

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED AND CITY STAFF RESPONSE

Comment: Support proposed project. (7)

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Comment: Access road is unstable and constitutes risk of slope failure and landslides. (2)

Response: *The southerly end of the access road has presented a maintenance challenge for City staff. A road fill failure occurred on January 10, 2005.*

Comment: Move forward with the project as soon as practicable. (1)

Response: *Agreed. The project timing will be affected by the City and County permit process, the rainy season and fire season, and possibly by any major construction project creating significant traffic on Mission Canyon Road.*

Comment: Surge tank project is unnecessary and extreme. (1)

Response: *The surge tank is not being used and the access road creates maintenance responsibilities. These facilities are no longer necessary for the operation of the City's water system.*

Comment: Removal of the road and fill is overkill. Place debris fence below access. (1)

Response: *Please see previous response. A debris fence will not stop a road fill failure and would not achieve the goal of removing the unused surge tank and access road which create maintenance responsibilities.*

Comment: Request water pipes be removed from Mission Creek. (1)

Response: *Removal of water pipes in Mission Creek is outside of the scope of this project.*

Comment: Slope restoration and stabilization is important. (1)

Response: *Agreed.*

Comment: Revegetate with native plants and indigenous genetic stock. (2)

Response: *The County Grading Permit will contain requirements for revegetation of disturbed areas. A Geologic and Soils Engineering Exploration Report, May 11, 2012, Grover Hollingsworth and Associates, Inc. recommended "deep rooted groundcover to assist in stabilization of the surface soils."*

Comment: Community to review draft restoration plan. (1)

Response: *City staff will follow the review processes established by the City and County as required in their permitting process.*

Comment: Ensure success of vegetation restoration plan. (1)

Response: *The County Grading Permit will contain requirements to ensure successful erosion control and revegetation.*

Comment: Minimize construction period. (3)

Response: *Requirements in the City Building Permit and County permits as well as the construction plans and specifications determine the necessary construction period. Once all of this information is available, the design engineer will specify the construction and plant establishment period in the construction contract documents.*

Comment: Perform construction and restoration in low fire risk season. (2)

Response: *The County Grading Permit will contain requirements to address this issue.*

Comment: Condition project to protect against project increasing fire threat. (1)

Response: *See previous response.*

Comment: Coordinate construction timing with other access impacts such as the Botanic Garden Project. (1)

Response: *See previous response.*

Comment: Repair any damage to concrete plaza, environment, and other infrastructure. (3)

Response: *The project Contractor will repair damage caused by the construction.*

Comment: Repair any damage on Mission Canyon Road. (1)

Response: *Please see previous response.*

Comment: Courtyard surface slumps due to drainage pipe and waterline-City should repair it. (1)

Response: *The courtyard is in County right of way. This appears to be an existing condition that may best be discussed with the County Roads Department staff.*

Comment: At 1530 Mission Canyon Road- Move existing fire standpipe, connect waterline to new water meter box, construct asphalt driveway to access existing solar panels, propane tank, and for brush clearance removal. (1)

Response: *The project will remove the access road adjacent to and on 1530 Mission Canyon Road property. In order to mitigate impact to that property it is intended that the items contained in the comment will be constructed as part of the project.*

Comment: Support restriction on future development of surge tank parcel by new owner. (12)

Response: *City easements and the surge tank parcel will be needed during the vegetation establishment phase which could be several years. After the*

vegetation is established, City staff may recommend that the City Council declare the surge tank parcel to be excess to the City's needs and offer it for sale in accordance with State and City law.

At the time when staff presents the permit and design contract for approval to City Council, City staff will indicate staff's intent to return to Council after completion of the Project to request authority to initiate steps to vacate all excess portions of the 1919 waterline easement, quit claim the City interest in a 1968 road easement without warranty to existing property owners and users, and dispose of the 2,500 square feet City-owned surge tank parcel. Staff will also suggest that a deed restriction be imposed on the surge tank parcel prior to its disposal which prohibits future development and is compatible with a Santa Barbara Land Trust conservation easement on an adjacent 134 acre parcel.

Comment: Support deed restriction against any human activity on City parcel. (1)

Response: *Please see previous comment.*

Comment: Request that City parcel be sold to a particular individual. (10)

Response: *The disposal of City land is governed by State and City law. Attached please find the applicable City statutes that govern the City land disposal process.*

Comment: Concerned regarding the stewardship of the existing Conservation Easement of land in the project area. (6)

Response: *The City has no authority concerning this comment.*

Comment: Closed bid process for parcel creates undue hardship. (3)

Response: *Please see previous comment.*

Comment: City should retain ownership of parcel. (1)

Response: *It is inappropriate for the City to retain land for which it has no use.*

Note: The neighbor comments above are not a quote but a paraphrasing of the comment. Each comment is followed by a number which represents the times the comment was found in the responses from the neighbors. A total of fourteen neighbor emails and letters were received by the City in response to City's letter of April 3, 2013.