seat multimedia theater. The applicant plans to display all current exhibits in the main exhibit hall and add ten more as funds are secured. The Alfred & Anna Multari Environmental Education Center would accommodate visits by large groups of school children to use the wet lab and audio-visual equipment.

The new visitor center represents one of a four-tiered upgrade underway at the Dunes Center that is estimated to cost \$3 million. Other upgrades include:

- Demolition and reconstruction of the adjacent building for use as the administrative and volunteer center of the Dunes Center campus. This phase is fully funded and will be completed by the end of this year.
- Design, fabrication, and installation of ten exhibits and displays that focus on the natural and historical aspects of the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes.
- Redesign of the building that currently serves as the visitor center, converting it into the Olivier Fourie Research library that would serve as a repository for all Dunes Center data.

The Dunes Center (and the Nature Conservancy) have received a number of CREF grants in the past:

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

- a \$22,500 grant in the 1999 cycle to develop and implement an educational package for teachers and students to visit the Dunes Center;
- a \$22,000 grant in the 1999 cycle to produce a 20-minute video of the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes;
- a \$21,500 grant in the 2001 cycle to create an interactive computer program about the life history of Guadalupe Dune's land and sea mammals; and
- a grant in the 2003 cycle (see 2005 grant below)
- a \$190,000 grant in the 2005 cycle (this merged a \$168,000 grant from the 2003 cycle and a \$22,000 grant from the 2005 cycle) towards the Dunes Center exhibit hall and ten exhibits.

In addition, the Board awarded a \$50,000 grant in the 1994 cycle to construct a building to house the Dunes Center. However, the Dunes Center could not secure the necessary additional funds within two years and had to give the money back to the CREF program; the \$50,000 grant was reallocated in the 1997 CREF cycle. The Dunes Center received a \$166,836 grant in the 2000 cycle to construct a building to house exhibits. During the planning process, the Dunes Center decided to design the building with specific exhibits, which increased the cost from \$350,000 to \$2.3 million. Pursuant to the CREF contract, the Dunes Center returned the \$166,836 to CREF because the Center could not secure the additional monies prior to the contract termination date.

---

**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 seashore habitat: through the wrack line, to the near shore and out to the first waves of the breakwater. 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 seashore 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 anticipates that the center will accommodate 49,000 visitors a year.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** This project is considered a capital improvement, which satisfies the higher priority use of CREF.
- (+) **Criterion #5 and Criterion #7.** The applicant seeks 100% of the proposed mural costs from CREF. However, the proposed mural is a part of a larger \$3 million Dunes Center project. Towards this \$3 million budget, the applicant has secured just over \$1 million (35% of the budget): \$75,000 from the California Coastal Conservancy, \$82,000 from the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, approximately \$200,000 from the Dunes Stewardship Collaborative, \$100,000 from the Unocal Foundation, \$110,000 from the Santa Barbara Foundation,

\$200,000 from the City of Guadalupe Redevelopment Authority, approximately \$78,000 in private donations, and \$190,000 from the CREF 2005 cycle. The applicant seeks the remaining 65% from seven other funding sources and CREF. With the 2005 CREF award and this year's CREF request, the applicant seeks a total of 9% of the budget from CREF.

- (+) **Criterion #6.** The project would not require any ongoing County operational or maintenance costs. The first year operational costs are folded into the \$3 million budget. Leasing of office space, point of entry fees, membership fees, gift shop revenues, concession sales, along with the endowment revenues will pay for the operational costs after the first year. In addition, the applicant states that it put considerable effort into selecting an exhibit design team whose primary mandate has been to design and construct high quality, durable, and robust exhibits.
- (+/-) **Criterion #8.** Regarding just the proposed mural, staff believes the applicant can complete it once fully funded. In addition, the applicant states that the applicant's exhibit designer is most proud of its in-house mural painting.

However, to complete the mural, the applicant needs to have a building to house it in. It remains uncertain if full funding for the planned exhibit hall building will be secured. However, the Dunes Center staff has been working hard to raise funds from several sources, and has persevered when fund-raising stalled. After being turn down by some funding sources, for example, the Center made necessary adjustments to its fund-raising efforts by hiring a consultant to examine the feasibility of funding the center, followed by establishing an Advisory Committee, Steering Committees, and a campaign chair that resulted in recent fund-raising successes. In addition, the reconstruction of the administrative building – one portion of the four-tiered plan – is likely to be completed by the end of this year.

**Other Considerations:** In June of 2003, the applicant hired an independent consulting firm to determine the feasibility of funding the proposed upgrades to the Dunes Center from public and private funding sources statewide. The consultant contacted several funding sources and identified prospective grants totaling \$2,338,500. The applicant has secured over \$1 million from over eight sources and is currently seeking over \$2 million from seven other funding sources.

The applicant has successfully operated the Dunes Center for a number of years and has successfully completed a number of exhibits, funded by CREF. Two of its CREF-funded educational CD ROMS, Mammalian Marvels and Avian Adventures, won awards from the National Association of Interpretation.

---

---

**PROJECT # 15**  
**ACQUISITION OF LAND ALONG THE SANTA MARIA RIVER**  
**FOR A NATURE CENTER/TRAILS**

*5<sup>th</sup> District*  
*City of Santa Maria*  
*Requests \$415,000*  
*Total Project Costs: \$765,000*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests funds to purchase 248 acres in and along the Santa Maria River, located east of Highway 101. The applicant plans to construct a self-guided river walk and interpretative garden on the purchased land.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends denying request due to lack of coastal nexus.

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

**Background:** The applicant has developed a Santa Maria River Nature Center at a Santa Maria City-owned building at Preisker Park, one block from the Santa Maria River. Through this Center and its associated curriculum, the applicant will educate students and the public about the watershed environment. The proposed trail system would compliment an established environmental educational curriculum, which three surrounding school districts are implementing.

The applicant unsuccessfully sought funding for development of the Santa Maria River Nature Center in the 1998 and 2000 CREF cycles. During those evaluations, staff stated that only portions of the proposal possessed a coastal-nexus, such as education of the river mouth and ocean and coastal dependent species. Staff encouraged the applicant to return to future CREF funding cycles for these components.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

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

- (-) **Criterion #1.** The proposal is to purchase inland land in and along the Santa Maria River east of Highway 101; this proposal does not have the necessary coastal nexus.
- (-) **Criterion #2.** The proposal would enhance recreation, however not *coastal* recreation. The proposal would not enhance any coastal resources.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The purchased land and associated walking trails would be a benefit to an area that is growing in population rapidly. The applicant states the walking trails would primarily target students (3<sup>rd</sup> through 6<sup>th</sup> graders) while studying an associated curriculum, Santa Maria Valley residents, and tourists.
- (-) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is not a coastal acquisition.

- (+/-) **Criterion #5 and Criterion #7.** The applicant seeks 54% of the total purchase price from CREF. It has secured \$250,000 from the State Department of Parks and Recreation. The applicant states it will seek funding from the Community Development Block Grants program.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The City of Santa Maria Recreation and Park Department commits to funding the maintenance costs for the purchased land.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** Staff believes the applicant can successfully complete this proposal. The applicant has a willing seller, and the applicant has secured 30% of the purchase price.

**Other Considerations:** The applicant has been envisioning the Santa Mara Nature Center and associated trails for approximately nine years. It has a building at Preisker Park designated for the Center. Curriculum associated with the Center's focus has been funded, developed, and used by three surrounding school districts.

---

---

**PROJECT # 16**  
**MARINE EXHIBIT, PHASE II**

*5<sup>th</sup> District*  
*The Santa Maria Valley Discovery Museum*  
*Requests \$47,750*  
*Total Project Costs: \$67,750*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests funds to expand on its existing Marine Exhibit, considered Phase II. Specifically, the applicant requests monies to install:

- a Dock Side Fish Station (\$10,000 CREF request), with take-home science educational booklet, to identify ocean fishes;
- a Pelagic and Coastal Birding Mural (\$9,000 CREF request), to be located above the shipwreck's ocean scene;
- a Birding Activity Center (\$12,000 CREF request), identifying and learning about the physical characteristics (beaks, feet, feathers, etc.) of Central Coast birds;
- improvements to the shark tank (\$16,750 CREF request), including a reverse osmosis system, cooling fans, window shades, artificial reef, and sand filter.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends full funding in the amount of \$47,750, contingent on the applicant securing all necessary funds to complete the project.

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

**Background:** The Santa Maria Valley Discovery Museum recently has moved its location within Santa Maria and held its grand opening in January of 2005. The applicant has received five past CREF grants:

- \$24,500 in the 1994 CREF cycle to install the Tide Pool Touch Tank, the Kelp Forest Tunnel, and the Sea It! Research Vessel exhibits;
- \$13,444 in the 1997 cycle to develop marine science curriculum and conduct workshops for teachers and children;
- \$20,000 in the 2002 cycle and \$79,000 in the 2005 cycle to install an Ocean Supermarket exhibit that teaches adults and children about the marine food chain and the variety of everyday food that comes from the ocean; and
- \$115,000 in the 2004 cycle to install a Marine Exhibit.

All projects have been completed with the exception of filling the shark tank, which is part of the latter project.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

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

- (+) **Criterion #1.** The proposed project is coastal related by function, educating children and adults about ocean fish and coastal bird species.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposal enhances recreation and environmentally sensitive coastal resources by teaching children about ocean fish and coastal bird species and in so doing, heightens the sensitivity of their habitat, the ocean.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The applicant states that this proposal will benefit over 25,000-40,000 people who visit the museum annually. Specifically, the museum attracts children (underprivileged, special educated and at-risk), parents, grandparents, and counselors.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** The project is a capital improvement, which satisfies the higher priority use of CREF.
- (+/-) **Criterion #5 and Criterion #7.** The applicant seeks 70% of the proposal's budget from CREF and secured 30% from the Wood-Claeyssens Foundation and Santa Barbara Foundation.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The proposal would not require any additional ongoing County operational or maintenance costs. The applicant states the museum has an annual budget for maintenance and repair.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** Staff believes the proposal can be completed successfully. The applicant has received five CREF grants in the past, completing four successfully and currently working on completing the fifth. The applicant opened its new museum in January of 2005.

**Other Considerations:** None.

---

---



**PROJECT # 17**  
**ENHANCEMENT/DEVELOPMENT OF FOUR EXHIBITS**  
**AT THE NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM**

*5<sup>th</sup> District*  
*The Natural History Museum*  
*Requests \$114,000*  
*Total Project Costs: \$150,700*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests funds to enhance existing exhibits (see *Background* section) and develop new exhibits in its Natural History Museum. The applicant plans to:

- Enhance its existing “Sealife and Seashore” exhibit (\$19,500 CREF request) by:
  - purchasing and installing lights to better light the existing exhibit;
  - installing an estuary scene with taxidermy shore birds, a tree, and a heron’s nest; and
  - installing a new interactive display, depicting tidals zones, its habitants, and their adaptation and exposure to various elements (e.g., air, sun, seawater, and waves).
  
- Enhance its existing “Outside Titans of the Pacific” exhibit (\$5,000 CREF request) by:
  - installing a water feature for the existing jadite dolphin statue;
  - create a whale costume for visitors to “feel” how it is to be a whale; and
  - create a Jeopardy Game of ocean life.
  
- Develop a new exhibit, “From the Beginnings Under the Sea” (\$44,000 CREF request), which includes:
  - a 15-minute video of local pioneers talking about their recollections of important aspects of our area (e.g., Will Souza talking about his great grandfather on a Portuguese whaler, Owen Rice talking about Twitchell Dam, J.J. Hollister talking about geology of the area) and shown on a TV in the museum;
  - an interactive kiosk that shows plate tectonic movement over time;
  - an oil-painted mural, depicting the central coast during the Jurassic period; and
  - a stratigraphic wall, depicting the geologic strata that lie below the coast and the City of Santa Maria.
  
- Develop a new riparian habitat exhibit (\$45,500 CREF request), which includes:
  - a fiberglass steelhead fish head, where the visitor puts his/her head in the fish’s mouth to hear a few facts about the fish and its life cycle; and
  - a habitat/species diorama.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends a partial grant in the amount of \$50,000, designated for the “From the Beginnings Under the Sea” exhibit (\$44,000) and the remaining monies (\$6,000) could go towards another component of the proposal. The remaining portion would be contingent

on the applicant securing the necessary funds to complete an exhibit. Staff also recommends deferring the unfunded balance of this request for consideration in the 2007 CREF cycle.

**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 completed an exhibit that depicts a local seashore habitat in its museum with a \$26,000 grant in the 2001 CREF cycle. The applicant recently completed an outdoor learning area with a \$30,000 2004 CREF grant.

---

**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 the marine environment, the steelhead trout, an ocean-dependent species, and the history of the coastal environment. Only a small portion of the proposal does not feature a strong coastal nexus.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The project enhances environmentally sensitive coastal resources and coastal recreation by educating visitors about the marine and seashore habitats, the various species that frequent these habitats, and the history of these habitats. In so doing, this education heightens the sensitivity, respect and enjoyment of these habitats.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The applicant states that two school groups and an average of 60 visitors per month visit the museum. The Earth Day event brought in over 100 visitors and the Grapes and Grains October festival brought in over 300 visitors. The applicant states that it is working with various school districts and other regional and local museums to provide science and natural history enrichment programs for students and teachers.
- (+) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is a capital improvement, which satisfies the higher priority use of CREF.
- (+/-) **Criterion #5 and Criterion #7.** The applicant seeks 76% of the project costs from CREF. The applicant secured \$27,500 as in-kind donations and services from five sources. The applicant is applying for another \$10,200 for in-kind services from four additional sources. Services range from lighting, taxidermy, installation of the estuary exhibit, interactive kiosk, and prehistoric mural.
- (+) **Criterion #6.** The project would not require any additional ongoing County operational or maintenance costs. The applicant has successfully operated the museum now for six 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 its last two exhibits funded by CREF.

**Other Considerations:** None.

---

---

**PROJECT # 18**  
**WILDLIFE CARE CENTER**  
**SEABIRD CARE COMPOUND**

*County-Wide*  
*Santa Barbara Wildlife Care Network*  
*Requests \$150,000*  
*Total Project Costs: \$400,000 (\$3.6 million for entire Wildlife Care Center)*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant requests funds to help construct a seabird care compound as part of the comprehensive wildlife care center (see *Background* section below) that the applicant is developing on 1.5 acres of land in the Goleta foothills. The seabird care compound will consist of the following facilities:

- a 20' x 100' x 20' pelican aviary;
- a 10' x 30' x 4' shallow pool aviary, with fencing, nets, and hooded top;
- four warm water rehabilitation ponds in a stepped series;
- a 12' x 4' soft water recovery pool for oiled birds after washing;
- a water filtration and softening system;
- water heating system; and
- a permanent, enclosed seabird-washing station, with a storage tank for oiled wastewater.

Additional costs for the seabird care compound include a portion of the entire wildlife care center's costs for contractor fees, construction permits, project engineering and drawings, perimeter fencing, site preparation and concrete slabs, and water filtration, softening, and heating systems.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends a partial award of \$120,000, contingent on the applicant securing all monies to complete the seabird care compound. Staff also recommends deferring the unfunded balance of this request for consideration in the 2007 CREF cycle.

**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 recently purchased a 1.5-acre parcel and plans to construct a wildlife care center. The center will have an administrative office, an intake area, a main clinic, a quarantine area for sick animals, mammal care facilities, covered outdoor enclosures for large and small animals being rehabilitated, a songbird compound, a seabird compound, hawk and eagle aviaries, and a sanctuary for unreleaseable wildlife.

In past CREF cycles, the applicant has received:

- 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;
- a \$1,037 grant in the 2004 cycle to purchase a net to discourage visiting birds to the existing sea bird facility; and
- a \$31,800 grant in the 2005 cycle towards the proposed seabird compound.

In addition, 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 sea birds. 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.
- (+) **Criterion #5 and Criterion #7.** The applicant states that the entire budget for the wildlife care center is \$3.6 million (this includes the \$1.5 million used to purchase the 1.5-acre property). The applicant has secured \$1.8 towards that budget. The applicant seeks monies from CREF for the only coastal nexus portion of the proposed Center – the Seabird Compound.

The applicant seeks approximately 38% of the seabird compound budget with this year's CREF request. Last year's CREF request equates to 8%. The seabird care compound portion of the wildlife care center is \$400,000. Towards this \$400,000, the applicant has secured \$105,500 from five sources: the 2005 CREF grant cycle, the 2004 Santa Barbara Foundation cycle, Dos Cuadras Offshore Resources, Othwaite Foundation, and all SBWCN's board members. The applicant has received \$25,000 as in-kind services for architectural and engineering fees, and Venoco has pledged \$9,000. A \$30,000 grant from the 2005 Santa Barbara Foundation cycle is pending. The applicant states that it plans to seek the remaining \$80,500 from various foundations and corporations.

- (+) **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 15 years. The applicant states that its operating and maintenance budget would come from its annual fund-raising program.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** Staff expects the applicant to complete the proposal successfully. There is a huge need and a lot of support for the facility. The applicant has secured 50% of its entire budget for the wildlife care facility. It purchased a 1.5 acre property for the facility and met with neighbors surrounding the property. It has submitted applications to the Planning & Development Department and hopes to receive permits by the end of this year. The applicant has successfully been rescuing and rehabilitating birds for over 16 years. It has

successfully completed two small CREF grants. However, the applicant still needs to raise approximately \$1.8 million more.

**Other Considerations:** The applicant states that its first priority for fund-raising is to raise the money to prepare the site and to install the seabird compound. The neighbors on either side of the current seabird facility (located in the backyard of a residential home) have been frustrated with the odors caused by “visiting” birds to the pond. The applicant has worked with the neighbors and the International Bird Rescue and Research Center to design a netting enclosure to completely cover the current pond, thereby eliminating access for visiting birds. However, the applicant would like to move the seabird facility to the new site as soon as possible to appease the neighbors of the current site.

There may be opportunity in the future to condition proposed oil and gas projects to contribute money towards establishing and operating a bird and wildlife rehabilitation center. However, the timing of these permits may be too far in the future for the seabird care compound project.

---

---

**PROJECT # 19**  
**BEACH PARKS ARUNDO REMOVAL PROJECT**

*County-Wide (except 5<sup>th</sup> District)*  
*Santa Barbara County Agricultural Commissioner's Office*  
*Requests \$42,100*  
*Total Project Costs: \$100,560*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicant proposes to: (a) remove Arundo donax, also known as giant reed or simply Arundo, from five beaches along the southern coast of Santa Barbara County; and (b) survey and map Arundo along five beaches located west of Gaviota State Beach, along the northern coast of the County. The applicant has divided the proposal into three components:

- **Component A – South Coast Beaches Arundo Control (\$3,400 CREF request)**  
The applicant proposes to remove, by hand, small patches of Arundo from the following beaches (this effort would not include removing larger stands of Arundo along the bluffs of these beaches):
  - Isla Vista beaches/Coal Oil Point in the Third District,
  - Goleta Beach County Park in the Second and Third Districts,
  - Arroyo Burro Beach County Park in the Second District, and
  - Rincon Beach County Park in the First District.
  
- **Component B – Lookout Park Arundo Control (\$38,700 CREF request)**  
The applicant proposes to stump cut mature stands of Arundo, apply a herbicide, and replant areas with native plants and erosion control material at the Lookout Beach County Park in the First District.
  
- **Component C – Northern Beaches Arundo Assessment (\$0 CREF request)**  
The applicant proposes to survey and map Arundo at the following beaches and nearby view sheds:
  - Guadalupe Dunes County Beach Park in the Fourth District,
  - Ocean Beach in the Third District, and
  - Jalama Beach County Park in the Third District.
  - Vandenberg Air Force Base in the Third District, and
  - Hollister Ranch in the Third District.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends deferring this request for consideration in the 2007 CREF cycle in order to focus 2006 CREF dollars on the Isla Vista beach stairways. However, staff encourages the applicant to move forward with Component C since the applicant was not seeking CREF funds for this component.

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

**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 \$21,888 CREF grant in the 2003 cycle to remove pampas grass along a natural seep area along Elings Park's access road and the riparian habitat 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 most of the Arundo removal and survey work is on the beach. Ninety-two (92%) of the CREF request is for removing Arundo on the beach at Lookout Park.
- (+) **Criterion #2.** The proposal enhances an environmentally sensitive coastal resource, the estuary and beach ecosystems. Arundo displaces native vegetation and associated wildlife because of the massive stands it forms. It is invasive and reduces biodiversity and habitat quality. Component A of the proposal does not include removing larger stands of Arundo; therefore, re-infestation in these areas is probable, unless further removal work is implemented shortly thereafter.
- (+) **Criterion #3.** The bulk of the proposal benefits the ecosystem at Lookout Park. Other south county beaches will benefit, too (see *Summary of Project* above); however, not to the extent as Lookout Park. Surveying and mapping Arundo is a first step towards benefiting the ecosystems along the coast between Hollister Ranch and Guadalupe.
- (+) **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 is seeking 42% of the project's funding from CREF and offers the remaining 58% as in-kind services. The applicant offers in-kind services, valued at \$58,460, from itself and various volunteers for project management, tools, erosion control planning, and surveying/mapping Arundo.
- (+/-) **Criterion #6.** The applicant is requesting that CREF pay for the second and third years of Arundo maintenance at Lookout Park (\$4,800) and the applicant (a County agency) would be responsible for maintenance from then on. Since Component A does not include removal of larger stands of Arundo along the beaches' bluffs, there will be continuing re-infestation of Arundo in the areas associated with Component A.
- (+) **Criterion #8.** Staff believes the initial project can be completed successfully. Since the proposal involves a very competitive species, the applicant will need to do much follow up work to eradicate the species (see *Criterion #6*).



**Other Considerations:** The applicant reduced its original CREF by approximately \$10,000. The reduction represents some savings on labor by using the Fire Department's Hot Shot crews.

The applicant has been successfully implementing its pampas grass removal project, funded by a 2003 CREF grant. The applicant has proven to be a good CREF applicant, sending in detailed invoices and alerting staff of any project scope or budget changes.

---

---

**PROJECT # 20**  
**LAND-TO-SEA AGRICULTURAL LANDS**  
**AND COASTAL WATERS FIELD TOURS**

*County-Wide (except 2<sup>nd</sup> District)*  
*San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties Agricultural Watershed Coalition*  
*and*  
*Community Environmental Council*  
*Request \$34,699*  
*Total Project Costs: \$75,874*

---

**Summary of Proposal:** The applicants request funds to help pay for a series of day-long field tours in six targeted watersheds:

- Santa Maria River in the Fourth and Fifth Districts,
- Santa Ynez River in the Third and Fourth Districts,
- San Antonio Creek in the Third and Fourth Districts,
- Gaviota Creek in the Third District,
- Carpinteria Creek in the First District, and
- Rincon Creek in the First District.

The purpose of the field tours is to focus attention on the interrelationship of agriculture to coastal habitats and what is being done to ameliorate potential negative impacts of agricultural practices to coastal waters and species. The field trips will be open to anyone: growers, ranchers, interested general public, media representatives, etc. However, each trip will be limited to 40 people. The applicants state that field trips will be customized in each watershed to account for the respective coastal habitat and growing conditions. The impacts that diverse upstream agricultural operations have on the health of these coastal ecosystems will be explored. The tours will begin in the upper reaches of a watershed, visiting farms and ranches and focusing on management practices. The tours will continue downstream to the coastal waters, shifting the focus to critical habitat for sensitive species.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends denying this proposal due to competitiveness of the cycle.

**Applicant's Priority Ranking:** The applicants each submitted only one proposal.

**Background:** In July of 2004, the Central Coast Regional Water Control Board adopted the Conditional Agriculture Waiver, which requires growers to implement management practices (irrigation, sediment, fertility, and pesticides) to improve overall water quality (surface and groundwater) on the Central Coast.

Each of the six watersheds is in some stage of watershed planning. The *San Antonio Cooperative Resource Management Plan*, the *Santa Maria River Estuary Enhancement and Management Plan* and the *Carpinteria Creek Watershed Plan* were completed in 2003, 2004, and 2005, respectively. Landowners in both the Gaviota and Rincon watersheds are forming working groups to begin the watershed planning process. There were unsuccessful efforts to prepare a Santa Ynez Watershed

plan in the 1990's. (In the 1995 CREF cycle, the Board of Supervisors awarded a \$100,000 CREF grant to this planning effort; however, the applicant, The Land Trust for Santa Barbara County, returned approximately two-thirds of the grant monies due to irreconcilable differences between the stakeholders.) The applicant states that efforts may be revived in the future. The field tours will concentrate on implementation of the management practices found in the watershed plans. For watersheds without plans yet, the tours will draw attention to the need of watershed planning and increase landowner and public awareness and participation.

---

**Satisfaction of CREF Criteria:**

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

- (+/-) **Criterion #1.** The proposal's subject is the connection between agricultural activities and how those activities affect the health of surface, ground, and ocean waters. In practice, the County has only funded watershed projects that limit such CREF grants to areas of the watershed closest to the coast. This proposal has a partial coastal nexus; the portion of the proposal with the strongest nexus is the affect on the downstream coastal ecosystems.
- (+/-) **Criterion #2.** The proposal hopes to enhance environmentally sensitive coastal resources. This proposal could lead to better water quality in our ocean, thereby partially benefiting coastal recreation and coastal tourism. However, it is unknown if the proposal will have an impact on coastal resources.
- (+/-) **Criterion #3.** The applicant states that the six field tours will be limited to a total of 240 people. It will be open to all members of the public: farmers, ranchers, interested individuals, local community leaders, environmental stakeholders, and media representatives. Depending on who participates in the tours, the proposal could benefit 240 people, or if particular participants spread the word (e.g., media, community leaders, etc.), the proposal could benefit more people. If the proposal encourages farmers and ranchers in the targeted watersheds to shift to management practices that benefit the ecosystems downstream, the general public benefits with cleaner ocean water.
- (-) **Criterion #4.** The proposal is categorized as educational; it does not satisfy the higher priorities of CREF, which are capital improvements and coastal acquisitions.
- (+) **Criterion #5 and Criterion #7.** The applicants seek 47% of the total proposal budget from CREF and seek 53% of the total budget as in-kind services. The applicants hope to identify 42 speakers for the six field tours and estimate this in-kind service to be approximately \$33,600 in value. The applicants are also seeking approximately \$6,000 as donated food and drink for the tours.

This proposal is a portion of a larger project. The applicants have secured a \$658,103 grant from the National Fish and Wildlife (Guadalupe Oil Field Settlement Quality Trust Grant), providing outreach and education regarding water quality issues to growers and to the public in Southern San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties. The applicants are also seeking \$150,000 from the Cooperative State Research Education and Extension Service to measure behavioral responses to water quality regulations and to measure management practices effectiveness. The applicants are negotiating: (a) a \$56,703 contract with the

Central Coast Water Quality Preservation, Inc. to provide cooperative monitoring outreach and coordination; and (b) a \$20,210 contract to provide monitoring outreach for the Conditional Agriculture Waiver follow-up monitoring programs (some of the monies for these grants are for activities in San Luis Obispo County). The applicants also plan to seek monies from Prop. 40, 50, and 319(h) for monitoring, research, and management practices implementation, effectiveness measurement, and demonstration projects.

- (+) **Criterion #6.** There are no ongoing or operational costs associated with this proposal. This proposal is part of a five-year outreach program.
  
- (+) **Criterion #8.** There appears to be a lot of enthusiasm (see *Other Considerations* below). The applicants have secured a good amount of financing for the concept of increasing the awareness of growers and ranchers about management practices and the connection with the health of downstream ecosystems. Regarding the proposal, staff believes the applicants can successfully complete the field tours. However, it is unknown what affect the outreach will have on growers and ranchers and if ultimately, coastal ecosystems can benefit.

**Other Considerations:** One of the applicants (the SLO and SB Counties Agricultural Watershed Coalition) is a committee formed through a Memorandum of Understanding among five grower associations (Central Coast Wine Growers Association, Santa Barbara County Farm Bureau, Santa Barbara Cattlemen's Association, Flower and Nursery Growers of Santa Barbara County and SLO's Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association). The Coalition's mission is to represent these five entities in the development of and implementation of voluntary, cost effective, producer-directed programs to protect and enhance water quality in Southern SLO and SB Counties. The Coalition has been very active in its outreach efforts; it has created an advisory group, organized and attended numerous meetings and conferences on watershed planning, participated in water quality planning courses, and wrote media articles.

---

---

**APPENDIX B**

**At-a-Glance**

**CREF Allocations by Supervisorial District  
(1988-2005)**

Appendix B  
 CREF Awards (1988-2005)

**Table 1: First District<sup>6</sup>**

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Andree Clark Bird Refuge	\$ 170,000	1988	Cap. Improv. <sup>7</sup>
Carpinteria Swimming Pool	150,000	1988	Cap. Improv.
Carpinteria Salt Marsh Land Acquisition	83,000	1990	Acq. <sup>8</sup>
Carpinteria Salt Marsh Land Acquisition	150,000	1993	Acq.
Carpinteria Salt Marsh Land Acquisition	25,000	1995	Acq.
Carpinteria Salt Marsh Nature Park Interpretative Signs	38,500	2002	Cap Improv.
Carpinteria Salt Marsh, Basin I and So. Marsh Improve. Plan	50,000	2003	Cap Improv.
Santa Barbara Zoo – Sea Lion Exhibit	25,000	1990	Cap. Improv.
Santa Barbara Harbor Boat Launch	150,000	1990	Cap. Improv.
Carpinteria Bluffs Appraisals	20,000	1991	Acq.
Carpinteria Bluffs Appraisals	15,000	1992	Acq.
Carpinteria Bluffs Appraisals	15,000	1997	Acq.
Carpinteria Bluffs Acquisition	100,000	1998	Acq.
Carpinteria Bluffs Acquisition	350,000	1999	Acq.
Carpinteria Bluffs Restroom/Storage Facility	30,000	2004	Cap. Improv.
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. Improv.
Lookout Park Accessibility Modifications	30,000	1994	Cap. Improv.
Carpinteria Lions Community Building	25,000	1995	Cap. Improv.
Oceanview Park (Careaga) Acquisition	200,000	1995	Acq.
Channel Drive/Butterfly Beach Stair Refurbishment	27,000	1995 (1999 <sup>9</sup> )	Cap. Improv.
Pedestrian Improvements at Butterfly Beach	30,000	2005	Cap. Improv.
Coastal Bikeway, North Jameson Lane	95,000	1995	Cap. Improv.
Summerland Greenwell Park:			
Phase 1 Improvements	20,000	1996	Cap. Improv.
Phase 2 Improvements	16,000	2001	Cap. Improv.
Seed Storage/Demonstration Garden	10,000	2005	Cap. Improv.
Bikeway Studies: Santa Claus Lane/Carp. Ave & Ortega Hill	50,000	1996	Cap. Improv.
Hammonds Meadows Beach Access Stairs	10,500	1996	Cap. Improv.
Ocean Recreation Center	60,000	1997	Cap. Improv.
Rincon Beach Access	29,000	1997	Cap. Improv.
Rincon Beach Day Use Area Planning	28,500	2001	Cap. Improv.
Rincon Beach Day Use Area Implementation	7,720	2002	Cap. Improv.
Rincon Beach Day Use Area, Phase I	37,037	2003	Cap. Improv.
Finney Street Beach Access	21,413	1997	Cap. Improv.
Surfrider Extension Trail	51,500	2000	Acq.
Santa Claus Lane Preliminary Beach Access	26,000	2000	Acq.
Santa Claus Lane Beach Access, Phase I	22,500	2004	Acq.

< Table Continues >

<sup>6</sup> Grants awarded between 1988-1991, 1992-2001 and 2002-on all reflect different district boundaries.

<sup>7</sup> Capital improvement

<sup>8</sup> Acquisition

<sup>9</sup> Reallocated in the 1999 cycle

*Appendix B*  
*CREF Awards (1988-2005)*

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Adjusted Amount</b>	<b>Approved</b>	<b>Type</b>
Design Guidelines for Hwy 101 Landscaping and Structures	\$ 10,000	1998	Plan/Rsch. <sup>10</sup>
Carpinteria Creek Watershed Outreach	14,671	2002	Edu <sup>11</sup>
Carpinteria-Rincon Coastal Multi-Use Trail, Feasibility Study	50,000	2003	Plan/Rsch
Harbor Seal Sanctuary Improvement	19,323	2004	Cap. Improv.
Lifeguard Facility at Ash Avenue/Beach	20,000	2005	Cap. Improv.
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,356,536</b>		

---

<sup>10</sup> Planning & Research

<sup>11</sup> Education

Appendix B  
 CREF Awards (1988-2005)

**Table 2: Second District<sup>12</sup>**

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

< Table Continues >

<sup>12</sup> Grants awarded between 1988-1991, 1992-2001 and 2002 on all reflect different district boundaries.



Appendix B  
 CREF Awards (1988-2005)

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Santa Barbara Maritime Museum:			
Museum Construction	\$ 30,000	1996	Cap. Improv.
Auditorium Construction	15,172	1998	Cap. Improv.
Outreach Library	8,850	1999	Cap. Improv.
Increase Visibility Project	0	2004	Edu.
Santa Barbara County Veterans Memorial	20,000	1996	Cap. Improv.
Lower Westside Bikeway	29,720	1997	Cap. Improv.
South Coast Watershed Resource Center (WRC)	50,000	2000	Cap. Improv.
WRC & Arroyo Burro Firehydrant/Underground Utilities	29,883	2001	Cap. Improv.
WRC Improvements and Exhibits	19,861	2003	Edu
Shoreline Drive Enhancement	50,281	2000	Cap. Improv.
Shoreline Park Stairs Beach Access	30,000	2002	Cap. Improv.
Audubon Goleta Slough Restoration	15,500	2000	Cap. Improv.
Atascadero Mutt Mitt Stations	4,800	2002	Cap. Improv.
Atascadero Creek Trail Bridge Decking	5,118	2004	Cap Improv.
Shade Structure for Native Plants <sup>13</sup>	15,000	2002	Cap. Improv.
Lifeguard Towers at Arroyo Burro, Goleta, and Jalama Beaches <sup>14</sup>	57,505	2002	Cap. Improv.
San Jose Creek Bikeway	0	2004	Cap. Improv.
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,247,897</b>		

<sup>13</sup> Benefits both the Second and Third Districts.

<sup>14</sup> Benefits both the Second and Third Districts.

Appendix B  
 CREF Awards (1988-2005)

**Table 3: Third District<sup>15</sup>**

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Isla Vista:			
Camino Corto Acquisition	\$ 550,000	1988	Acq.
Isla Vista Redevelopment Agency - \$250,000 Loan	0	1991	Acq.
Del Playa Land Swap	10,300	1996	Acq.
Blufftop Acquisition	57,500	2001 (2005) <sup>16</sup>	Acq.
Blufftop Acquisition	493,159	2003 (2005) <sup>17</sup>	Acq.
Camino Corto Master Plan & Implementation	17,355	1994	Plan/Rsch.
Camino Corto and Del Sol Vernal Pool Reserve	30,311	1996	Cap. Improv.
Camino Corto and Del Sol Vernal Pool Reserve – Irrig.	30,000	1997	Cap. Improv.
Estero Park Lathhouse for Propagating Natives	24,000	1998	Cap. Improv.
Pescadero Blufftop Improvement	25,000	1999	Cap. Improv.
Del Playa Pelican Park – Water Meter	10,000	2001	Cap. Improv.
Camino del Sur Stairway Improvements	25,000	2001	Cap. Improv.
Bathrooms, Preliminary Planning & Permitting	30,000	2003	Cap. Improv.
Blufftop Acquisition	215,350	2005	Acq.
Goleta Valley Transfer Development Rights	10,500	1988	Plan/Rsch.
Goleta Beach Slough Revetment	100,000	1988	Cap. Improv.
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. Improv.
Improvements	49,981	1991	Cap. Improv.
Improvements	201,724	1991	Cap. Improv.
Debt Repayment (on Santa Barbara Shores loan)	115,217	1996	Acq.
Improvements	46,351	1997	Cap. Improv.
Regional Plan	50,000	2000	Plan/Rsch.
Regional Plan	50,000	2002	Plan/Rsch.
Acquisition (Ellwood Mesa)	367,963	2004	Acq.
Acquisition (Ellwood Mesa)	50,000	2005	Acq.
More Mesa Appraisal and Hazardous Waste Survey	25,000	1990	Acq.
More Mesa Management Plan	10,000	1991	Plan/Rsch.

< Table Continues >

<sup>15</sup> Grants awarded between 1988-1991, 1992-2001 and 2002 on all reflect different district boundaries.

<sup>16</sup> Reallocated in the 2005 cycle

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

Appendix B  
 CREF Awards (1988-2005)

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	230,000	2003 (2005) <sup>18</sup>	Acq.
Gaviota Ranch/Brinkman Estate Conservation Easement	55,000	2005	Acq.
Mission Santa Ines and Its Harbors Project	8,723	1995	Edu.
Phase II – El Capitan Bikeway and Trail	50,000	1996	Cap. Improv.
Gaviota Creek Fish Passage	50,000	1991 (1996) <sup>19</sup>	Cap. Improv.
Gaviota Creek Fish Passage	20,000	1993 (1996) <sup>20</sup>	Cap. Improv.
Gaviota Creek Fish Passage	30,000	1996	Cap. Improv.
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. Improv.
San Jose Creek Class I Bike, Planning	75,000	1998	Cap. Improv.
Snowy Plover & Coastal Access Pilot Program	25,000	2001	Edu.
Ocean Beach Nature Center	50,000	2003	Cap. Improv.
Surf Beach Snowy Plover Docent Wind Shelter	0	2004	Cap. Improv.
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$5,848,514</b>		

<sup>18</sup> Reallocated in the 2005 cycle

<sup>19</sup> Reallocated in the 1996 cycle

<sup>20</sup> Reallocated in the 1996 cycle

Appendix B  
 CREF Awards (1988-2005)

**Table 4: Fourth District<sup>21</sup>**

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Leroy Park Recreational Center	\$ 75,000	1988	Cap. Improv.
Leroy Park Recreational Center	75,000	1990	Cap. Improv.
Leroy Park Recreational Center	75,000	1991	Cap. Improv.
Point Sal Acquisition	125,000	1988	Acq.
Point Sal Road Reopening Alternative Analysis Report	50,000	2005	Plan/Rsch.
Ocean Park Improvements	400,000	1988	Cap. Improv.
Ocean Park Improvements	100,000	1990	Cap. Improv.
Host Site	19,000	1999	Cap. Improv.
Mission Vieja Site Acquisition	50,000	1990	Acq.
Burton Mesa Management Plan	19	1988	Plan/Rsch.
Burton Mesa Management Plan	76,320	1992	Plan/Rsch.
Burton Mesa Management Plan	40,000	1994	Plan/Rsch.
Burton Mesa Acquisition	281,162	1996	Acq.
Burton Mesa Acquisition	72,691	1996	Acq.
Burton Mesa Acquisition	210,000	1997	Acq.
Cabrillo High School Aquarium:			
Construction	100,000	1994	Cap. Improv.
Construction	77,943	1998	Cap. Improv.
Construction	123,335	2000	Cap. Improv.
Outreach Program	11,724	1995	Edu.
Technology/Media Exhibit	71,142	2001	Edu.
Santa Ynez River Enhancement Plan <sup>22</sup>	36,088	1995	Plan/Rsch.
Surf Beach Pedestrian Crossing	120,000	1997	Cap. Improv.
Santa Ynez River Open Space/Park	25,000	1998	Acq.
Burton Mesa Chaparral Garden	2,271	2000	Cap. Improv.
Guadalupe Dunes Vehicle Barrier to Protect Snowy Plovers	13,450	2002	Cap. Improv.
Guadalupe Dunes Tractor	89,000	2004	Equipment
Lompoc Aquatic Center	67,126	2002	Cap. Improv.
Dunes Center:			
Exhibit Hall/Visitor Center	168,000	2003 (2005) <sup>23</sup>	Cap. Improv.
Exhibit Hall/Visitor Center	22,000	2005	Cap. Improv.
Pioneer Space Center's Coastal Display	11,942	2004	Equipment
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,588,213</b>		

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

<sup>22</sup> Benefits both the Third and Fourth Districts.

<sup>23</sup> Reallocated in the 2005 cycle

Appendix B  
 CREF Awards (1988-2005)

**Table 5: Fifth District<sup>24</sup>**

Project Name	Adjusted Amount	Approved	Type
Waller Park Water Conservation	\$ 125,000	1988	Cap. Improv.
Allan Hancock Theater Expansion	175,000	1990	Cap. Improv.
Peregrine Falcon Reintroduction	5,000	1992	Plan/Rsch.
S.M./Guadalupe Dunes Bikeway:			
Bikeway Study	30,000	1992	Plan/Rsch.
General Plan Amendment	374	1996	Plan/Rsch.
Construction of Bikeway, Phase IV	0	1997	Cap. Improv.
Guadalupe Dunes County Park:			
Kiosk Staffing	0	1993	Edu.
Management Plan Update	33,222	1994	Plan/Rsch.
Trailer	5,000	1996	Cap. Improv.
Phase II, Master Plan for Road Repairs	23,705	1996	Plan/Rsch.
Implementation Plan	104,065	1998	Cap. Improv.
Implementation Plan	22,935	1999	Cap. Improv.
Guadalupe Dunes Education Center (Dunes Center):			
Construction of Center	0	1994	Cap. Improv.
Construction of Exhibit Hall	0	2000	Cap. Improv.
Exhibits	120,000	1995	Edu.
Ecosystem Education Unit Package	22,500	1999	Edu.
Video of Dunes	22,000	1999	Edu.
Land & Sea Mammals Interactive Computer Program	21,500	2001	Edu.
Santa Maria Valley Discovery Museum:			
SEA IT!	24,550	1994	Edu.
SEA IT! Phase II	13,444	1997	Edu.
Ocean Supermarket Exhibit, Phase I	20,000	2002	Edu.
Ocean Supermarket Exhibit, Phase II	79,000	2005	Edu.
Marine Exhibit	115,000	2004	Cap. Improv.
Point Sal Appraisals	5,000	1995	Acq.
Point Sal Acquisition	33,415	1999	Acq.
Pioneer Park	25,000	1996	Acq.
Santa Maria YMCA Pool	0	1997	Cap. Improv.
Santa Maria Valley Beautiful Earth Week	10,000	1998	Edu.
Salmon & Trout Educational Program	3,000	1998	Edu.
Guadalupe Community Park Ball Fields	25,000	1998	Cap. Improv.
Van for the Environmental Education on Wheels	0	1999	Edu.
Van for the Environmental Education on Wheels	16,500	2001	Edu.
Marine Science Curriculum, Pilot Program	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. Improv.
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,144,542</b>		

<sup>24</sup> 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. Improv.
Snowy Plover Video	8,930	1998	Edu.
Santa Barbara Wildlife Care Network:			
Upgrades to Seabird Rehabilitation Facility	1,580	2000	Cap. Improv.
Seabird Net Enclosure	1,037	2004	Equipment
Seabird Care Compound	31,800	2005	Cap. Improv.
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. Improv.
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$266,598</b>		

**Table 7: Amounts Allocated by Districts<sup>25</sup>**

District	Amount
First	\$ 2,356,536
Second	\$ 3,247,897
Third	\$ 5,848,514
Fourth	\$ 2,588,213
Five	\$ 1,144,542
Three or More Districts	\$ 266,598
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$15,452,300</b>

<sup>25</sup> Grants awarded between 1988-1991, 1992-2001 and 2002 on all reflect different district boundaries.