

Katherine Douglas

General Public Comment - Group 1



From: Rama Fox <rama@ramafoxlegal.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 6, 2024 1:12 PM
To: sbcob; Supervisor Das Williams; sbcob; svmha.340oldmill@yahoo.com
Cc: a.bushnell.anderson@gmail.com; 'Ellen Duke'; sidhi5@hotmail.com
Subject: Santa Barbara Senior Mobilehome Parks - Moratorium on Conversion to All-Age

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

To Our Honorable Santa Barbara County Supervisors –

Hello and thank you all for your support of the mobilehome conversion from senior to all-age Moratorium yesterday.

Although the Agenda said 11:45 am to hear our request, as you know it didn't happen until about 3:45 pm. When Supervisor Capps met with us the prior week at Rancho Santa Barbara, she warned that it likely wouldn't be heard until the afternoon. However, I was concerned I might miss it, so I hung in there and watched you all for hours. And am I glad I did. I got to witness how thorough, patient, well-informed, and conscientious you all are. Truly.

When Supervisor Capps came to meet with us earlier, her warmth and straight-forward clarity and attention was a tribute to the SB County Board of Supervisors actually caring for our community first-hand, and not merely "just doing a job." As I carefully watched on Nov. 5th, the sincerity of each of you was very apparent. I was also impressed with the depth of information, insight, and understanding with which you each came prepared.

I hope you know how valuable and appreciated you all are.

Your grateful constituent and friend...

Rama Fox-Cheever
San Vincente Mobile Home Park #34



Rama Fox, MA, CHH

Witness Preparation Service

www.RamaFoxLegal.com

818-784-3001

Just when the caterpillar thought the world was over, it became a butterfly! Annon

Be kinder than necessary, because everyone is fighting their own kind of battle. Plato

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Applicable privileges are not waived by virtue of this information having been sent by email.

Katherine Douglas

From: Kevin Goodwin (kmgoodwin365@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<kwautomail@phone2action.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 6, 2024 11:47 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Deny Exxon trucking project - Upcoming Board of Supervisors Meeting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to deny this dangerous project as recommended by the Santa Barbara Planning Commission.

In addition to the significant and unavoidable risks of spills from trucking the oil, the purported benefit of producing oil from the offshore platforms and processing it on the Gaviota coast would bring with it unacceptable risks of offshore oil spills, air pollution and toxic fire and smoke risks that were not analyzed in the EIR, which focused narrowly on trucking impacts.

The recent oil spill off of Orange County underlines the severity of these risks. In addition, ExxonMobil's facilities were the largest sources of air pollution in the county and contained dangerous and toxic materials in an area that has burned by wildfire twice in the 6 years since the facilities have been shut down. We were fortunate that oil and dangerous gases were not present at the site during the recent Alisal fire, which burned onto ExxonMobil's property.

It is not just that the trucking routes are along sections of road with above average accident rates, there have been specific and recent instances of oil tankers on this route spilling oil into rivers and starting fires. In fact, on October 11 -- the same day as the Alisal fire -- an oil tanker crash near Orcutt caused a fire in Eucalyptus trees.

Thank you for denying this dangerous and unacceptable oil trucking project.

Sincerely,

Kevin Goodwin
6300 Coffee Rd
Bakersfield, CA 93306
kmgoodwin365@gmail.com
(858) 436-4054

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. If you need more information, please contact Member Care at Sierra Club at member.care@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5673.

Katherine Douglas

From: Layne Wheeler <layne.wheeler@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 11:27 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Las Varas Ranch Development, Coastal Trail and Open Space

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Chair Wolf and Board members,

As a voter and concerned citizen, I am concerned about the impacts of the Las Varas Ranch development on coastal trails and access. I respectfully request that the Board of Supervisors:

- Support your Planning Commission and ensure that the project Environmental Impact Report is revised to fully address project impacts.
- Protect historic informal public coastal access to Edwards Point.
- Require dedication of an easement for a nearshore California Coastal Trail.
- Support the County's Coastal Plan that identifies Edwards Point as a major Coastal Park.

Please do everything possible to acquire a nearshore California Coastal Trail and protect blufftop open space on Las Varas Ranch!

Sincerely,

Sent from my iPad

Katherine Douglas

From: Susan Shields <shields3033@netscape.net>
Sent: Tuesday, November 19, 2024 3:09 PM
To: sbcob; web@coastal.ca.gov
Subject: Damage caused by rocket launches

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

https://www.nytimes.com/2024/11/18/us/politics/spacex-starship-sonic-boom-damage.html?unlocked_article_code=1.bE4.hRfc.wJ2kPRjD0MF7&smid=url-share

SpaceX Starship's Sonic Boom Creates Risk of Structural Damage, Test Finds

An independent researcher found that noise recorded miles away from the site of a recent test flight was equal to standing 200 feet from a Boeing 747 during takeoff.

► Listen to this article • 6:39 min [Learn more](#)



By Eric Lipton

Reporting from Washington

Nov. 18, 2024

SpaceX's new Starship rocket far exceeds projected maximum noise levels, generating a sonic boom so powerful it risks property damage in the densely populated residential community near its South Texas launch site, new data suggests.

The measurements — of the actual sound and air pressure generated by the rocket during its fifth test launch last month — are the most comprehensive publicly released to date for Elon Musk's Starship, the largest and most powerful rocket ever constructed.

Starship, as tall as a 30-story building, is so large that it generates 10 times as much noise as the Falcon 9 rocket that SpaceX now uses to get cargo and astronauts to orbit, the new data shows. SpaceX plans another test this week.

For residents of South Padre Island and Port Isabel, which are about six miles from SpaceX's launch site in South Texas, the noise during the October test flight was the equivalent of standing 200 feet from a Boeing 747 plane during its takeoff, said

Kent L. Gee, an independent acoustics engineer who conducted the monitoring.

Dr. Gee is the chairman of the physics and astronomy department at Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah, as well as a researcher helping NASA study ways to reduce noise impacts generated by supersonic planes. The test results were published on Friday in The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America.

The Federal Aviation Administration and SpaceX did not respond to requests for comment.

When supersonic Concorde jets were still in service, the United States banned them from flying over domestic land “so their resulting sonic booms won’t startle the public below or concern them about potential property damage,” according to NASA.

The Starship flight test in October was about 1.5 times as loud on the ground as the Concorde sonic boom, the test results showed.

The loudest noise during the test came not during the Starship liftoff, as the giant rocket powered by 33 engines rose into the sky. Rather, the test data indicated that the peak noise was generated by the sonic boom about 6.5 minutes after liftoff, as the first-stage booster returned to the site for its self-landing at the launchpad.

During liftoff, the city of Port Isabel’s sound impact reached a maximum of 105 decibels, the data shows. That is roughly equal to the noise level emitted during an average rock concert or use of a chain saw. As the first-stage booster returned, the maximum perceived noise level in Port Isabel and South Padre Island was about 125 decibels, which is equivalent to a gunshot at close range.

As that sound hit the community, it briefly created an overpressure event exceeding 11 pounds per square foot, compared with the maximum eight pounds per square foot in South Padre Island that the F.A.A. had projected in October.

Separate tests were conducted last month by a sound consultant, Terracon of Houston, hired by city officials in Port Isabel. Officials there have been increasingly concerned that the SpaceX launches might be damaging homes in the small city of

about 5,000 residents.

Terracon found a peak sound pressure level of 144.6 decibels as the rocket descended, which is also higher than Port Isabel expected, said the city manager, Jared Hockema.

“We are all for economic development and the work SpaceX is doing,” Mr. Hockema said. “We just want economic development that takes place in a manner that follows the law and does not hurt existing residents or the environment.”

Modest property damage, such as cracks in plaster or breaks in “older and weakened, or poorly mounted windows,” can start to occur when the pressurization level hits 10 pounds per square foot, according to the F.A.A., particularly if this type of level occurs repeatedly during launches. But this remains unlikely until the level hits about 20 pounds per square foot, the agency says.

In the October flight test, car alarms went off on the streets where the technicians were doing the sound monitoring. And Mr. Hockema said the city received a series of reports from residents of minor damage during the SpaceX launches, although no data has been collected on the total count.

Dr. Gee and his team set up testing devices in eight locations from six miles out — on the rooftop of the Margaritaville Hotel in South Padre Island, a resort community — to 22 miles out, at a private home in Brownsville, the closest large city.

No tests were conducted closer to the launch site, even though there are dozens of homes in Boca Chica village, less than two miles from the launchpad, and in rural areas nearby. The area is also surrounded by a national wildlife refuge and state park that are home to several endangered or threatened birds and turtles, which may also be harmed by the noise.



The SpaceX Starbase complex is surrounded by the Lower Rio Grande Valley National Wildlife Refuge. Meridith Kohut for The New York Times



Justin LeClaire, an avian conservation biologist for the Coastal Bend Bays & Estuaries Program, photographed a dead Atlantic green sea turtle on Boca Chica Beach. Meridith Kohut for The New York Times

There has been extremely limited public data about the actual noise impact from the five full-scale Starship launch tests so far.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service employees last year expressed frustration that they did not have the money to buy devices to do such measurements on their own.

“It is clear we don’t have the proper equipment for this (multiple devices, environmental condition sensors, software, etc.),” Stephanie Bilodeau, a wildlife refuge specialist at the agency, wrote to one of her colleagues last year, in an email obtained by The New York Times through an open records request.

The Times reported this year that SpaceX had harmed the environment around the launch site in a variety of ways. At times SpaceX disregarded promises it had made when it first proposed building a launchpad in South Texas in 2012, as it vowed to have a “small, eco-friendly footprint.”

The data Dr. Gee collected last month did have some inconsistencies. When measuring just in the frequencies that humans typically hear — ignoring certain low and high frequencies — the Starship test launch in October had lower levels at all the test sites than the F.A.A. had projected.

These questions about the sound impact of the Starship are important as SpaceX is planning, once the tests are complete, to launch this rocket from two sites near the Kennedy Space Center in Florida as well as from South Texas.

“I would not be surprised if we fly 400 Starship launches in the next four years,” Gwynne Shotwell, SpaceX’s chief operating officer, said at a conference last week in New York.

Dr. Gee and his team will be measuring noise again during the test planned for Tuesday. Weather and wind conditions can affect how noise travels, so the results could be different, he said.

Eric Lipton is an investigative reporter, who digs into a broad range of topics from Pentagon spending to toxic chemicals. More about Eric Lipton

Katherine Douglas

From: Jean King (whjaking@comcast.net) Sent You a Personal Message
<kwautomail@phone2action.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 20, 2024 6:22 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Deny Exxon trucking project - Upcoming Board of Supervisors Meeting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors,

For years we Californians have been fighting to protect our ocean waters from oil pollution.

I urge you to deny this dangerous project as recommended by the Santa Barbara Planning Commission.

In addition to the significant and unavoidable risks of spills from trucking the oil, the purported benefit of producing oil from the offshore platforms and processing it on the Gaviota coast would bring with it unacceptable risks of offshore oil spills, air pollution and toxic fire and smoke risks that were not analyzed in the EIR, which focused narrowly on trucking impacts.

The recent oil spill off of Orange County underlines the severity of these risks. In addition, ExxonMobil's facilities were the largest sources of air pollution in the county and contained dangerous and toxic materials in an area that has burned by wildfire twice in the 6 years since the facilities have been shut down. We were fortunate that oil and dangerous gases were not present at the site during the recent Alisal fire, which burned onto ExxonMobil's property.

It is not just that the trucking routes are along sections of road with above average accident rates, there have been specific and recent instances of oil tankers on this route spilling oil into rivers and starting fires. In fact, on October 11 -- the same day as the Alisal fire -- an oil tanker crash near Orcutt caused a fire in Eucalyptus trees.

Thank you for denying this dangerous and unacceptable oil trucking project.

Sincerely,

Jean King
4205 Colgate Way
Livermore, CA 94550
whjaking@comcast.net
(925) 445-0318

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. If you need more information, please contact Member Care at Sierra Club at member.care@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5673.

Katherine Douglas

From: martha hassen <marthahassen2000@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 20, 2024 2:47 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: BOS Meeting Oct. 8, 2024 Senior Park Overlay

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I want to commend Chelsea Lenzi, and Lia for their help and support at the above mentioned meeting.

Their unfailing good humor and genuine help got us through the long day.

The young men who handle the security at the front door are incredible. They do their job with a smile and a quip, while calming us old ladies down.

Appearing before the BOS and giving a statement is tremendously nerve-racking.

I want to thank the Board for their patience and understanding.

Martha Hassenplug
Resident Rancho Santa Barbara

Katherine Douglas

From: Gina White (gina.r.white@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<kwautomail@phone2action.com>
Sent: Friday, November 22, 2024 12:12 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Deny Exxon trucking project - Upcoming Board of Supervisors Meeting

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to deny this dangerous project as recommended by the Santa Barbara Planning Commission.

In addition to the significant and unavoidable risks of spills from trucking the oil, the purported benefit of producing oil from the offshore platforms and processing it on the Gaviota coast would bring with it unacceptable risks of offshore oil spills, air pollution and toxic fire and smoke risks that were not analyzed in the EIR, which focused narrowly on trucking impacts.

The recent oil spill off of Orange County underlines the severity of these risks. In addition, ExxonMobil's facilities were the largest sources of air pollution in the county and contained dangerous and toxic materials in an area that has burned by wildfire twice in the 6 years since the facilities have been shut down. We were fortunate that oil and dangerous gases were not present at the site during the recent Alisal fire, which burned onto ExxonMobil's property.

It is not just that the trucking routes are along sections of road with above average accident rates, there have been specific and recent instances of oil tankers on this route spilling oil into rivers and starting fires. In fact, on October 11 -- the same day as the Alisal fire -- an oil tanker crash near Orcutt caused a fire in Eucalyptus trees.

Thank you for denying this dangerous and unacceptable oil trucking project.

Sincerely,

Gina White
323 Hershner Dr
Los Gatos, CA 95032
gina.r.white@gmail.com
(408) 626-8481

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. If you need more information, please contact Member Care at Sierra Club at member.care@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5673.

Katherine Douglas

From: John Landmann (jsport2004@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<kwautomail@phone2action.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2024 5:13 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Deny Exxon trucking project - Upcoming Board of Supervisors Meeting

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to deny this dangerous project as recommended by the Santa Barbara Planning Commission.

In addition to the significant and unavoidable risks of spills from trucking the oil, the purported benefit of producing oil from the offshore platforms and processing it on the Gaviota coast would bring with it unacceptable risks of offshore oil spills, air pollution and toxic fire and smoke risks that were not analyzed in the EIR, which focused narrowly on trucking impacts.

The recent oil spill off of Orange County underlines the severity of these risks. In addition, ExxonMobil's facilities were the largest sources of air pollution in the county and contained dangerous and toxic materials in an area that has burned by wildfire twice in the 6 years since the facilities have been shut down. We were fortunate that oil and dangerous gases were not present at the site during the recent Alisal fire, which burned onto ExxonMobil's property.

It is not just that the trucking routes are along sections of road with above average accident rates, there have been specific and recent instances of oil tankers on this route spilling oil into rivers and starting fires. In fact, on October 11 -- the same day as the Alisal fire -- an oil tanker crash near Orcutt caused a fire in Eucalyptus trees.

Thank you for denying this dangerous and unacceptable oil trucking project.

Sincerely,

John Landmann
4090 Rosenda Ct
San Diego, CA 92122
jsport2004@yahoo.com
(209) 951-0383

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. If you need more information, please contact Member Care at Sierra Club at member.care@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5673.

Katherine Douglas

From: Douglas Kraus (superrawvegan@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<kwautomail@phone2action.com>
Sent: Friday, November 22, 2024 11:08 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Deny Exxon trucking project - Upcoming Board of Supervisors Meeting

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to deny this dangerous project as recommended by the Santa Barbara Planning Commission.

In addition to the significant and unavoidable risks of spills from trucking the oil, the purported benefit of producing oil from the offshore platforms and processing it on the Gaviota coast would bring with it unacceptable risks of offshore oil spills, air pollution and toxic fire and smoke risks that were not analyzed in the EIR, which focused narrowly on trucking impacts.

The recent oil spill off of Orange County underlines the severity of these risks. In addition, ExxonMobil's facilities were the largest sources of air pollution in the county and contained dangerous and toxic materials in an area that has burned by wildfire twice in the 6 years since the facilities have been shut down. We were fortunate that oil and dangerous gases were not present at the site during the recent Alisal fire, which burned onto ExxonMobil's property.

It is not just that the trucking routes are along sections of road with above average accident rates, there have been specific and recent instances of oil tankers on this route spilling oil into rivers and starting fires. In fact, on October 11 -- the same day as the Alisal fire -- an oil tanker crash near Orcutt caused a fire in Eucalyptus trees.

Thank you for denying this dangerous and unacceptable oil trucking project.

Sincerely,

Douglas Kraus
19479 Greenbriar Dr
Tarzana, CA 91356
superrawvegan@gmail.com
(818) 776-1636

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. If you need more information, please contact Member Care at Sierra Club at member.care@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5673.