

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
Unknown	Overall review spacing, formatting, grammar, capitalization, italics for Latin names, tables breaking across pages, headers with text starting on the next page, common name then Latin name when first mentioned. Overall var. and ssp. should not be italicized. Measurements as both imperial and metric. Overall animal or wildlife	Final page formatting will be reviewed upon final adoption and incorporation of Errata Sheet. Use of imperial and metric vary by context. Edits to Table 6 made to remove italics from “var.” and ssp.” See Errata Sheet.
Unknown	Is this document a draft? Should reflect in title	The CWMP will be updated once adopted with “Final” as well as adoption resolution information.
Unknown	Section 3.3 Creeks and Other Jurisdictional Waters includes more than creeks and other jurisdictional waters - such as 3.3.4 Section 3503 of the CFGC	While not specific to creeks, this regulation applies within creek corridors and was specifically requested by TAC members for addition.
Unknown	The breakdown of Table 5 into categories is confusing. Are arroyo willow thickets the only riparian habitat? Seems as though coast live oaks, cottonwoods, and sycamores occur within riparian habitats as well. Similar are the only upland vegetations coastal sage scrub and coyote brush scrub	The label in Table 5 will be changed to “Riparian Scrub”, which is dominated by young trees and shrubs. The vegetation mapping was centered along the creek centerline (200 feet on either side of the centerline). Therefore, only those upland communities within the assessment area were included in Table 5. See Errata Sheet.
Unknown	Since Sawyer was used, why are the vegetation communities (starting on page 59) introduced as Holland and again introduce Sawyer. Seems as though Sawyer should be introduced first as it was the basis of mapping then provide the similar habitat description	The comment is stylistic in nature. No change proposed.
Unknown	Categorize emergent wetland by dominant species as was done for other vegetation communities to align with Sawyer	Emergent wetland description refers to the similar description for cattails. This was done to reduce redundant text.
Unknown	To be consistent all vegetation communities should include wildlife uses	Wildlife habitats have been described for all vegetation communities (or refer the reader to the appropriate section).

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
Unknown	Categorize Beach with Holland	Descriptions in Holland do not fit the characteristics of the sandy substrates mapped and described as “Beach” in the CWMP. No changes made.
Unknown	What time of year was open water recorded? Seems to be highly variable	A note in Open Water included to state that this land cover type was mapped in the fall of 2019. See Errata Sheet.
Unknown	There is a Sawyer vegetation community that includes non-native grasses	There are many vegetation communities that include non-native grasses; however, Holland best captures the nature of this vegetation community in the CWMP. Listing and mapping all non-native grass/herb alliances is beyond the scope of the CWMP. Most of the non-native grass/herblands are a mixture of European grasses and weedy herbs. No changes made.
Unknown	Table 6. Santa Barbara honeysuckle is widespread within the Goleta watershed	The widespread occurrence of this species is provided in Table 6.
Unknown	Table 6 Documentation of Occurrence responses are not consistent. 1) Not documented within the City. Habitat for this species is present within the City. 2) This species has been documented to occur outside of the City in Isla Vista. Consistency in responses allow for reader to more easily follow where the species occurs	The table reflects feedback from TAC members with an effort to try to identify occurrences and potential in and around the City. No changes proposed.
Unknown	Table 6 and 7. When were the plants and wildlife documented in the areas described? Relevant as some may no longer occur.	Intent of the tables is to illustrate known occurrences to inform possible current and future habitat, rather than focus on when historical occurrences took place. No changes proposed.
Unknown	What does 1B.2/similar and all Status Abbreviations mean?	The Status Legend for Table 6 updated to include CRPR status definitions. See Errata Sheet.

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
Unknown	Table 7 does not represent the document text. Yellow warbler, warbling vireo, etc.	As described on page 66, the species listed in Table 7 (for wildlife) were based on a desktop analysis of the California Natural Diversity Database and USFWS Information for Planning and Consultation. In addition, it should be noted that CNDDDB is not an exhaustive and comprehensive inventory of all rare species statewide. See the footnotes on page 66. Yellow warblers (CDFW Species of Special Concern) were observed during spring and summer 2020 riparian bird surveys but were not included in Table 7 as they were not confirmed as nesting during those surveys. This species is special-status during the nesting stage. Warbling vireo is not a special-status species.
Unknown	Table 7 is titled special-status wildlife yet includes wildlife with Status None/None. Why are they included if not special-status?	Table 7 footnotes updated to reflect that species with a None/None status are tracked in CNDDDB and included in the CDFW Special Animals List. See Errata Sheet.
Unknown	Update western snowy plover nesting occurrence data. Coal Oil Point - Devereux Beach and Sands Beach. North Campus Opens Space. Devereux Slough?	Devereux Slough adequately covers these locations. No changes proposed.
Unknown	What does PSE mean? Is that the correct Status for crotch bee	PSE acronym explained in footnote. Status of crotch bee is correct based on 2019 Fish and Game Commission vote.
Unknown	Are all monarch butterfly individuals special-status?	Yes, the overwintering population is considered special-status and the USFWS is currently considering a petition to list the monarch under the ESA and is expected to make a decision in December 2020.

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
Unknown	Where is the Smith River?	The Smith River is in northern California. A clarification has been added to Table 7. See Errata Sheet.
Unknown	4.3.5.3 specify in text plants or wildlife for all non-native invasive call-outs	No change. Comment unclear.
Unknown	What California Invasive plant council levels are you calling out? Why only certain species. Pampas grass!	As noted on page 83, those areas which were composed of a significant amount of non-native invasive species during the reconnaissance surveys and potential candidate areas for restoration were mapped. Therefore, the non-native plant section is not meant to be an inventory of all plant species encountered. Pampassgrass is mentioned in the text however. Specific Cal-IPC priority listings are included in Actions 10.1.1 and 10.1.2 (see page 223).
Unknown	Tab listed numbers instead of in-text for ease to reader	No change. Comment unclear.
Unknown	Define and Wildlife Corridor Study and further use the call-out WCS/Study etc.	No change. Comment unclear.
Unknown	4.3.5.5 wildlife observations don't total properly. What else was observed to equal the total?.	Domestic species make up the difference.
Unknown	Shouldn't birds be included in wildlife movement areas? Specifically, those birds that are in the creek/riparian habitats	No change. Birds are discussed in the next section.
Unknown	4.3.5.6 Paragraphs should break differently to flow. Surveys are introduced in first paragraph then continued in second paragraph	This is a stylistic suggestion. No changes proposed.
Unknown	Would be nice if there were photo descriptions for all photos indicating which creek/habitat the photo was taken	The photos align with the creek in which the photo is embedded. The photo is meant to be a general illustration and as such, a specific location is not needed.
Unknown	In-text figures would allow ease of reader to comprehend materials	General comment. Figures consolidated at end of the CWMP but will be imbedded after CWMP adoption. Basic maps provided with each creek in text to provide context in Section 4.3.6.

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
Unknown	Vegetation communities are described as being "within the creek" perhaps it's meant within the creek corridor or study area as coast live oaks don't occur in creeks - the water	Edit made to clarify these vegetation communities lie within the creek assessment area rather than within the creek. See Errata Sheet.
Unknown	4.3.6.1 consistency. Maria Ygnacio, Maria Ygnacio Creek, Maria Ygnacio creek ... and then MY is used only in the photos	4 items added to Errata Sheet. No change to "MY" as this is shorthand for the photo and introduced properly in text.
Unknown	4.3.6.1 invasive plants or non-native invasive plants – consistency	Headers in Section 4.3.6 updated to include "Non-Native." See Errata Sheet.
Unknown	Because this document will likely not be read from cover to cover, include more clarification as to when surveys or studies were performed - for example - instead of "a total of 36 bird species were observed along San Jose Creek during surveys" include "during 2020 San Jose Creek surveys, a total of 36 bird species were observed"	Several edits made to reference the year(s) when survey work conducted. See Errata Sheet.
Unknown	Table 27. What is the organization? Alpha, large to small?	The table is generally by federal, regional/state, local.
Unknown	Table 30. Column labeled Creek then each entry includes Creek. Also in other tables	This is a stylistic comment. No changes proposed.
Unknown	Actions should be tied to a timeline. Accountability	Discussion about prioritization and funding will be done after adoption of the CWMP.
Unknown	Wildfire and how the potential for debris flows impacts to creeks and watersheds should be discussed. Creek capacity. Potential "choke" points where debris flows can accumulate and cause hazards - and associated management and actions that can be taken	This analysis was not conducted for the CWMP. This could be included in a future update to the plan. Separate actions, in coordination with other agencies, are underway to address this issue. Debris flows are discussed in Section 5.2.5.1.
Unknown	Click table of contents to jump to section	Internal TOC links can be added after CWMP adoption.
Unknown	Figure intro page listing all figures. Appendix intro page listing all appendices	Page listings can be added after CWMP adoption.

<p>Eddie Harris</p>	<p>Thank you for an excellent presentation at the virtual workshop. I do appreciate your attention to my suggestions, and I am happy with the extensive background and the detail that has gone into the draft. I credit you, the administrative staff, the consultant’s team, and experts on the TAC for providing information that will be valuable for the community and for decision makers.</p> <p>I think however that there is one rather important aspect of watershed planning that has not been adequately addressed in the plan. In the workshop Monday night, I attempted to convey to you my concern about a lack of focused discussion of groundwater recharge in portions of watersheds that lie within the city’s boundary. The CWMP does mention that new development will be required to comply with runoff retention conditions of approval. But beyond that, I do not find much that informs the reader and users of the plan about impairment that results from surface hardening. There is much more information that should be included in the plan. First, it is important to identify environmental deficiencies that result from hardened treatment of the urban landscape:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impairment of water quality – (briefly discussed in connection with the City’s NPDES compliance). Runoff pollution is not cleansed by natural geofiltration, and by microbial breakdown of pollutants. • Increased flooding risks – Loss of temporary safe storage of flood waters – runoff from hardscape increases hydrograph, increases flooding risk. • Loss of groundwater recharge, resulting in: • Loss of base flow during periods of dry weather – results in loss of pools and refugia for fish, temperature increase, impaired water chemistry, fish mortality. • Less access to water - creating stress on terrestrial wildlife that depends on creek for life process. • Depletion of water supply for human use. • Saltwater intrusion - Depleted ground water allows saltwater intrusion into coastal zone, contaminating fresh water sources. • Increased fire risk due to depletion of soil moisture – results in fuel desiccation, live fuel moistures in unsafe range. 	<p>Additional language added to Section 4 discussion of groundwater and to various Strategies and Actions in Section 6 to emphasize the significance of groundwater infiltration and efforts to address impervious surfaces within the City. See Errata Sheet.</p>
---------------------	--	--


Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
Response to Comments Table

	<p>Considering these impairments that result from hardening of the landscape, restoring porosity where appropriate may be one of the most essential and effective strategies in recovery of functional water resources. Restoration of porosity addresses all of these urban ills. Very few other strategies yield this multiplicity of benefits.</p> <p>You mentioned several actions and programs that are already part of Goleta’s response to groundwater depletion. Storm water regulations, and planned ground water recharge projects are among those efforts. I suggest that it may be important to include those actions and programs in a sub-section of the CWMP, along with any other actions that the city might consider to correct groundwater conditions, and a summary of the impairments listed above. As an incentive for participation by homeowners to re-landscape yard-space with rain gardens, swales and percolation basins, it can be stressed that directing roof run-off into vegetated landscaping, and using rain-barrels for vegetable gardens can save property owners on their water bill.</p> <p>I want to mention that the City of Santa Barbara does have a comprehensive and well-crafted plan in place to correct similar problems that exist within their watersheds. The city of Goleta may benefit by reviewing S.B.’s amended NPDES plan and perhaps borrowing some of that content.</p> <p>I came to realize this deficiency in the plan over this past weekend when I was able to re-read and evaluate the content in its entirety. I know this comes a little late in the process, but I think it is important for you to consider a more detailed treatment of the problem by adding better detail in the plan, and there is time remaining to do that.</p> <p>The City of Goleta will be asking the County of Santa Barbara and other agencies with upstream jurisdiction to work together on watershed planning by helping to restore base flow to City creeks. It is important that the CWMP shows that appropriate and effective actions are also</p>	
--	---	--

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
	<p>being taken by the city to restore base flow by addressing those deficiencies that lie within the city’s boundary.</p> <p>Here are links to a few reports that provide background:</p> <p>https://stormwater.pca.state.mn.us/index.php?title=MS4_fact_sheet_-_Retrofitting:_Infiltration,_Filtration_%26_Bioretenion</p> <p>https://www3.epa.gov/region1/npdes/stormwater/assets/pdfs/BMPRetr_ofit.pdf</p> <p>https://www.casqa.org/sites/default/files/downloads/socallid-manual-final-040910.pdf</p> <p>I hope that these suggestions will help to improve the CWMP. A complete watershed management plan should identify and address deficiencies throughout the entirety of every watershed.</p>	
Mark Cassady	<p>Section 3.4.2 discusses changes made to Title 17 of the Goleta Municipal Code on March 3, 2020, and notes that Section 17.30.070 includes four findings that are required for any reduction of a SPA buffer below the 100-foot standard. We believe it would be helpful to summarize these required findings in this document. This will help ensure that buffer reductions are minimized.</p>	<p>The specific details of the Goleta Municipal Code are not included in Section 3.4.2. As such, no change is proposed for this specific provision to ensure overall consistency. The application of Section 17.30.070 will be done for relevant development proposals through the permit review process. Any application of the four findings mentioned will be done through a Major CUP and a can only be done at a public hearing in front of the Planning Commission or City Council.</p>

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
Mark Cassady	<p>We are not sure if this was intentional, but it seems odd that the image below appears in all creek descriptions. We suggest confirming that all images are correctly attributed to the appropriate creek.</p> 	<p>Edits made to remove redundant photos. See Errata Sheet.</p>
Mark Cassady	<p>Table 27 notes that no TMDLs are in preparation for the creeks that extend through the City of Goleta. This is not exactly accurate as TMDLs for nitrates have been approved for Bell Creek and Glen Annie/Los Carneros watersheds. See links below. http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/water_issues/programs/tmdl/docs/bell_ck_nitrate/ http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/water_issues/programs/tmdl/docs/glen_annie_loscarneros_nitrate/</p>	<p>Clarification added to reflect established TMDLs for nitrates. See Errata Sheet.</p>
Mark Cassady	<p>We support prioritization of the actions described in Chapter 6 as an important early next step toward improving aquatic habitat and water quality. Specific restoration and capital improvement projects should be identified and evaluated for factors such as cost, constructability, ability of each to achieve specific goals and objectives, and landowner and other stakeholder support.</p>	<p>No response required.</p>

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
Christiane Schlumberger	<p>I am writing to add my voice to those urging you to approve and establish a program to implement the proposed Goleta Creek and Watershed Management Plan at the hearing on Tuesday, November 17.</p> <p>The Plan will protect and enhance creek habitats, ensure clean water, restore stream flows, create opportunities for passive recreation and nature-based learning, and will ensure effective and environmentally-sound flood control management.</p> <p>I urge you to adopt and implement the Plan, and request that the Plan be incorporated into the Conservation Element of the City’s General Plan.</p> <p>The Plan should be developed into a staffed City Program under the Public Works Department, as recommended in the Plan, or in another Department. Creating a City Creeks Program will ensure that the Plan is implemented and provides the intended public benefits such as creek restoration and clean water.</p> <p>The City should create and appoint a public Creek and Watershed Management Advisory Committee to guide the Program, and to vet priorities and creek and watershed enhancement projects.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>Adding the CWMP into the Conservation Element of the General Plan is a policy consideration and would ultimately require a General Plan Amendment as part of a future work program, if City Council provides staff with that direction.</p> <p>After adoption of the CWMP, Public Works will address staffing and funding options through the work program review process with City Council. During the work program review process, CWMP implementation can be considered with the totality of all City programs and associated staffing and funding needs.</p> <p>An Advisory Committee is one option for City Council consideration in Action 7.11.2.</p>
Dan Silver	<p>Endangered Habitats League, a regional conservation group, urges you to adopt and implement the Creek and Watershed Management Plan, and that the Plan be incorporated into the Conservation Element of the City’s General Plan.</p> <p>Thank you for protecting irreplaceable resources for nature and community.</p>	See response above.

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
Lindsey Bolton	<p>I am writing in favor of the Goleta Creek and Watershed Management Plan (CWMP).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I urge you to adopt and implement the Creek and Watershed Management Plan, and request that the Plan be incorporated into the Conservation Element of the City’s General Plan. CWMP is a plan that will benefit the land and community through the restoration of stream flows, providing clean water and offering flood control management as well as providing opportunities for the public to engage in recreational and educational activities in nature. 2. The Plan should be developed into a staffed City Program under the Public Works Department, as recommended in the Plan, or in another Department. Creating a City Creeks Program will ensure that the Plan is implemented and provides the intended public benefits such as creek restoration and clean water. 3. The City should create and appoint a public Creek and Watershed Management Advisory Committee to guide the Program, and to vet priorities and creek and watershed enhancement projects. 	See response above.
Debbie Allen	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I urge you to adopt and implement the Creek and Watershed Management Plan, and request that the Plan be incorporated into the Conservation Element of the City’s General Plan. [You may add your personal reasons for supporting the Plan.] 2. 3. The Plan should be developed into a staffed City Program under the Public Works Department, as recommended in the Plan, or in another Department. Creating a City Creeks Program will ensure that the Plan is implemented and provides the intended public benefits such as creek restoration and clean water. 4. The City should create and appoint a public Creek and Watershed Management Advisory Committee to guide the Program, and to vet priorities and creek and watershed enhancement projects. 	See response above.

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
Jeff Phillips	<p>1. I urge you to adopt and implement the Creek and Watershed Management Plan, and request that the Plan be incorporated into the Conservation Element of the City’s General Plan.</p> <p>2. The Plan should be developed into a staffed City Program under the Public Works Department, as recommended in the Plan, or in another Department. Creating a City Creeks Program will ensure that the Plan is implemented and provides the intended public benefits such as creek restoration and clean water.</p> <p>3. The City should create and appoint a public Creek and Watershed Management Advisory Committee to guide the Program, and to vet priorities and creek and watershed enhancement projects.</p>	See response above.
Greg Branam	<p>I urge you to adopt and implement the Creek and Watershed Management Plan, and request that the Plan be incorporated into the Conservation Element of the City’s General Plan. [You may add your personal reasons for supporting the Plan.]</p> <p>The Plan should be developed into a staffed City Program under the Public Works Department, as recommended in the Plan, or in another Department. Creating a City Creeks Program will ensure that the Plan is implemented and provides the intended public benefits such as creek restoration and clean water.</p> <p>The City should create and appoint a public Creek and Watershed Management Advisory Committee to guide the Program, and to vet priorities and creek and watershed enhancement projects.</p>	See response above.
Tina Brenza	Please approve and establish a program to implement the proposed Goleta Creek and Watershed Management	See response above.

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
Bill Woodbridge	<p>I live right next to Maria Ygnacio Creek in Goleta. It doesn't appear that there has been any maintenance, clearing or improvements made to this creek in dozens of years. I urge you to adopt and implement the Creek and Watershed Management Plan, and request that the Plan be incorporated into the Conservation Element of the City's General Plan. The CWMP will protect and enhance creek habitats, ensure clean water, restore stream flows, create opportunities for passive recreation and nature-based learning, and will ensure effective and environmentally-sound flood control management.</p> <p>The Plan should be developed into a staffed City Program under the Public Works Department, as recommended in the Plan, or in another Department. Creating a City Creeks Program will ensure that the Plan is implemented and provides the intended public benefits such as creek restoration and clean water.</p> <p>The City should create and appoint a public Creek and Watershed Management Advisory Committee to guide the Program, and to vet priorities and creek and watershed enhancement projects.</p>	See response above.
Karen Dorfman	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I urge you to adopt and implement the Creek and Watershed Management Plan, and request that the Plan be incorporated into the Conservation Element of the City's General Plan. 2. The Plan should be developed into a staffed City Program under the Public Works Department, as recommended in the Plan, or in another Department. Creating a City Creeks Program will ensure that the Plan is implemented and provides the intended public benefits such as creek restoration and clean water. 3. The City should create and appoint a public Creek and Watershed Management Advisory Committee to guide the Program, and to vet priorities and creek and watershed enhancement projects. 	See response above.

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
Kelsey Maloney	<p>I hope this message finds you well. I'm writing my comments and would like them to be read into the record at the hearing:</p> <p>I urge you to adopt and implement the Creek and Watershed Management Plan, and request that the Plan be incorporated into the Conservation Element of the City's General Plan. As a long-time resident of Santa Barbara, I have a deep appreciation for our creeks and our ocean.</p> <p>I want to ensure that future generations have the opportunity to enjoy clean creeks and a healthy ocean. Creating a City Creeks Program will ensure that the Plan is implemented and provides the intended public benefits such as creek restoration and clean water. The City should create and appoint a public Creek and Watershed Management Advisory Committee to guide the Program, and to vet priorities and creek and watershed enhancement projects.</p> <p>Our beaches and creeks are precious community resources. Please protect them now for future generations.</p>	See response above.
Brigitta Van Der Raay	<p>Please adopt the Goleta Creek and Watershed Management Plan, and incorporate the Plan into the Conservation Element of the City's General Plan. As you move forward, please also move to provide staff and funding to ensure that clean waters, waterways, and riparian habitats are implemented and maintained.</p> <p>Thank you for your work and support this far. I encourage you to continue good work like this that seeks to ensure that we live in a beautiful and healthy community.</p>	See response above.

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
John Brooks	<p>The Goleta Creek and Watershed Management Plan will protect and improve creek habitats, make sure there is clean water, restore the stream flows, create opportunities for passive recreation and nature-based learning, and will make sure there is effective and environmentally-sound flood control management.</p> <p>This needs to be in the General Plan.</p> <p>The council should also create and appoint a public Creek and Watershed Management Advisory Committee to</p>	See response above.
Carter Morgan	<p>I urge you to adopt and implement the Creek and Watershed Management Plan, and request that the Plan be incorporated into the Conservation Element of the City’s General Plan. Additionally, the Plan should be developed into a staffed City Program under the Public Works Department, as recommended in the Plan, or in another Department. Creating a City Creeks Program will ensure that the Plan is implemented and provides the intended public benefits such as creek restoration and clean water. And finally, the City should create and appoint a public Creek and Watershed Management Advisory Committee to guide the Program, and to vet priorities and creek and watershed enhancement projects.</p> <p>Protecting Goleta’s natural resources, including our creeks and beaches, is essential for maintaining the beauty and health of our community. Thank you for being good stewards of our land, water, and air while in turn protecting our area’s wildlife!</p>	See response above.

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
<p>Deborah Williams</p>	<p>Our creeks and watersheds are one of the most wonderful aspects of our City. They are so important: to our quality of life, to the quality of our environment, and to our economy (including property values). However, Goleta’s creeks and watersheds not only need to be protected, but also, in some areas, they need to be restored to provide important habitat, clean water and other benefits going forward.</p> <p>My husband and I are fortunate to live adjacent to Las Vegas Creek. Many people from throughout Goleta walk down our street to enjoy the watershed’s oaks, sycamores and wildlife. Throughout the year, my husband and I visit San Pedro Creek and watershed as well as San Jose Creek and watershed to experience the birds, vegetation, amphibians, and more. We chose to live in Goleta, in part, because of the creeks and watersheds here. We encounter so many other people who agree with this sentiment.</p> <p>The Creek and Watershed Management Plan before you has been thoughtfully written and reviewed. It is excellent. I urge you to adopt and implement the Plan, and incorporate it into the Conservation Element of the City’s General Plan.</p> <p>As a member of the Goleta Parks and Recreation Commission (speaking solely on my behalf), I know how important Advisory Committees are to the City Council and the city as a whole. I urge the Council to create and appoint a public Creek and Watershed Management Advisory Committee to assist the Creeks and Watershed Program, including reviewing priorities and creek and watershed enhancement projects.</p> <p>Also, as recommended in the Plan, there should be a staffed City Program to implement the Plan.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments. Protecting and enhancing our creeks and watersheds are a priority, and a very important part of our legacy.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
Karin Lohwasser	<p>First of all, thank you Goleta City Council! I am still relatively new to the area and I am constantly impressed by your work.</p> <p>I am writing in support of the city’s adoption and implementation of the Goleta Creek and Watershed Management Plan and in support of a public Creek and Watershed Management Advisory Committee to guide the program and assess priorities of creek and watershed enhancement projects.</p>	See response above.
Katherine Emery	<p>Process. SBAS believes that City staff and Dudek have done an excellent job of soliciting public input, holding public workshops, and working with a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to bring the CWMP to completion. We especially appreciate the appointment of a TAC composed of personnel from regulatory agencies and NGOs, which provided extensive input on the draft CWMP. As you probably know, one of our SBAS Conservation Committee members, Scott Cooper, served as SBAS’s representative on the TAC and he regularly acted as a conduit between SBAS and the CWMP development team, keeping SBAS apprised of the content and progress of the CWMP and sharing SBAS input with the TAC and development team. In addition, a number of our Conservation Committee members, including our Co-Chairs, Lori Gaskin and Jessie Altstatt, and our bird experts, Mark Holmgren and Adrian O’Loghlen, attended CWMP public workshops and provided direct input to the development team. SBAS feels that the CWPP development team was very responsive to our concerns and input and tried to integrate our feedback into the final CWMP. Given all of this, we would like to make two points: (1) Public input indicated that Goleta’s citizens most valued our local creek corridors for their natural resource values, that is their role in providing habitat for native plants and animals. (2) We encourage the City to use the TAC template in developing other programs, plans, and actions, because it provides the local expertise needed to guide such plans or projects and ensures that all relevant agencies, NGOs, and citizens are on the same page.</p>	No response required.

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
Katherine Emery	<p>Content, recommendations. The CWMP contains a large amount of information on our local creeks, riparian zones, and SPAs. Such information on Goleta’s creek systems is crucial for guiding the management of these areas. We thank the City Council for funding the development of the CWMP, and also the subsequent mammal and bird studies that greatly informed the CWMP. The development team has collected, synthesized, and summarized this information in the CWMP and now Goleta has a good foundation for inventorying and monitoring natural resources associated with our local creeks. The CWMP also identifies a series of problems or human impacts associated with our local creeks, then offers recommendations for remedying these problems. We believe that the CWMP’s analysis of negative human impacts on local creeks and possible actions that could mitigate these impacts constitute a clear, cohesive blueprint for management approaches and actions that could protect, preserve, and restore our local creek corridors.</p>	No response required.

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
Katherine Emery	<p>Next steps. As indicated by SBAS’s endorsement of the Environmental Defense Center’s environmental group letter on the CWMP, we believe that the CWMP is an excellent plan so the next major consideration for the City Council is the CWMP’s implementation. SBAS recommends that the City Council take steps to ensure that the CWMP is implemented fully over time by enshrining the CWMP in City policy, appointing an expanded TAC to shepherd the CWMP through to actions, and integrating the CWMP’s provisions into the City’s budgetary and planning processes. In short, we strongly support EDC’s recommendations for next steps.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Integrate the CWMP into the City’s General Plan. 2. Appoint an expanded TAC and citizens’ group to guide the plan’s implementation. Public input indicated that most citizens were concerned about the creeks flowing through their back yards, so the current TAC could be expanded to include citizens from each watershed. 3. Integrate the CWMP recommendations into the City’s budgetary and planning processes (such as the City’s Strategic Plan) to ensure that there are sufficient funds and personnel to implement the CWMP’s recommendations. Implementation of the CWMP will require that the City allocate funds and appoint personnel to carry out the CWMP’s recommendations. SBAS recognizes that funding and personnel allocations may take some time owing to the COVID/financial crisis; however, the City could still integrate CWMP recommendations into its planning and budgetary processes at this time. 	<p>Adding the CWMP into the General Plan is a policy consideration and would ultimately require a General Plan Amendment as part of a future work program, if City Council provides staff with that direction.</p> <p>Options provided in Action 7.11.2 include: but are not limited to, the creation of a new Creek and Watershed Advisory Committee, an informal advisory committee, or utilization of an existing committee or commission. The specific structure will be determined after adoption of the CWMP.</p> <p>After adoption of the CWMP, Public Works will address staffing and funding options through the work program review process with City Council. During the work program review process, CWMP implementation can be considered with the totality of all City programs and associated staffing and funding needs.</p>
Katherine Emery	<p>Again, we congratulate the CWMP development team on a job well-done and the City Council for having the vision to fund the development of the CWMP. We believe that implementation of the CWMP will protect, preserve, and restore our creek corridors while mitigating flood damage, providing many benefits for Goleta’s citizens.</p>	<p>No response required.</p>

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
Brian Trautwein	<p>The undersigned organizations write in support of adoption of the City of Goleta Creek and Watershed Management Plan (“Plan”), and urge the Council to adopt the Plan tonight. We represent diverse community groups who understand that the Plan represents a significant step forward in protecting and enhancing our environment, and offers a multitude of benefits including clean water, healthy wildlife habitats, nature-based education, recreation, and economic progress.</p>	<p>No response required.</p>
Brian Trautwein	<p>The Council deserves immense credit for the vision exhibited in Plan initiation, adoption, and implementation. Our recommendations for advancing the Plan are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate the Plan in the Conservation Element of the City’s General Plan, • Add the establishment of a staffed Creek and Watershed Management Program (“Program”) to the City’s Strategic Plan, and establish the Program in the Public Works Department, as recommended in the Plan’s Strategy 1.1, or another appropriate Department, as soon as feasible, and • Create and appoint a Creek and Watershed Advisory Committee, as recommended in the Plan’s Action 7.11.2, to assist Council and staff on guiding Program implementation priorities, including identifying revenue options. 	<p>Adding the CWMP into the Conservation Element of the General Plan is a policy consideration and would ultimately require a General Plan Amendment as part of a future work program, if City Council provides staff with that direction.</p> <p>After adoption of the CWMP, Public Works will address staffing and funding options through the work program review process with City Council. During the work program review process, CWMP implementation can be considered with the totality of all City programs and associated staffing and funding needs.</p> <p>An Advisory Committee is one option for City Council consideration in Action 7.11.2.</p>

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
Eddie Harris/ Daniel McCarter	You have before you tonight a watershed and creek plan that will be of great value in ensuring that Goleta’s future includes healthy and functional water resources. Planning for clean water, high habitat values for fish and wildlife, and safe recreational waters are among objectives that are detailed in the plan. Santa Barbara Urban Creeks Council recommends that you adopt the Creek and Watershed Management Plan (CWMP) and that you also take steps to enable the city to begin implementation. We are a 501(c)(3) watershed advocacy group that has worked tirelessly over the past 33 years, helping over 3,000 members and families across the south coast who share a vision for watershed health. This plan has been shaped by a competent team of knowledgeable experts and presents that vision for Goleta’s future.	No response required.
Eddie Harris/ Daniel McCarter	We also support the Environmental Defense Center’s recommendations to facilitate implementation of the plan. Those recommendations include adoption of the CWMP in the city’s General Plan, establishment of a CWMP program in the Parks and Open Space Division and creation of a Creek and Watershed Management Advisory Committee. These recommendations are important to successful implementation and will ensure that the plan will fulfill its intent in guiding the City of Goleta through challenges that lie ahead.	<p>Adding the CWMP into the Conservation Element of the General Plan is a policy consideration and would ultimately require a General Plan Amendment as part of a future work program, if City Council provides staff with that direction.</p> <p>After adoption of the CWMP, Public Works will address staffing and funding options through the work program review process with City Council. During the work program review process, CWMP implementation can be considered with the totality of all City programs and associated staffing and funding needs.</p> <p>An Advisory Committee is one option for City Council consideration in Action 7.11.2.</p>

Item D.1. Creek and Watershed Management Plan – November 17, 2020
 Response to Comments Table

Commenter	Comment	Staff Response
Staci Caplan	<p>SBAOR overall supports the recommended Creek and Watershed Management Plan, however we do have concerns regarding one policy.</p> <p><i>Action 8.1.7. Consider amendments to General Plan subpolicy CE 2.2 and GMC Section 17.30.070 to provide greater clarity regarding SPA buffer requirements and to provide greater protection to SPAs. Consider biological resources and water quality in any proposed amendment to subpolicy CE 2.2 of the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan.</i></p> <p>We do not support Action 8.1.7 and request you keep the language “as-is” in the General Plan CE 2.2. The language within CE 2.2 allows flexibility for property owners while still adhering the spirit of the Streamside Protection Areas (SPA). Maintaining the allowance of the creek setbacks to be considered on a case-by-case basis ensures that the property can be used to its fullest extent. In addition, by keeping the current General Plan language</p>	<p>City Council initiated a General Plan Amendment to CE 2.2 on January 21, 2020 via City Council Resolution No. 20-02. As such, Action 8.1.7 does not reflect a new action, but rather reflects existing direction from City Council. Of note, Action 8.1.7 does not commit the City to any specific amendment to CE 2.2. nor requires an amendment be made. The use of the verb “consider” allows for flexibility in the ultimate approach to CE 2.2, consistent with the General Plan Amendment initiation.</p> <p>Any future amendment to CE 2.2. would be done through a recommendation by Planning Commission at a noticed public hearing and action by City Council at a noticed public hearing.</p>