

de la Guerra, Sheila

Public Comment-Group 3 #10



From: Tom Deardorff II <tom@dff.farm>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 10:40 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Additional Meeting for 101 Sound Walls

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.

The materials for the sound wall item posted to the website are not complete. In particular, the actual study that formed the decisions to not require sound walls was not posted nor was there any of the analysis done by the various agencies on the issue. Of major note, there is also no report/study on the impact of the project on flood impacts. The study at issue apparently only looked at the proposed widening with sound walls and without sound walls. Where is the study about the proposed widening versus no project? The issue is the project will negatively affect flood control in a significant way. This conclusion needs to be vetted in public and/or properly studied before you approve the 101 project. We - the community - deserve additional time and public discourse on this issue.

Also, the public deserves access to these flood control studies/materials and, therefore, the meeting on this item needs to be continued for an additional hearing with all materials properly posted. Peer review of these items is needed.

In addition, Chair Williams has just announced (it is 10:25 am) that the agenda is so full today that time and opportunity to be heard on this matter will be limited. The "awards" are given open ended time to praise people. However, you shut down the public from talking about important issues. The 101 project is the most important public project of the last 40 years. You should not use a packed agenda as a way to disenfranchise the community to talk about this topic.

Thank you.

Tom Deardorff, II
Deardorff Family Farms
P.O. Box 1188
Oxnard, CA 93032
805.487.7801 ext. 107

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Tom Deardorff II <tom@dff.farm>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 12:00 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Item 10 April 4, 2023 Agenda

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.

The reduction of time to speak on the 101 Sound Wall issue is improper. There are many concerns that the public needs to discuss in an open forum; including:

1. Legal Requirements. The staff report seems to downplay the legal necessity for sound attenuation by saying that it is not required by the EIR. This is a red herring meant to distract you from your legal obligations. Indeed, County, State and Federal laws do require you to use sound attenuation on Section 4D. The abatement of highway traffic noise is required by County, State and Federal statutes and regulations for both new construction and reconstruction of highways. There are hundred of miles of sound walls along the freeways in Southern California that did not exist 20 years ago. They were not built out of the gracious heart of Cal-Trans. No, they were built as a legal requirement when the freeways were improved/expanded - just like in Carpinteria. You are legally required to do the same type of noise attenuation in Section 4D. The Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan, Noise Element, states that 65 db is unacceptable. The current state of the 101 exceeds 65 db and the widening project makes that number even higher (see all your EIRs). Therefore, attenuation is required. You can not approve Section 4D without any sound attenuation.

2. Two Alternatives. Section 1102.5 of the State Highway Design Manual requires Cal-Trans to present two alternative options for sound walls. For Section 4D, there are no viable alternatives presented. They have not even looked at the sound walls independently or in short lengths or different locations. There is simply nothing for you to consider. The law does not allow this. Unless and until Cal-Trans provides two viable alternatives, Section 4D can not be approved by the Board.

3. Proper Study of Noise. In July, 2006, the 101 In Motion Final Report was presented to the Santa Barbara County Association of Government in cooperation with the all the Cities, the APCD and Metropolitan Transit. The community also played a large role in the study. The conclusion was that sound walls would be included in the project. Again, this was from 2006 - 17 years ago.

In 2011, the Noise Study and Vibration Reports concluded that sound wall would be included in the project and would achieve the legally required objective for sound attenuation. Then, for the next 12 years every study, every community outreach, and every discussion about the project included sound walls. In fact, there was a Soundwall Voting Meeting in 2021 that was yet another public outreach about the sound walls showing all sound walls still in place for Section 4D. Also, if you look on-line the maps for the sound walls still exists. Granite Construction's website stills says "sound wall are included" in section 4D with a picture of the map with sound walls. In short, every governmental entity, community member, consultant, construction company, and interested party assumed sound walls were part in parcel to Section 4D.

This is a 17 year old promise to include sound walls. As a result, none of the alternative sound attenuation alternatives have been studied. The Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan, Noise Element, states that these alternatives include reducing speed, route selection, extra right-of-ways, depression of the roadway, and landscaping. The State's Highway Design Manual has similar alternatives. The problem for you is that no one has studied or looked into these alternative because all have assumed sound walls would be built. And now, you can not simply remove sound walls from the project without studying these alternatives. You are legally obligated to study alternatives.

4. Major Flood Control Risk. Staff claims that sound walls were built in Carpinteria because they have better flood control. If true, then you need to engage a study of Montecito flood control and require that it be upgraded to the same level as Carpinteria. The point is this - there are no sound walls proposed to be built in the rivers, stream, and water ways of Montecito. So, the only reason there is an "issue" with sound walls is because the other infrastructure of Section 4D is not able to handle flood control and, as a consequence, it is flooding adjacent properties. Attached is a portion of the sound wall flood control study that shows over 100 properties will be inundated with flood water as a result of the Section 4D project WITHOUT constructing sound walls. That's right - even without sound walls Section 4D results in significant and major flood issues to 100's of properties. You can not approve a project that knowingly results in a significant threat to health, safety and property in Montecito. Surely, you need to study this further so that the bridges, culverts, stream beds, and other infrastructure that is part of Section 4D are upgraded to handle flood control so that 100's of properties and the lives associated with them are protected from flooding caused by this project.

6. Recovery Map is Wrong. The map you are using assumes the entire watershed is "burned" leading to larger than normal runoff and all the culverts and bridges are blocked. That is not the case. The watershed is not burned and substantial infrastructure improvements have been made to bridges and retention basins. Why are you using bad science to form current decisions? The City of Santa Barbara is not using it. You should not either. Adopt a resolution to use the old flood control maps as they are more accurate at this point in time. Once those are adopted, then approve Section 4D with sound walls that have been promised for 17 years.

Please accept this as an addition to my public comments which may have been cut short.

Tom Deardorff, II
Deardorff Family Farms
P.O. Box 1188
Oxnard, CA 93032
805.487.7801 ext. 107