



**City of Santa Barbara  
PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT**

**PARK AND RECREATION COMMISSION AND  
CREEKS CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Special Joint Meeting**

Monday, July 10, 2006

**Minutes**

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – The special joint meeting of the Park and Recreation Commission and the Creeks Restoration and Water Quality Improvement Citizens Advisory Committee was called to order by Chair Longstreet at 5:55 p.m. in Council Chambers at City Hall.
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**
3. **ROLL CALL:**

**Park and Recreation Commission Members**

**Present**

Ada Conner (Vice Chair)  
Daraka Larimore-Hall  
Beebe Longstreet (Acting Chair)

**Absent**

Steve Forsell  
Arnoldo Gonzales  
Laura Spracher (intern)

**Creeks Advisory Committee Members Present**

Myfanwy DeVoe (Chair)  
Daniel E. Hochman  
Bruce Klobucher  
Jeff Phillips  
David Pritchett  
Daniel Wilson

Environmental/Land Use  
Hotel/Lodging Industry  
Ocean Users  
Environmental/Land Use  
Environmental/Land Use  
Community at Large

**Creeks Advisory Committee Members Absent**

Michael Jordan (Vice Chair)  
George Weber

Business Community  
Environmental/Land Use

**Liaison Representatives Present**

Rob Almy  
Iya Falcone  
Bendy White

County Project Clean Water Liaison  
City Council Liaison  
Planning Commission Liaison

**Staff Present**

Nancy Rapp  
Jill E. Zachary  
Jan Hubbell

Parks and Recreation Director  
Creeks Restoration/Clean Water Manager  
Senior Planner

**PUBLIC COMMENT** - None**5. BUSINESS ITEM****a. Review of Veronica Meadows Specific Plan**

Ms. Rapp stated that the review of the Veronica Meadows Specific Plan is before the Park and Recreation Commission and the Creeks Advisory Committee because the housing development project is located adjacent to public park land, and the applicant is proposing to do creek restoration on City-owned land. She stated that in March 2006, Council requested specific changes to the project and asked that the revised project come before the Creeks Advisory Committee, the Park and Recreation Commission, Architectural Board of Review, and the Planning Commission.

**Jeff Phillips arrived at 5:41 p.m.**

Ms. De Busk, Associate Planner, stated that the proposed restoration is located in the Las Positas Valley, adjacent to Las Positas Road, across from Elings Park. She stated that the site is currently within the jurisdiction of the County of Santa Barbara. She said that the applicant is seeking approval for 1) annexation into the City, 2) the Veronica Meadows specific plan, 3) a General Plan map amendment, 4) a zoning map amendment, 5) a local coastal plan amendment, 6) a hillside design district map amendment, 7) a lot-line adjustment, and 8) a statement of overriding consideration related to the environmental review of the property.

Ms. De Busk stated that the key issues to be discussed are the appropriate land use and zoning designation for the property. She said that staff had proposed to zone the site with the specific plan because it can be tailored to address the unique environment and constraints that exist on the property. She said that Council will make the final decision on annexation and land use issues after receiving comments from the Architectural Board of Review, the Creeks Advisory Committee, the Park and Recreation Commission, and the Planning Commission.

Ms. De Busk stated that following annexation, the applicant would submit a subdivision proposal to the City including creek restoration which would go through the formal review process including environmental review and all applicable City review boards. She said that staff's review of the project will be based on the development standards and criteria that are set forth in the specific plan. She said that the role of the Park and Recreation Commission and the Creeks Advisory Committee is to send comments to Council on the objectives and standards identified in the draft specific plan, and to provide the applicant, Planning Commission, and Council comments on the draft creek restoration plan. She said that Council has asked for input regarding:

- Pedestrian access

- Creek set-backs and permitted land uses within the set-back zone
- Drainage as it relates to water quality in the creek environment
- The restoration plan including stabilization and restoration
- Future maintenance responsibilities within the creek banks

Ms. De Busk said that staff is requesting an easement across the creek at the northern portion of the property, whereas the applicant proposes an easement at the end of Alan Road. She said that staff recommends that a pedestrian path connect to the bridge in the northern location and run along the public road within the subdivision. She said that the applicant is proposing that the drainage from Campanil Hill be placed in a subsurface storm drain and that the specific plan does not require the drainage to be in an open channel.

### **Applicant Presentation:**

Steve Amerikaner, Hatch and Parent, stated that Council reviewed the Veronica Meadows project on March 21, 2006, and requested the following:

- Reduced housing density
- Removal of a vehicular bridge
- Rural road characteristics
- Pedestrian path on the east side of the creek.

Mr. Amerikaner stated that the applicant has met those requirements by reducing the number of homes from 24 to 15, removing the vehicular bridge, creating a road that is rural in character, and including an easement at the southern portion of the project in order for the City to install a pedestrian bridge. He said that the applicant has proposed to restore 1,800 linear feet of creek bank.

Mr. Swanson, Swanson Hydrology and Geomorphology, stated that Arroyo Burro flows through a highly urbanized watershed. He said that changes in the watershed have led to an increased flow, and the creek as responded by widening and is currently down-cut. Mr. Swanson said that when creek stability and function are addressed then vegetation, wildlife habitat, and aesthetics follow.

Mr. Swanson said that traditional engineering needs to be incorporated into the project to stabilize the banks and retain water in order to protect the current homes and roads as well as the proposed development. He also stated that the key strategy would be to emulate nature.

Mr. Swanson stated that the five features of the plan include boulder weirs, floodplain benching, bioengineered stream bank stabilization, boulder/cobble substrate and revetment, and a native vegetation planting plan. He gave a brief description of each feature.

Mr. Swanson stated that if this project is not done, this reach of Arroyo Burro will experience a loss of oak trees, continued degradation, and continued sediment release. He said that the restoration project that his firm designed will improve

water quality, riparian habitat, erosion control, and creek aesthetics.

### **Commission and Committee Discussion:**

Mr. Pritchett asked if there will be additional environmental review. He asked if the field visit/consultation with various agencies was based on the plan being presented this evening. Mr. Pritchett asked for a full copy of Mr. Kandolf's comments regarding the project.

- Ms. De Busk responded that the environmental review process will be revisited.
- Mr. Swanson responded that the site visit was during the last spring and stated that the letter from Mr. Kandolf was previously submitted to the Planning Commission.

Ms. DeVoe asked why the setback has been reduced from 100-feet to 50-feet despite previous recommendations by the Creeks Advisory Committee to maintain the 100-foot setback. She asked what impact backyard elements would have on the creek. Ms. DeVoe stated that she is concerned with the creek shifting.

- Ms. Jan Hubbell stated that Council told the applicant that it would be acceptable to reduce the set-back to between 50 and 100 feet. She said permanent structures would not be located within 50 feet of the creek and that the backyard elements would not substantially affect the creek.
- Mr. Amerikaner stated that the City does not have a policy related to a 100-foot setback. He stated that the most recent project approved on Arroyo Burro included a 48-foot setback.
  - Ms. Longstreet commented that the Committee and Commission are commenting on the specific plan and may disagree with Council.
- Mr. Swanson stated that from top-of-bank to 50-feet would be solely vegetation. He said that within 50 feet to 100 feet, mostly permeable, backyard compatible uses with runoff-to-bioswale treatment. He said that the reason for the buffer is to leave room for erosion, water quality buffering, and wildlife habitat. He said that 100 feet is at the high end of an urban creek buffer. Mr. Swanson said that the stability elements within the restoration plan would address the erosion and migration of the creek, and the bioswales would address the water quality element. Mr. Swanson stated that the creek is in the process of meandering, which is a wonderful process on a nice rural creek where there aren't houses. He said that wildlife habitat would be improved by the new restoration plan.

Mr. Hochman stated that he is concerned that water quality is not at the forefront of the proposed restoration project. He asked why the road would be placed within the 50-foot buffer and if bioswales would be strategically placed throughout the project.

- Mr. Swanson responded that when he was discussing fine sediment release, he was talking about water quality and that in the development drainage plan, all water would be drained to bioswales. He said that the

road could be placed within the buffer zone because 1) the bioswales would address the issue of water quality, 2) the restoration plan would address erosion and creek mobility, and 3) there would not be a large impact on wildlife habitat.

Ms. Conner asked for clarification regarding restoration maintenance.

- Ms. Rapp responded that the applicant would be responsible, in perpetuity, for the restoration maintenance. She said that the applicant has proposed to maintain the vegetation within the restoration area for five years. She said that staff recommends that it be maintained in perpetuity by the homeowners association.
- Mr. Amerikaner stated that the homeowners association would maintain the hardscape elements within the restoration project in perpetuity and all vegetation for the first five years. He said that, after five years, the applicant is proposing that the homeowners association maintain the vegetation on the western side of the creek and the City maintain the east side.

Mr. Larimore-Hall asked if there would be further peer review.

- Ms. Hubbell responded that peer review is a requirement of this project.

Mr. Wilson asked how set-backs and vegetation planting by residents would be enforced. He asked if the 50-foot and 100-foot buffer lines from top-of-bank are based upon the existing top-of-bank or if they will shift in relation to the restoration project as the creek is widened. Mr. Wilson asked to what degree the buffer would be reduced and/or expanded.

- Ms. Hubbell responded that enforcement tends to work better when there is a homeowners association because home owners tell on each other.
- Mr. Swanson stated that the restoration plan addresses erosion control, wildlife habitat, and water quality even though the buffers would be reduced. He said that by shifting the buffer with the top-of-bank, there is a disincentive for private landowners to do restoration.
- Ms. Rapp responded that two lots would be impacted by the reduced setback.

**Mr. Almy arrived at 6:00 p.m.**

Ms. Longstreet asked if the development restrictions would be locked-in. She asked whether the specific plan has a time limit in case the developer does not come through with a project. She asked if maintenance plans and standards would be included. She asked who will fund the creek restoration and maintenance. She said that the applicant proposed a 50/50 split. She asked who will own and maintain the privately owned 35-acres of open space. Ms. Longstreet asked if the homeowners association would carry major catastrophic insurance since there are geological concerns with the property. She asked if the City's IPM standards would be enforced in the limited setback zone will.

- Ms. Hubbell responded that this is a recorded document that is tied to the property forever. She said that the specific plan is related to zoning even

if the developer changes. Ms. Hubbel responded that maintenance plans and standards would be included and said that there will not be maintenance standards for the 35-acre open space because there is not a proposal to change the land. She said that there would be an easement for a future trail. Ms. Hubbel responded that the City's IPM program would be enforced.

Mr. Wilson asked if the developer is committed to implementing the restoration plan as presented this evening.

- Ms. Hubbel responded that a restoration plan is required for this project.
- Ms. Rapp stated that the restoration must take place prior to the development of the project.
- Mr. Amerikaner stated that assurances would be built into the development review process to ensure that the creek restoration will be done. He said that completion bonds or pre-construction installation are ways to ensure follow-through. Mr. Amerikaner said that the developer is prepared to restore 1,800 feet of the creek. He said that he is concerned that through the review process, the plans will become infeasible. He said that the applicant is worried that the City's requirements are spinning out of control. Mr. Amerikaner said that the restoration element is not required by the EIR because the vehicular bridge has been removed. He said that the creek restoration is a gift from Mr. Lee to the City because he believes in it.

**Public comment opened at 7:16 p.m.**

Walter Knapp said that he does not want a footpath or footbridge connecting to the end of Alan Road. He said that he would prefer to see this footpath at the entrance of Elings Park. He also stated that the historical footbath from Alan Road to Hidden Valley should be on the west side of the creek, not along Las Positas Road. He said that he is opposed to 15 homes with access from Alan Road because it introduces too much traffic.

**Public comment closed at 7:22 p.m.**

**The meeting recessed at 7:24 p.m. and reconvened at 7:42 p.m.**

**Committee and Commission discussion:**

Ms. Longstreet stated that she is concerned that there are only two storm drains draining to the creek – one at the north end and another at the south end.

- Mr. Wilson said that there is no need for additional outfalls if two outfalls will not cause erosion or velocity impacts. He added that he would prefer that water enter the creek as diffusely as possible.

Mr. Phillips stated that with regard to water quality, he is concerned that the setbacks have been reduced and include yards despite the Committee supporting a 100-foot setback twice in the past. He said that the purpose of the buffer is to prevent the lateral migration of soap, pesticides, and fertilizers from

getting to the creek. He recommended that the landscaping within yards be limited to native plants.

Ms. DeVoe asked that staff confirm that bioswales would be incorporated into the plan.

- Ms. Hubbell responded that there are Best Management Practices to manage the quantity of storm water runoff and that the development project would return for review.

Mr. Klobucher said that the Committee had previously requested that the Campanil Hill drainage be kept in an open drainage system.

- Ms. Zachary responded that the Creeks Advisory Committee had previously recommended that surface drainage remain above ground to the extent possible. She said that the specific plan includes alternative means of addressing site drainage.
- Ms. Hubbell responded that prior proposal included overland and below surface drainage.

Mr. Wilson asked how much water moved through the Campanil Hill drainage and asked why it would be necessary to place it in an underground pipe.

- Mr. Amerikaner responded that there is not any scientifically-based reason to leave the water above ground.
- Mr. Lee responded that the drainage is dry most of the time with a trickle of water after light rains and a healthy flow that disappears before it reaches the creek after a couple of days of heavy rains.

#### **ACTION**

**Hochman moved, seconded by Pritchett, and passed 6/0 that the Creeks Advisory Committee recommend that the specific plan include maintaining the daylighting of the Campanil Hill drainage.**

#### **ACTION**

**Larimore-Hall moved, seconded by Conner, and passed 3/0 that the Park and Recreation Commission recommend that the specific plan include maintaining the daylighting of the Campanil Hill drainage.**

#### **ACTION**

**Conner moved, seconded by Larimore-Hall, and passed 3/0 that the Park and Recreation Commission concur with Section 28.50.020 Items A.1. – A.5.**

#### **ACTION**

**DeVoe moved, seconded by Hochman, and passed 6/0 that the Creeks Advisory Committee concur with Section 28.50.020 Items A.1. – A.5.**

Mr. Hochman asked how the Committee can ensure that areas considered open space remain open space. He asked if staff has a recommendation related to enforcement.

- Ms. Hubbell responded that enforcement detail is included in the conditions of approval for the development project.

#### **ACTION**

**Hochman moved, seconded by Pritchett, and passed 6/0 that the Creeks Advisory Committee recommend that strong enforcement and maintenance plans be included in the project's conditions of approval.**

#### **ACTION**

**Larimore-Hall moved, seconded by Conner, and passed 3/0 that the Park and Recreation Commission recommend that strong enforcement and maintenance plans be included in the project's conditions of approval.**

Mr. Pritchett stated that element B-2 includes the removal of oak trees and he does not believe that these trees need to be removed.

- Ms. Zachary responded that if the restoration plan were to move forward, six oak trees would be removed – five on the eastern side and one on the western side of the creek. She said that there would be a number of conditions including the replacement of native trees lost in association with the project. She said that the specific plan aims to acknowledge that protecting natural and open space areas from future development is important.
- Ms. Longstreet responded that the Committee and Commission are being asked to vote on the ratio by which removed trees must be replaced, and not the specific trees to be removed.

Mr. Phillips moved that all landscaping within Areas B and C be native plant species only, and all chemical, pesticides, and fertilizer use be banned within this area.

- Ms. Hubbell responded that the specific plan is consistent with the City's IPM program and allows exceptions for arundo and pampas grass removal.
- Mr. Hochman made a friendly amendment to include native, non-invasive plants.

#### **ACTION**

**Phillips moved, seconded by Klobucher, and passed 6/0 that the Creeks Advisory Committee recommend that all landscaping planted within Areas B and C be native, non-invasive plant species.**

#### **ACTION**

**Conner moved, seconded by Larimore-Hall, and passed 3/0 that the Park and Recreation Commission recommend that all landscaping planted within Areas B and C be native, non-invasive species.**



Mr. Phillips asked if the City's IPM program addresses chemical fertilizers and pesticides.

- Ms. Rapp responded that she is not certain whether chemical fertilizers are also addressed.
- Mr. Wilson stated that the use of slow-release organic compost is an appropriate fertilizer.

**ACTION**

**Hochman moved, seconded by Klobucher, and passed 3/2 that the Creeks Advisory Committee recommend that Section 28.50.020 B include the prohibition of chemical fertilizers in Areas B and C for landscaping purposes, following restoration. DeVoe abstained.**

Mr. Hochman recommended that staff investigate other restrictions on other compounds to be used within Areas B and C with the intent of preserving creek habitat.

**ACTION**

**Conner moved, seconded by Larimore-Hall, and passed 3/0 that the Park and Recreation Commission recommend that Section 28.50.020 B include the prohibition of chemical fertilizers in Areas B and C for landscaping purposes, following restoration.**

**ACTION**

**Wilson moved, seconded by [inaudible], and passed 6/0 that the Creeks Advisory Committee recommend that since the Las Positas Valley is surrounded by natural areas, invasive plants should be precluded from the project.**

**ACTION**

**Larimore-Hall moved, seconded by Conner, and passed 3/0 that the Park and Recreation Commission recommend that since the Las Positas Valley is surrounded by natural areas, invasive plants should be precluded from the project.**

**ACTION**

**Larimore-Hall moved, seconded by Conner, and passed 3/0 that the Park and Recreation Commission recommend that Section 28.50.020 Item B.4.o language be changed from "environmental engineering firm with experience in creek restoration" to "ecological restoration engineering experts."**

**ACTION**

**Hochman moved, seconded by Phillips, and passed 6/0 that the Creeks Advisory Committee recommend that Section 28.50.020 Item B.4.o language be changed from "environmental engineering firm with experience in creek restoration" to "ecological restoration engineering experts."**

**ACTION**

**Klobucher moved, seconded by Pritchett, and passed 6/0 that the Creeks Advisory Committee accept the language of the remainder of Section 28.50.020 B.**

**ACTION**

**Conner moved, seconded by Larimor-Hall and passed 3/0 that the Park and Recreation Commission accept the language of the remainder of Section 28.50.020 B.**

Mr. Hochman stated that he is concerned that the plan includes a roadway that runs through setback Areas B and C.

- Mr. Phillips said that he concurs with the applicant that the excessive grading to place the road out of the setback would be more detrimental than having it pass through the setback.
- Mr. Wilson said that he concurs with Mr. Phillips since lots are not proposed within the immediate vicinity of the road at that location.

Mr. Amerikaner stated that condition E2, as it is written, requires the applicant to build the bridge. He said that the applicant has not offered and will not offer to build a bridge. Mr. Amerikaner recommended that the language be changed to "easement for a pedestrian bridge." He said that building the bridge is not a part of the specific plan for the current applicant or any future applicants. Mr. Amerikaner stated that he understands that the purpose of this meeting was to decide upon major parameters of the project, and the installation of a bridge is a major parameter. He stated that the project does not include a bridge and therefore the specific plan should not require a bridge.

- Ms. Hubbell responded that the inclusion of a pedestrian bridge or easement will be determined as a part of the project. She said that the specific plan states that there will be a bridge or an easement for a bridge, which will be decided as a part of the project approval.

Mr. Klobucher stated that the ocean users would love the ability to move from Elings Park to Arroyo Burro Beach.

**ACTION**

**Hochman moved, seconded by Phillips, and passed 5/0 that the Creeks Advisory Committee recommend that a pedestrian bridge or easement be located across from Jerry Harwin Parkway, connecting to the internal public road. Wilson abstained.**

**ACTION**

**Conner moved, seconded by Larimore-Hall, and passed 3/0 that the Park and Recreation Commission recommend that the pedestrian bridge or easement be located across from Jerry Harwin Parkway, connecting to the internal public road.**

**ACTION**

**Hochman moved, seconded by Klobucher, and passed 6/0 that the**

**Creeks Advisory Committee concur with the remainder of the circulation element.**

**ACTION**

**Larimore-Hall moved, seconded by Conner, and passed 3/0 that the Park and Recreation Commission concur with the remainder of the circulation element.**

Mr. Hochman stated that education and outreach components should also be added to bridges and paths.

Mr. Wilson stated that with regard to Public Health and Safety, he feels that all road surfaces should be made of permeable materials. He said that permeable concrete can be made to support large sized rescue vehicles.

- Ms. Hubbell responded that the roadway would be narrower than most roads with a 20-foot asphalt center and concrete sides and a decomposed granite finish.

**ACTION**

**Larimore-Hall moved, seconded by Conner, and passed 3/0 that the Park and Recreation Commission recommend that language encouraging the further investigation of the use of porous paving for the internal roads of the project be included under the Public Health and Safety element.**

**ACTION**

**Hochman moved, seconded by DeVoe, and passed 6/0 that the Creeks Advisor Committee recommend that language encouraging the further investigation of the use of porous paving for the internal roads of the project be included under the Public Health and Safety element.**

Pritchett said that Section 28.50.030 defines the limited activity zone as “between 50 and 100 feet from the top of bank” and recommended that it be reworded to “at least 100 feet from the top of bank.” He said that this definition change of Area B would address the more difficult issues that are not addressed by the specific plan. He also proposed that the language changed from “in order to preserve the creek environment and allow for incidental residential use” to “in order to preserve the creek environment and to allow for restoration option.” He said that this language would help to define the purpose of the 100-foot setback. He said that it is not necessarily to protect the creek but to allow more options to allow for a restoration project.

Mr. Hochman stated that he would like to keep the language for Areas B and C as it is currently written because he supports a “No Use Zone” and a “Limited Activity Zone.” He said that he would like to know where the boundaries for these zones would be.

Mr. Phillips said that yards and landscaping are not appropriate in a setback zone.

Mr. Wilson stated that the functions of a buffer are to 1) recharge groundwater supplies, 2) uptake storm water pollutants, and 3) protect wildlife from humans, dogs, and lights. He said that if the water from roads, roofs, decks, and patios drains to bioswales, then groundwater recharge and pollutant uptake would be addressed, and if there were a 25- to 50-foot densely vegetated buffer, wildlife protection would be addressed. Mr. Wilson said that he was a proponent of the 100-foot buffer because of the unknowns of the restoration plan and he believed that a 100-foot buffer would allow the creek to meander. He said that if the creek is going to be stabilized, then a smaller buffer may be acceptable as it would fulfill the objectives of recharging the groundwater, storm water pollutant uptake, and wildlife protection. He said that if dogs and lights were banned, then the need for a wider buffer is further reduced.

Pritchett moved that Section 28.50.030 defines Area B as a Limited Activity Zone the areas located at least 100 feet from the top of bank, and shall be maintained in as natural a state as possible in order to preserve the creek environment to all for restoration options and allow for incidental residential use.

Ms. Longstreet stated that it may be appropriate to have setbacks and buffers based on the actual creek bank locations.

- Ms. Hubbell responded that basing the buffer line on the new top-of-bank, based on restoring the bank, discourages restoration. She said that the 100-foot setback was originally recommended because the creek restoration plan was not yet determined.

Pritchett said that he is proposing that Area C adhere to a 100-foot setback.

#### **ACTION**

**Pritchett moved, seconded by Phillips, and passed 5/0 that the Creeks Advisory Committee recommend that Area C maintain a 100-foot setback from the top of bank in accordance with Figure 4-4 of the Final EIR with the exception of the pinch-point. Wilson abstained.**

#### **ACTION**

**Conner moved, seconded by Larimore-Hall, and passed 3/0 that the Parks and Recreation Commission recommend that Area C maintain a 100-foot setback from the top of bank in accordance with Figure 4-4 of the Final EIR with the exception of the pinch-point.**

#### **ACTION**

**Larimore-Hall moved, seconded by Conner, and passed 3/0 that the Park and Recreation Commission recommend that Area B as defined in Section 28.50.030 be eliminated and the letter distinctions for the usage areas be amended accordingly but if Area B is to exist, then there is concurrence with the usage allowed.**

Mr. Hochman stated that he is concerned that Council will support a smaller “No Use Zone” and there will still be a need for a “Limited Activity Zone.” He said that the risk of not discussing the Limited Activity Zone is that if Council supports a smaller set-back then the Committee has missed the opportunity to provide input on appropriate uses.

With regard to the creek restoration plan, Mr. Pritchett stated that there are other restoration alternatives and he would like to see a more open design process.

Mr. Phillips recommended peer review at the current design level (30%).

- Ms. Zachary stated that she understands that the Creeks Advisory Committee would like potential alternatives to the design and recommended that the Committee and Commission identify areas of concern relative to the proposal to better evaluate alternative designs.

Mr. Phillips said that the best place to get ideas on these issues is from other restoration professionals. He said that the Creeks Advisory Committee is concerned with the amount of revetment proposed for the project.

Mr. Wilson stated that he is concerned how the restoration project will communicate with potential restoration projects above and/or below stream. He said that the applicant’s plan meets their objectives of stabilizing the creek and protecting property. He said that wildlife habitat and water quality can be improved by the applicant’s proposal but he does not know what this means downstream.

Mr. Phillips stated that Arroyo Burro is a 303(d) listed water-body for bacterial contamination and certain elements could be included in the restoration plan to reduce the bacteria entering Arroyo Burro Estuary.

#### **ACTION**

**Phillips moved, seconded by Hochman, and passed 6/0 that the Creeks Advisory Committee recommend that an independent review be conducted at the current stage of project development as well as at a later stage as recommended by City staff. Specific areas of concern include: revetment, fixing in place, opportunities to improve water quality such as wetlands, wildlife habitat improvement, bank stabilization, suspended sediment reduction, improving habitat for turtles and other sensitive species, bank sedimentation, wildlife habitat improvement, and bacterial reduction.**

#### **ACTION**

**Larimore-Hall moved, seconded by Conner, and passed 3/0 that the Park and Recreation Commission recommend that an independent review be conducted at the current stage of project development as well as at a later stage as recommended by City staff. Specific areas of concern include: revetment, fixing in place, opportunities to**

improve water quality such as wetlands, wildlife habitat improvement, bank stabilization, suspended sediment reduction, improving habitat for turtles and other sensitive species, bank sedimentation, wildlife habitat improvement, and bacterial reduction.

**ACTION**

Conner moved, seconded by Larimore-Hall, and passed 3/0 that the Park and Recreation Commission concur with staff's recommendation regarding maintenance, cost for creek stabilization, and restoration.

Mr. Pritchett asked for the definitions of appropriate or adequate maintenance or site management.

- Ms. Rapp responded that a maintenance plan will be included in the conditions of approval.
- Ms. Hubbell responded that the specific plan requires the preparation and implementation of the maintenance plan.

**ACTION**

Hochman moved, seconded by Klobucher, and passed 5/0 that the Creeks Advisory Committee concur with staff's recommendation regarding maintenance, cost for creek stabilization, and restoration. Wilson abstained.

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

At 9:55 p.m. there being no further business to come before the Committee,

**ACTION:**

Larimore-Hall moved, seconded by Conner, and passed 9/0 that the meeting be adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy L. Rapp  
Parks and Recreation Director