

## Alexander, Jacquelyne

---

**From:** Thomas Bollay <tba@architect.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 19, 2018 12:53 AM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Subject:** Fwd: Proposed adoption of FEMA Interim Advisory Flood Maps (Recovery Maps)  
**Attachments:** BOS let 61818.pdf; ATT00001.htm

Thomas Bollay  
[TBA@Architect.com](mailto:TBA@Architect.com)

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Thomas Bollay <[tba@architect.com](mailto:tba@architect.com)>  
**Date:** June 18, 2018 at 11:04:34 PM PDT  
**To:** [boardletters@co.santa-barbara.ca.us](mailto:boardletters@co.santa-barbara.ca.us)  
**Cc:** Thomas Bollay <[tba@architect.com](mailto:tba@architect.com)>  
**Subject:** **Proposed adoption of FEMA Interim Advisory Flood Maps (Recovery Maps)**

Dear, Clerk of the board,

Please submit this letter to the BOS on the record for tomorrows hearing.

June 18, 2018

Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors 105 E. Anapamu Street

Santa Barbara, CA 93101

sent via email

Re: Proposed adoption of FEMA Interim Advisory Flood Maps (Recovery Maps), June 19, 2018 Board Hearing , Item D3

Dear Chair Williams and Members of the Board of Supervisors:

The basic premise of the new FEMA map is described by FEMA as:

**“Changed Conditions Due to Fire/Flood.** Recovery Maps do not replace the current effective Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), but the advisory flood elevations from the new Recovery Maps are based on sound science and engineering, new analyses, and are derived from post-fire flows and post-debris flow ground conditions.”

**“Mapping Purpose - Recovery Maps for Safer Rebuild.** Mapping hazards is vital for safe disaster recovery; it provides the data necessary for new construction and creates awareness of risk.”

It is generally agreed that the area most at risk of a subsequent debris flow event is that portion of Montecito above East Valley Road, so I have focused this preliminary review on that area of Montecito.

**Of the 147 homes above East Valley Road that were destroyed or heavily damaged, 6 of which included fatalities, only 7 properties or 4.6% are shown to be at moderate risk or higher on the new FEMA Recovery Map, defining moderate risk as having surface flows of 1’ or greater in depth.**

I began by reviewing the Randall Road neighborhood (one of the hardest hit areas of Montecito along East Valley Road). I overlaid SBC’s “Finalized Damage Inspections” map with their red, orange, yellow and blue dots, and FEMA’s new “Recovery Map”, I was surprised to see that all seven homes destroyed in the 1/9 event on Randall Road were depicted as in the “less than 0.5’ of surface water” or at “low risk”, yet there were 3 fatalities there, how can that be? I then started looking closer at other neighborhoods above East Valley Road, and I found a systematic pattern of areas that suffered heavy damage not showing up as in an area of hazardous surface flow depths. I focused on only those homes with red and

orange dots. Of the 147 homes above East Valley Road that were destroyed or heavily damaged, 6 of which included fatalities only 4.6% were shown to be at a depth that resembled moderate risk (1-3' of water depth), in other words, 95.4% of the homes were shown at no risk (no surface water- outside of the yellow lines), low risk (less than .5' of water depth or no significant risk (0.5-1.0' of water depth).

If the purpose of waiting 5 months for this model to be run by FEMA was to “provide the data necessary for new construction and create awareness of risk.” and it only highlighted 4.6% of the homes that were destroyed/damaged in the 1/9 event as at risk, the exercise has failed.

**The problem is that hundreds of Montecito residents need to rebuild and the County needs the revenue!**

I am told that SBC Flood Control will sit down with each homeowner and work to improve their resiliency using their best engineering judgment. Engineering judgment is good for those rebuilding, but what about those not damaged in the 1/9 event, how much risk are they in? This model in its current iteration fails to inform the community or provide accurate risk information.

### **Conclusion**

Allow the recovery to continue, reconstruction should be allowed to proceed, based on private “best engineering judgment”. Let the private sector in consultation with Flood control do this important work, let’s begin the reconstruction of Montecito now.

**Do not approve this model** for the purpose of recovery, it is not ready. Have SBC Flood Control continue to work with FEMA and their consultants to improve this model in an effort to create a more realistic Risk Map for all in our community or scrap it.

Thomas Bollay, AIA  
Architect / Civil Engineer  
P.O. Box 5686  
Santa Barbara, CA 93150  
Studio 805.969.1991  
E-mail [TBA@Architect.com](mailto:TBA@Architect.com)

## Alexander, Jacquelyne

---

**From:** esque13@aol.com  
**Sent:** Monday, June 18, 2018 10:33 PM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Subject:** Letter to BOS regarding FEMA Interim Advisory Flood Map  
**Attachments:** FEMA Letter to BOS - 06-18-18.docx

Dear County Clerk:

I am hoping that it still might be possible for a copy of my letter (copied below as well as attached) to be included in the packets for Board of Supervisor members, as I would very much like my concerns and comments to be part of the public record.

Thank you very much,  
Susan Keller, Commissioner  
Montecito Planning Commission

Dear Chair Williams and Supervisors:

The FEMA Interim Advisory Flood Map was made available to the public just a week ago. There has been only one community meeting (this past Thursday) for residents to discuss and ask questions about this map, a map that will have life-long repercussions on construction in Montecito.

It has been brought to my attention by numerous homeowners that there are significant errors and omissions in the map. There has not been adequate time for property owners to study the map and have a reasonable opportunity for public comment on these problems. There also has not been sufficient time for local experts with specific and particular knowledge of affected areas to properly study the map and determine its implications. Tomorrow's meeting is in Santa Maria, which poses yet another hurdle for appropriate public comment and Montecito community participation in this most important decision.

In the strongest possible terms, I urge you to postpone the vote on FEMA's Interim Advisory Flood Map until there has been sufficient time for adequate public review and input. A short delay will not substantially burden those who wish or need to rebuild their homes completely, and this decision will have lasting future impact on many other homeowners. Please do not short-change the public process. A rush to a quick approval has the potential to create a significant, unintended burden on homeowners in Montecito, both those who are insuring their properties and those who wish to rebuild or repaid.

Sincerely,  
Susan Keller  
Montecito Planning Commissioner

SUSAN KELLER  
480 Pimiento Lane  
Santa Barbara, CA 93108  
(805) 565-9357

---

June 18, 2017

Das Williams, Chair  
Board of Supervisors  
County of Santa Barbara  
105 East Anapamu Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Dear Chair Williams and Supervisors:

The FEMA Interim Advisory Flood Map was made available to the public just a week ago. There has been only one community meeting (this past Thursday) for residents to discuss and ask questions about this map, a map that will have life-long repercussions on construction in Montecito.

It has been brought to my attention by numerous homeowners that there are significant errors and omissions in the map. There has not been adequate time for property owners to study the map and have a reasonable opportunity for public comment on these problems. There also has not been sufficient time for local experts with specific and particular knowledge of affected areas to properly study the map and determine its implications. Tomorrow's meeting is in Santa Maria, which poses yet another hurdle for appropriate public comment and Montecito community participation in this most important decision.

In the strongest possible terms, I urge you to postpone the vote on FEMA's Interim Advisory Flood Map until there has been sufficient time for adequate public review and input. A short delay will not substantially burden those who wish or need to rebuild their homes completely, and this decision will have lasting future impact on many other homeowners. Please do not short-change the public process. A rush to a quick approval has the potential to create a significant, unintended burden on homeowners in Montecito, both those who are insuring their properties and those who wish to rebuild or repaid.

Sincerely,



Susan Keller  
Montecito Planning Commissioner

## Alexander, Jacquelyne

---

**From:** J'Amy Brown <j.amy.brown@att.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 18, 2018 10:05 PM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Subject:** FW: Map & MPC comments

Mr. Allen~Please distribute to full Board of Supervisors re interim FEMA map adoption

Dear Supervisors;

I am hoping you will consider delaying action on the Montecito hazard area zone map set for vote on Tuesday. The map that came out last Thursday. needs far more community study and input before BOS adoption. It should be allowed careful local review. There are errors and the community needs more time to identify those and correct them. This map will be "forever" so it needs to be done correctly and thoroughly understood by professionals and residents alike.

It is my understanding properties with less than 50% damage can move forward sans new flood control regs., so a few months study will not, in many cases, severely hamper rapid recovery.

Please allow the public an opportunity to weigh in, so those most familiar with the terrain can note inconsistencies, errors or omissions before you take final action.

ALLOW THIS MAP TO HAVE A NORMAL PUBLIC SCOPING COURSE BEFORE ADOPTION, which includes in this case would mean community meetings via MA LUC and MA Board; MPC; MBAR and THEN BoS. A 30 to 60 day continuance would allow for that public input process.

Respectfully Submitted J'Amy Brown, Montecito  
1143 High Road  
Santa Barbara CA 93108  
805-886 3230

c.c Joe Cole Montecito Planning Commission / Cori Hayman, MA Landuse Chair

*J'Amy Brown*  
*Cell: 805 886-3230*  
*Landline: 805 969-5515*  
*j.amy.brown@att.net*

**Alexander, Jacquelyne**

---

**From:** Vicki Hazard <vchazard@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 18, 2018 8:54 PM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Subject:** Action on the new FEMA hazard map

Dear County Supervisors,

I am writing to express my sincere hope that the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors will delay action on the newly released FEMA hazard map. While the work reflected in this map is certainly an important component in planning Montecito's future, we need to provide local experts with sufficient time to study, discuss and adjust this map before it is formally adopted by the Board of Supervisors. There are errors and omissions within the map that need to be identified and corrected before this map can accurately reflect Montecito's current condition and future needs.

Respectfully submitted,

Vicki Hazard  
[vchazard@gmail.com](mailto:vchazard@gmail.com)  
805-450-4765

## Alexander, Jacquelyne

---

**From:** Robert C Hazard Jr <bobhazard@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 18, 2018 8:50 PM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Subject:** Fwd: BOS Agenda, Tuesday, June 19, 2018: Item D3) Interim Advisory Flood Maps

### **To: Das Williams and the County Board of Supervisors**

Please **delay for at least 60-days** any vote “to **consider** and **adopt** the FEMA Interim Flood Maps,” as requested by Tom Fayram and County Flood Control.

### **FEMA MAPS OR FEMA MESS**

The new FEMA Advisory Flood maps were anticipated to bring clarity to the process of safely and expeditiously rebuilding Montecito for those flood victims who have lost their homes. Instead the reverse is true, making homeowner decisions more complicated.

The FEMA maps were released to the public on June 11th and explained at a **Das Williams** sponsored, packed-house County Office Building presentation on the evening of June 14. Das Williams and attendees shared common concerns and sense of confusion upon leaving that 2-hour meeting.

There are hundreds of absurdities in these new FEMA maps. For example, when I click on the new FEMA map, and enter the address “2031 Packing House Road,” the address of the historic Birnam Wood Golf Clubhouse, built by Chinese stone masons in 1894 as a Crocker-Sperry citrus packing plant, here is the response:

The entire 154-year-old Clubhouse sits on level ground, 220 feet above sea level. On all previous maps the Birnam Clubhouse has always been outside the high-hazard zone. However, the new FEMA map shows a dark blue lake on the top of the sloped roof of the Clubhouse, which is absurd. The center of the Clubhouse is exempt from the high-hazard yellow line, but the other end of the Clubhouse is in the purple cross-hatched, high-hazard zone.

What does all this mean? If the Clubhouse were to rebuild, the blue portion circle of Clubhouse over the dining room and kitchen would have to be rebuilt with a foundation raised 7 to 14-feet higher than it is now; the middle of the club would be ok at the present height; and the right-hand portion would also have to have its historic foundation raised. Keep in mind that the entire clubhouse is at the same ground elevation and that the water pool shown on the roof is a total fiction of FEMA. The FEMA maps need more vetting before being adopted by



the county. These errors have enormous financial consequences for the owners of these properties.

Completely undamaged homes with no mud and no damage, previously labeled as being in the lower risk zone are now inside the new FEMA yellow line, designated as "high-hazard," which means that if they rebuild they are subject to the new elevation rules. There is no appeal; no remedies.

Please avoid a rushed decision by the County Board of Supervisors (BOS) on Tuesday, June 19<sup>th</sup> to “**consider and adopt**” the FEMA Interim Advisory Flood Maps for Santa Barbara County. Do not vote for approval on Tuesday!

Bob Hazard

Associate Editor

Montecito Journal

## Alexander, Jacquelyne

---

**From:** Lee Ohanian <leeohanian@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 18, 2018 6:49 PM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Subject:** Fwd: Concerns Regarding FEMA Risk Map for Thomas Burn Areas  
**Attachments:** Ohanian\_letter\_FEMA\_Maps.pdf

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I sent the following letter to you for your consideration on June 18, at around 8:20 am PDT. However, there was a mistake in the email address of the Board of Supervisors. I noticed that now, and am forwarding this to you with the correction email address and ask that you consider it given that it is late only because of a mistaken email address.

Thank you,

Lee Ohanian

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Lee Ohanian <[leeohanian@gmail.com](mailto:leeohanian@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 18, 2018 at 8:20 AM  
**Subject:** Concerns Regarding FEMA Risk Map for Thomas Burn Areas  
**To:** [sbcop@co.santa-barbara.ca.us](mailto:sbcop@co.santa-barbara.ca.us), "Williams, Das" <[dwilliams@countyofsb.org](mailto:dwilliams@countyofsb.org)>

Dear Chair Williams and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I have attached a letter with concerns and queries regarding the new FEMA mapping of the Thomas Fire burn areas. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Lee E. Ohanian  
258 Hot Springs Road  
Montecito, CA 93108

June 17, 2018

Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors  
105 East Anapamu Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Re: FEMA Interim Advisory Flood Maps, File No. 18-00422

Dear Chair Williams and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing with concerns and questions I have regarding the FEMA Interim Advisory Flood Maps as listed below.

- (1) This map appears to be a flood map, and not a debris flow map. Therefore, how can the map be used to provide information and guidance regarding debris flows?
- (2) I have not been able to find supporting documentation for how the map was constructed. In particular, I am assuming that generally accepted scientific methods were used to construct this map and draw conclusions regarding the determination of the areas of "Extreme Risk", "High Risk", and "No Risk". What criteria were used to make these judgements? What types of probability bounds were placed on these judgements? What is scientifically known, and not known, about the future flows of flooding and debris? The map shows many areas where the difference between "No Risk" and "High Risk" is separated by no more than 30 feet. To a layperson, this is hard to understand and appears to be arbitrary. The ranking of two adjacent properties would tend to be similar in the absence of a major geological explanation. In fact, there are areas on Sycamore Canyon Road in which the difference between "Extreme Risk" and "No Risk" is less than 200 feet. Surely FEMA can provide a scientific and statistical justification that sensibly explains these discrete decisions and why properties that are so close together can have such large differences in risk assessments.
- (3) The map appears to be very similar to maps presented earlier this year, but this seems unusual, assuming that state and local governments are making investments to protect the Thomas Fire burn areas from future flood and debris flow events. I urge you to provide a website that clearly documents what is being done to protect the burn areas from future flooding and debris flows. If state and local governments are taking many steps to prevent or limit future events, then why is the map unchanged from earlier this year? These investments in protection from future events should make the burn areas safer. If so, why isn't this reflected in the map?

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Lee Ohanian  
258 Hot Springs Road  
Montecito, CA 93108