

## 2011 CPA Membership Survey - Results

*In May, 2011 a survey was sent out by the CPA Board of Directors to the 200 active members of CPA (by email to those with active accounts and mail for those without). A total of 70 completed surveys were returned (35% return rate). Below are the results along with associated comments to the survey questions.*

---

1) CPA should continue to try to be a countywide organization and not just a South County organization.

YES	63.8%	44	
NO	14.4%	10	
MAYBE	21.7%	15	Total Respondents = 69

1. If resources are available, CPA should address issues of environmental protection countywide - but more specific land use and aesthetic issues should be limited to the South.
2. It depends on the support we can gather from north county, and we should only do what we can do well.
3. I believe CPA should focus it efforts on North County - recruiting new members, understanding and tracking key development projects and protecting the remaining Ag and open space after the aggressive development of the past decade.
4. Seems like it depends on resources and personnel (staff, volunteers). If you have the capability to cover the entire county, CPA should do so. If not, focus on South Coast only. Other groups like SBCAN seem to do a lot of North County work.
5. Seems that SBCAN is more active than CPA in North County. SBCAN seems to have more meetings in the north than in the south. If resources remain limited, maybe the CPA focus should shift the south county.
6. Only if there are members in the North County or people who will actively participate. If, as now, then only south county.
7. Go one way or the other. Don't try to do both.
8. By including the entire county, it should help swing Supervisors from North County to support CPA's initiatives, even when they may concern only the South Coast.
9. Only if there is a sufficient level of support in the North County, primarily in membership but also in financial contribution.

2) CPA should expand its activities in the North County since most of the growth in the future will be in the North County.

YES	47%	31	
NO	18.2%	12	
MAYBE	34.8%	23	Total Respondents = 66

1. Keep it the same
2. Depends on how active North County people want to be. No portion of the County should dictate to other areas.
3. Maybe we could help to launch a new North County CPA.
4. I personally view the "North County" with great suspicion and see it as a largely right wing anti environmental lost cause. However I hope I'm wrong. I was a strong supporter for the failed County split as I felt we'd be better off without them. My "maybe" reflects my hope that CPA can change that reality or at least slow it down vs. my fear that we will waste valuable and limited resources on a hopeless lost cause.
5. The key challenge to consider is that many of the current residents in N. County do not value responsible land use and protections. Perhaps CPA can draw more members to the cause by initially focusing on redevelopment opportunities (especially in the older areas like downtown Lompoc) -- this would create economic opportunity without sacrificing open space or Ag.
6. As a separate entity from South Coast. Our interests are different.
7. CPA has a long history in the South Coast and should continue if possible here. Expansion to the North County in lieu of South Coast would be regrettable, but in addition to the South Coast would be great -- depending on resources and personnel.
8. If Santa Maria wants to destroy itself CPA cannot stop that.
9. ONLY if there are major issues, and citizen participation. Appreciate the work of some north county folks on water issues.

10. Lompoc area and Santa Ynez Valley are special areas that are worthy of protection from over development and environmental disaster.
11. But consistent with the needed resources for running CPA. Actually, I was under the impression we were in both parts and this is what Olga Howard had been about.
12. I don't think this is a board decision as much as it is a response to (a) planning needs/challenges, and (b) availability of North County active members. Anyway, to the extent that this is a zero-sum game, I would not favor begging South County activities so as to be able to focus on the North County.
13. This would work only if the existing groups are willing to come under the umbrella of CPA.

3) CPA should reduce its activities in the North County since the bulk of the members and financial support for the organization is in the South County.

YES	19.7%	13	
NO	54.5%	36	
MAYBE	25.8%	17	Total Respondents = 66

1. If we cannot generate support for the organization and the policies we advocate in the north county we need to evaluate if we are the right organization to be doing the work or if there is something about our organizational culture that is getting in the way.
2. If it does not have the capacity to engage in north county issues, CPA shouldn't try, but should coordinate with SBCAN to allocate the turf. to cover NC issues, someone needs to monitor each city agenda, as should be done in South county, along with the supervisors.
3. Need to work to get more North County membership. Note that central coast opinion survey showed North County public opinion is shifting to be more like the opinions in South County
4. Yes, activities should be reduced IF there are few members. (What activities are there in the North County now?)
5. Membership and financial support are a result of activity and demonstration of caring.
6. Yes, at least for now. CPA has precious few resources right now. It should focus on its strength rather than spread itself thin.
7. Activity breeds support.
8. What happens in the North certainly affects the entire direction of the county.

4.) In addition to CPA's traditional role as an education and watchdog organization focusing primarily on land use planning, water, oil, transportation, etc., CPA should also be concerned with social justice issues as they relate to planning in the broader sense (i.e. diversification and economic inclusion).

YES	27.3%	18	
NO	50.0%	33	
MAYBE	22.7%	15	Total Respondents = 66

1. Much depends on how social justice is defined and whether we, as an organization, can afford the time and energy required to expand our range of primary concerns.
2. We don't need to duplicate SBCAN's efforts. CPA should focus on land use planning and be an authoritative voice in that focused realm.
3. Let SBCAN deal with that. We need to be focused on a few things and do them well
4. How can you separate land use and environmental issues from the people that the land/environment serve? I don't think CPA should be chasing issues like prisoner's rights -- but should think broadly about the IMPLICATIONS of development or not. cost of living, transportation options, etc are all relevant to "responsible" land use decision making. If CPA doesn't think about Environmental Justice -- then it should just call itself a Home Owner's Association.
5. Social justice issues are important to many of us, but this doesn't seem to be included in the historic mission of the organization. Instead of expanding its scope of work -- particularly to find new donors -- I would urge CPA to focus and build support for its original goals. Social justice issues that directly relate to land use planning such as affordable housing makes sense, but other issues such as immigration do not.
6. Not to duplicate work of Pueblo (living wage, immigration, insurance, etc.) but as social justice relates to traditional CPA issues, yes, (affordable housing, public transit, land use, etc.).
7. I need more information and specifics before I can answer intelligently

8. There are plenty of organizations that already focus on social justice issues as they relate to planning in the broader sense. SBCAN, Pueblo, etc.. One of the reasons I think CPA has not been as successful since Naomi left is because CPA has gone in this direction (and also the tilt towards "smart growth").
9. CPA should always be "concerned" about social justice. But we need to focus on a few things we can do well rather than flounder on a broad agenda. A few vital issues in the "land use planning, water, oil, transportation, etc." realm are enough to bite off.
10. There are several public trust issues that are being ignored that spill over into social justice. I think the paper water issue was a good example. Many of the state's regulatory agencies are clientele captured by the vary industries that they were established to control, this with adverse impacts on the state's citizens and guests. Of particular importance to me is public health and water-borne disease and pollution.
11. This is a very tricky one. I don't think we can be indifferent to social justice issues (e.g., homelessness) as these concerns do intersect with our traditional planning concerns. But I wouldn't retool the organization to make social justice a prominent focus.
12. This gets too political.

5) If financial survival of CPA is at stake, CPA should seek to collaborate with or merge with another, financially stronger organization with a somewhat similar environmental philosophy in an effort to prevent dissolution of the organization.

YES	36.9%	24	
NO	16.9%	11	
MAYBE	46.2%	30	Total Respondents = 65

1. Only if CPA's mission will not be compromised.
2. If there is a compatible organization with a similar mission.
3. CPA has struggled to stay solvent and support an Executive Director over the years. Collaboration doesn't necessary solve everything - but at its current mode of operation without an Exec Director - I believe CPA will be hard pressed to make progress on any agenda.
4. If it is truly survival, compromises may be justified, but CPA has a ebb and flow financial history. These are challenging times and CPA has to claim its turf and defend it - and be an effective active aggressive advocate.
5. Collaboration is a good option, merger would have to be considered very, very carefully.
6. Merger is an interesting idea, worth pursuing. Obviously, many factors, including views of another organization's membership, would be critical. If CPA is waning in influence because of a lack of members and grants (i.e., financial resources), it doesn't seem that another organization will be very interested in merger, if an equal merger is proposed. Collaboration in a limited way might be more likely.
7. Collaborate: YES; merge: NO.
8. I don't think CPA as currently structured can survive on its own.
9. Over the past ten years or so I kept suggesting that a logical place to look for new members was contacting folks who spoke up at ABR, HLC, P/C meetings - residents obviously interested in their neighborhoods (contacting them during the review process, not just after all decisions were made thru the process), but nobody seemed interested in the idea.
10. More detail is necessary before I would make any kind of decision on this.
11. I don't think "survival of the organization" should be our principal driver: it should rather be how can we with our history and resources contribute positively to the historic mission of the organization? If there is no clear answer to that question, then maybe it is time to wind down.
12. In the Santa Ynez Valley, they are many organizations - Valley Alliance, WeWatch, POSY, POLO (large funding base with more capability than CPA)

6) CPA should be pleased with the accomplishments of the past, declare victory for a job well done, and wind up its affairs and close down.

YES	2.9%	2	
NO	70.0%	49	
MAYBE	27.1%	19	Total Respondents = 70

1. At a time when the planning departments at both the City and County are being gutted, CPA may be the only voice for responsible planning there is.
2. We really need this voice to counteract the money.
3. CPA is still needed.

4. Maybe, a merger is not possible and financial resources are not forthcoming.
5. Maybe, if collaboration isn't supported and CPA members aren't willing to step up to financial support the organizations mission -- then the message is loud and clear, CPA is no longer relevant.
6. Maybe, Sometimes, this is the best pathway for an organization, especially if it finds itself lacking in funds and leadership. It would be a pity for this organization to dissolve but it might be best so that limited community resources can be refocused to other more deserving groups.
7. Land use issues in the 21st century will be more criticle than those issues that have been ignored in the 20th and thus compounded for the future.
8. CPA should consider becoming a volunteer based organization - no office, little or no staff, and dedicated volunteers who meet and work on the most important planning issues. Let go of the small battles. Focus on the big ones. There are not that many huge issues that deserve CPA's attention.
9. Before you do that what about revealing the financial condition/aspects of what is going on. (How these questions have evolved in this first section is really something - from expanding in north county, with or without north county financial support, to closing down. After we find out what is really going on financially maybe we'll have to scale back, and not have a executive director (how much does this costs, with salary, health insurance, etc.?) till things pick up (the economy) as an example.
10. CPA is the people who make it happen. They know better than to think the job is done. The name of the group through which they continue their activism doesn't really matter. But the task is hardly done and all of us must continue to work for what we believe is best for our communities.
11. CPA's careful monitoring of specific projects needs to be continued but could be housed by a larger more viable organization.
12. Younger leadership required

7) CPA should revert to an all-volunteer organization with no (or minimal) paid staff.

YES	8.6%	6	
NO	42.9%	30	
MAYBE	48.6%	34	Total Respondents = 70

1. Pending funding.
2. Not informed enough to respond.
3. If there is no other way.
4. don't believe that CPA will make any progress without either Dedicated Leaders or Paid staff. There doesn't seem to be enough volunteer hours/effort to sustain any real work.
5. Only if the board and volunteer members are strong enough to carry on the work. I've been involved with purely volunteer efforts -- they are challenging at best, especially over time. On the other hand, maybe this is the best course of action in the short time if financial resources are presently inadequate to hire staff. Do the best you can with what you have available for a period of time -- at least a year -- and see how it goes. If volunteers are serious and motivated, it can work for awhile.
6. Temporarily, yes, but we need to raise enough money to get some staff--at least to get agendas out keep the office organized.
7. We do need minimal paid staff.
8. Until there is a basis to do otherwise, it seems there is little choice. If the leadership can come to a consensus about their collective goals, the continuing question is how to accomplish those. Until there is some financial capacity to hire staff, there is no choice but to plod forward as volunteers and create results that encourage financial support.
9. Depends on what we want to accomplish. My group of four dealing with sewage and antibiotic resistance in water has no staff but we spend long hours and most of us are retired. It will be difficult, thus the best is to find a like minded NGO and join forces, if that is possible.

8) CPA should hire an Executive Director again. (Current Ex. Director left April 1)

YES	45.6%	31	
NO	16.2%	11	
MAYBE	38.2%	26	Total Respondents = 68

1. Sorry for all the maybe's but obviously I don't have enough solid information to say one way or another. Clearly, money is a big issue right now. I think the organization would be better with a paid executive director but what exactly were the circumstances for why the last one left so soon?

2. Not unless there is clear financial backing.
3. At present, we can't afford a full-time ED but if our financial situation changes, the hiring of an ED (at least on a part-time basis) should be a high priority.
4. CPA needs to rebuild and refocus with the efforts of community volunteers and from there decide whether a staffed organization is needed.
5. Don't know. If we are struggling as much as these these questions in both sections imply maybe/probably not. As an example, I've been a member over a decade and I was not informed that the executive director has left. This information could have changed my answers to earlier questions.
6. Need to figure out a mission, then see if an exec. director would help carry out the mission.
7. Yes - after you get a change in leadership.
8. Not at this time if the funds are not available. It is not fair to an ED to have to spend all her/his time fundraising to pay for a salary.

9) CPA should seek grants from foundations even if it means that CPA will have to change its “preservationist” history and reputation.

YES	16.9%	11	
NO	50.8%	33	
MAYBE	32.3%	21	Total Respondents = 65

1. Change to what?
2. How much will they have to change?
3. I am not sure why these two issues have been linked in this question.
4. That warrants a discussion, insufficient information here to discuss.
5. Change can be ok - but that does not mean a total abdication of the goals and mission of the organization.
6. I believe if CPA sticks with its preservationist history - the organization itself will become a thing of the past. The Pearl Chase society and the Historic Preservation society are devoted to preserving our past -- CPA should stand for solving Today's challenges and issues in the context of "living within our means" and environmental protection.
7. I don't see why the two must be mutually exclusive. Of course CPA should seek grants, but not if they come with those kind of strings attached.
8. I'm not sure exactly what this means but it sounds like a change in mission. I'm not for this exactly but on the other hand, a realistic view of land use planning is critical. For example, CPA's position on the city height limit (recent ballot measure) was a huge mistake. Was that considered "preservationist" to endorse a given height limit in the absence of other zoning criteria? I'm for reasonable growth -- granny units, more dense development within city limits, better transportation options, and preservation of open space.
9. It should seek grants based on its history AND future - grantors make grants on that basis, the future, not so much on the past.
10. CPA needs a support base of concerned citizens. If that cannot be accomplished then foundations will not bail out the organization.
11. Leadership needs to define their collective vision for the organization. Once that is done, some grants may be obtainable to meet those objectives.

10) I am interested in serving as a committee chairperson for CPA.

YES	3.7%	2	
NO	70.4%	38	
MAYBE	25.9%	14	Total Respondents = 54

1. I am already working in several environmental and conservation areas. I'm trying not to spread myself too thin.
2. I have been a member for many years and contributed money when asked. I have never been asked to be on a board or chair a committee yet I have attended meetings. I found this very interesting. I think that CPA should look to its membership and see who have been there for the long term. I also think that being in the city for some years should not be held against a person. The seniors also have a stake in the city and know its history, it takes some time to get to know this town.
3. Depends on where the location is. With gas over \$4 and am not inclined to drive to SB

11) I am interested in serving as a board member for CPA.

YES	9.6%	5	
NO	73.1%	38	
MAYBE	17.3%	9	Total Respondents = 52

1. I would rather be a resource person that is available as one or more particular niches comes up.

12) I am willing to significantly increase my commitment to CPA by donating money and/or getting new members to join CPA.

YES	7.8%	4	
NO	47.1%	24	
MAYBE	43.1%	22	Total Respondents = 51

1. Depends a lot. Sounds like CPA is undergoing a major transition and a huge financial challenge. I want a lot more information than you've provided members before making commitments.
2. Don't know. Since I just found out during this survey that the executive director left I feel that I don't know what's going on with the organization. First step might be letting the membership know what's going on. I have very much appreciated the work by the Plan Santa Barbara committee. It seems to be carrying on many of the old values of CPA (values from ten or so years ago when I first joined). With this last, short lived, executive director some of the emails made me feel that CPA had been hijacked.
3. Get the Valley agencies involved first.

13) I am willing to significantly increase my commitment of time to CPA by working on fundraisers, speaking at public events, soliciting new members, working in the CPA office, etc.

YES	6.25%	3	
NO	58.3%	28	
MAYBE	33.3%	16	Total Respondents = 48

1. I'll continue to represent you in worthy cases.
2. It depends on what direction the board decides to take CPA.
3. By using the term significantly, it may scare off folks who might be willing to help out some.
4. Too old to mount a new offensive.

14) CPA should support worker's rights including collective bargaining as an important part of a well planned community.

YES	24.5%	13	
NO	50.9%	27	
MAYBE	24.5%	13	Total Respondents = 53

1. I don't know enough about it. I do think that worker's housing and transportation issues are critical to the wellbeing of the entire community.
2. Collaboration-building is important--the old schism between the enviros-preservationists and the construction trades has diminished but not disappeared.
3. In rare instances, advocacy for such causes may become part of our institutional agenda. In general, however, CPA members should engage in strictly political activities as individuals.
4. Not sure this fits within scope of CPA's mission but maybe I have a skewed idea of what that mission is.
5. Not sure this is relevant to CPA's mission.
6. This is too far a field for me to appreciate. I think CPA could comment on this but not have it as a priority for taking up time.
7. While not adverse to organized labor, I'm not at all sure that CPA has anything to add here.
8. Stay out of this kind of politics. This is not a land issue.

15) CPA should support rent control as an important part of a well planned community.

YES	30.8%	16	
NO	46.2%	24	
MAYBE	23.1%	12	Total Respondents = 52

1. In rare instances, advocacy for such causes may become part of our institutional agenda. In general, however, CPA members should engage in strictly political activities as individuals.
2. Again, CPA could comment on this but it should not take up much energy.
3. Another issue to stay away from.

16) CPA should support low income housing projects as an important part of a well planned community.

YES	44.4%	24	
NO	24.1%	13	
MAYBE	31.5%	17	Total Respondents = 54

1. Depends on where. City of SB has done its share and more.
2. But not across-the-board; some "affordable" projects are more scam than community benefit.
3. Depends on the project, but generally, yes.
4. Unlike the two previous questions, this one addresses an issue centrally relevant to planning.
5. Only if the projects are consistent with CPA's historical preservationist goals.
6. Again, CPA should lend moral support in such areas but should not be side tracked from larger issues.
7. This is a fight for City hall, stay with The CPA fundamentals - land environment.

17) CPA should never agree to support projects which increase residential density beyond currently mandated limits unless they are 100% affordable housing projects.

YES	47.1%	24	
NO	27.5%	14	
MAYBE	27.5%	13	Total Respondents = 51

1. CPA should never agree to support projects that increase residential density beyond currently mandated limits.
2. Appropriate densities should be decided by considering infrastructure and services, environmental issues, community character, etc.; not changed because of affordability.
3. CPA should have the ability to evaluate individual projects that provide a substantial community benefit - I'm not sure 100% affordable is the only requirement to increase density.
4. I believe that we do need residential density in some areas of SB city and county to accommodate local workers and reduce transportation requirements. This density should be tied direct to jobs/employers.
5. Again, it depends upon the project. Some 100% "affordable" projects stink. I'd say that 100% affordability should be a strong criterion for supporting extra-density projects, but not a guarantee of support.
6. 100% affordable is not buildable in Santa Barbara. Be realistic!
7. We need to increase residential density, with affordable components. We need to support allowing "granny apartments." We need more residential density in the core of our cities, while maintaining architectural standards.
8. "Never" is too strong a word, and 100% is a very tough standard. There may well be situations in which some commercial or market rate housing components of an essentially affordable housing project deserves our support. Also, most 100% rental projects deserve our support even if they are not constrained by affordability requirements.
9. Never say never, but increasing density has so many hidden repercussions and affordable is a catch phrase that needs specific understanding and guidelines.
10. what's the definition of 'affordable'--if this includes moderate income 'workforce' housing then it's a viable position.
11. Look - housing issues today will change dramatically in 20, 50 and 100 years, so any costly changes won today will not matter in the future.
12. Never, no matter whatever.

## 18) How would you like to see CPA evolve?

1. I'd like to see CPA continue in its watch-dog role. It is unique, and it has helped preserve the special qualities of SB County & its cities.
2. Stick to its roots. CPA can make a special contribution by focusing on planning issues, not other issues, and encouraging citizen participation in planning.
3. Needs to be countywide organization. There are already local community planning organizations out there, but no broad based organization. CPA can work with the small community organizations, but a better, more important role, is for CPA to look after then larger communities needs, as all smaller cities and neighborhoods are connected. CPA can serve as a thread that links local organizations together, facilitates collaboration of said organizations, while fighting the fight at the regional level. It can offer assistance/expertise to local organizations when asked/needed, but it cannot take on every project, fight or battle. Must exist within its means and focus on getting community members, neighborhoods, cities, etc. educated in the planning process so they can eventually stand up and fight for their own causes. CPA would be the conduit to these organizations helping them work together as a broad region that is Santa Barbara County and beyond.
4. Build membership of younger professionals.
5. Pretty much as it has been.
6. I think CPA needs to move forward and not cling to the past. It needs strong leadership on the board.
7. Naturally and organically, the way it has for all of its existence, changing with the times and the faces who choose to become involved.
8. Continue advocacy and public education in matters of land use planning.
9. I would like to see it evolve into much more of a neighborhood and land use planning organization that has impact on local government. I'd like to see the committees rejuvenate, with regular position papers presented to the media - and with public forums on planning. This past year the organization apparently collapsed.
10. I would like to see CPA continue its county-wide activities, as there are many north county issues.
11. Participate in regional and national coalition grassroots movement to take back our environmental movement from corporatist control.
12. We should try to motivate current and new members to share the workload in at least one of the two main dimensions of our mission: education about and advocacy for good planning. In part we could do so by sponsoring monthly discussions (with modest refreshments at private homes) addressing some interesting topic (e.g., the pros and cons of new "smart" electric meters, census highlights, air quality monitoring in other U.S communities and overseas).
13. I would like to see an active group which supports the preservation of the quality of life of the current city residents and not obligated to supply housing etc for anyone who wants to live here. There has never been a survey of where the commuter traffic is going, only the statement that SB has to build to stop it. Look at the type of housing proposed to be built, would you give up a house 3 bedrooms and 2 baths with a yard to move into a 600 ft. condo? No and so the traffic will not stop. Would it not be better to require businesses to supply the housing for their employees before expansion? CPA should be active in the question of air quality, the set backs from the freeway for housing, the question of our water supply and the security of the long term supply. Gilbrater lost 1/3 of its capacity due to the fire but this seems to be ignored.
14. Become a broader-based, more citizen activated, organization pursuing planning issues. If we achieve a larger countywide citizen membership, I would like them to be more active in the affairs of CPA.
15. Seek greater connection with students at UCSB, SBCC, Westmont, etc and other young people.
16. Continue to be a leader on planning issues; monitor and participate in planning matters before the County and cities.
17. Stay grass-roots, involved in local (SB, Goleta, Carp) land use issues, informing the public and others, keeping an eye on issues that are essential to the mission, collaborating with other organizations, staying in the public view, speaking at meetings, councils, etc and not compromising integrity. Also encouraging interaction with members through events, workshops, etc
18. CPA should stay focused on Comprehensive Land Use Planning and Environmental Protection.
19. Larger, more wide spread membership. One or more staff persons. Continue to make statements on important issues in land use planning and the environment.
20. Support maintaining and increasing SB County's socio-economic diversity
21. Issues of political economy and bureaucratic incompetence as well as clientele capture should be on the agenda. Public policy should be brought into and under the purview of CPA.
22. Thriving committees, good relationships with electeds, and a good community PR program.
23. Return to policies that protect the character of SB.
24. Leave it alone, it shouldn't evolve. Board too interested in making developers happy.

25. More presence in the Central and North County. Contact POLO, POSY, SYV Alliance, WeWatch, Nancy Crawford-Hall, owner of Valley News and large cattle ranch.
26. Continue with its current mission statement.

19) What are priority issues that you think CPA should be working on?

1. Need to work within the organization's resources. Needs to continue to help smaller neighborhoods become more involved in the planning process (via education and occasional assistance/expertise on planning issues), but its primary goals should be to defend (watchdog) and help the county master plan evolved to meet a constantly changing communities needs (research and education).
2. Preservation and/or enhancement of community character, aesthetics, open space preservation, infrastructure adequacy.
3. Balance between tourism and local affordable work force in a well planned community
4. Balance of housing and public open spaces.
5. North County, Goleta and protecting the Gaviota Coast.
6. general plans, regional open space, development.
7. Getting the Santa Barbara City GP Update decided upon, one way or the other, and moving on; becoming serious again about traffic calming and promoting car alternatives, and working together with groups like COAST and the Bicycle Coalition; keeping an eye on all GP updates for monkey business; working with GOO and others on oil & gas issues, which are bound not to go away anytime soon.
8. Neighborhood protection. For example, the proposed higher density for the Milpas area by the GPU is liable to devastate the area with increased gang/graffiti problems. Open space protection, including city parks but also to Goleta-Gaviota. and the SY Valley.
9. Forcing SBCAG to follow the law in taking meaningful action in all areas of regional governance.
10. Sustainability/ living within our means.
11. Environmental protection in general/community plans and their implementation in large development projects.
12. The lack of active participation in issues that affect the city such as the general plan and major projects should be a top priority. As previously written there should be perhaps a north CPA and a south CPA. Certainly the push is on to make the city the worker housing for the surrounding county. Where are the affordable housing units in Hope Ranch and Montecito? The other concern is that there appears to be a push for the older members to be ignored in CPA and that we have to respond to the youth and their wishes. I see the present board as unable to act to attract members or to get their message out. The fact that the majority of the single family zones are now proposed to be duplex with (granny units) is of concern. The lack of the city to recognize the traffic congestion and thinking that we all can take the bus (75% is tax payer supported) ride a bike or walk is not reasonable. Our downtown is under the paid parking idea of the planning staff, look at the empty stores, and go out and see the competition at COSCO. Our sales tax revenue is down we are loosing it to stores which have ample parking and convenience.
13. Water and land use, especially as they are integral to land use policies and permits.
14. Plan Santa Barbara. Creating a modern community (South Coast) that capitalizes on SB's reputation and reality of beauty, good planning, good architecture, controlled commercial growth, ease of transportation, great recreation, and a very high quality of life. But we need to create a better jobs-housing balance in the region between Carp. and Goleta. Creating better integration of planning throughout the region to reach common goals through a more effective CAG or similar agency.
15. Opposing urban sprawl; favoring affordable and workforce housing.
16. Sound watershed planning.
17. Land use, height, bulk and scale of development, displacement of local workforce for tourist or high end development, encouraging more walkable areas, the gentrification of the funk zone and the waterfront.
18. Commitment to assuring citizens have adequate resources and services through good land use planning. Protection of open space and agriculture for long haul and future generations. Clean water and air etc. for healthy living.
19. Problems in development pressure areas. Water issues; help prevent more importation of water to fuel more development. Watch general plans of the cities and county. The area's heritage and beauty must not be destroyed by the uncaring and the avaricious.
20. Housing, transportation (especially public transit), environmental protection.
21. Public health and water quality.
22. Increasing membership. News letters.
23. Getting funds to finance CPA the way it is, not change it.

24. The same as you always have done - land use, water - imported and ground, waste water - ocean discharge and recycled to name a few.
25. Preserving Gaviota preserving existing ag. land preventing urban sprawl preventing existing urban areas from deteriorating.

20) Please tell us what time/financial commitment you are able to make to CPA.

1. Whether and how much I will participate depends on what direction the membership and board decides to take the organization.
2. I am with you in spirit and have in the past been quite active, but now am not able to give either time or money.
3. It would depend on what CPA is. If it is a planning protection organization, 5 or more hours/week, depending on the need and openness; if it is mostly environmental, although that's important, I already volunteer elsewhere, there are other organizations and I would not be interested in putting in much, if any time. As CPA has been/is recently I can't see making any financial commitment.
4. Minimal at this time.
5. 4 hr week, \$500/yr.
6. Cannot commit time due to potential conflict. Willing to increase financial support beyond annual membership.
7. Continue in the \$250-500/yr range, plus free or discounted legal services in worthy actions and projects.
8. What I can, when I can; that's about \$100 a year, and as much time as I can work in with other things.
9. I can contribute a little more, and can attend north county meetings that don't conflict with current commitments, and encourage participation.
10. None. I've put in my time & it wasn't valued!
11. Between \$500 and \$1,000 per year. Perhaps a bit more if things begin to look up with CPA.
12. I have attended meetings when they were called, I was very disappointed in the lack of meetings on land use and that when they were held they were dominated by speakers to educate us while pending projects were ignored. I also have give funds to CPA on a yearly basis. Unless I see that a direction is taken to get CPA into issues that concern the future of our city I will not be supporting it financially. I am willing to give my time and money but only if I see results that help our city. Again I feel that the organization should concentrate on the city and other areas should form their own organizations. There could be a coordination between groups but right now CPA has to get involved in the city.
13. Really no time right now. I probably average about \$400 per year, and I'll continue to do so.
14. That depends of CPA 's ability to stay focused on the job it has done well for so long.
15. A few hours a month. Regular donations.
16. I'd make a significant financial contribution. And for the rest, it depends on what CPA works on. So many things are supporting or opposing specific government or private actions and projects.
17. No financial, that committed elsewhere.
18. Limited time and \$1000 annually. Wish it could be more.
19. None with the path you are currently on.
20. When the Board show it wants to maintain CPA's land use mandate, then I will have time and money for CPA. Currently, the Board seems more interested in social issues and I don't support that direction for CPA.
21. I will contribute \$100 as a member.

21) Other Comments:

1. I hope that younger more energetic people are willing to contribute and let the older people retire gracefully.
2. I suggest you seek persons with skill in organizational development and marketing/branding, find a clear definition of CPA's niche, test to make sure there is public support, then brand yourself - such as the only group engaged as watchdog over every south coast city and the county to challenge bad projects and ensure land use decisions follow the law and protect our communities' environmental future. Better to merge with Pearl Chase Society than SBCAN due to the culture of the 3 organizations.
3. Your survey is long, rambling and redundant. What exactly is going on with CPA that elicits these questions? This is not a healthy organization if responses are being solicited in the void of information to members.
4. It should be realized and appreciated that for some time is money and a willingness to put in time should be appreciated. CPA has been its committees with open dialog, participation and outreach. That seems to have

been trashed this past year. CPA seems to have become a closed little group and I don't see how it can survive like that.

5. Since SBCAN deals with mutual issues, CPA could look to further developing cooperative activities.
6. We are a prime example of a group of brilliant people who have abdicated the big picture of activism by allowing ourselves to become marginalized in the hyper-focus trap of techno environmental mandate and law.
7. I was very disappointed that in 8 months CPA was made to be totally ineffective. I attended meetings left with a feeling that nothing had been accomplished and any input that did not fit the current director was worthless. Currently CPA is faced with an uphill battle, the group formed by Flacks to push density in the GP indicates how low CPA has fallen. CPA was not even present at the last meeting of the council sub-committee to speak.
8. I am amazed that the 50th anniversary year went by without a big event to celebrate it. What a wasted opportunity to galvanize the members and put on a wonderful event to celebrate the successes of the past years. I realize it might be difficult to find the right person for this unique position.
9. When hiring a new ED please find one who will keep the history in mind, consult with those who have been there for some time - including past directors, board members, staff - and not be autocratic in the decision-making. Thanks, I have hope that you will do the right thing(s) for CPA to keep it vibrant and effective.
10. The CPA good name and legacy should not be put up for grabs. Go for grants only as they apply to CPA mission. Keep good newsletters coming.
11. We must not be "taken over" by persons and organizations who do not truly believe in CPA's purposes. Respect our founders and their hard work. The battle continues.
12. I hope CPA continues and expands on its tradition of preserving SB, but not just the city but the whole county.
13. CPA needs to start looking a broader critical issues and issues on a regional scale
14. CPA has done nothing good since Naomi left. The Board does not seem to understand the issues.
15. Tell me and the other members why the CPA has fallen on hard times - money, leadership, we have gotten old, taken on too many issues?
16. Bless you and good luck.
17. Thank you for your good works!
18. I am proud to be a member of CPA and so grateful for what it is doing.