

Villalobos, David

From: Dallas, Mitch@DOT <mitch.dallas@dot.ca.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 9, 2020 12:52 PM
To: Ristig, Ciara
Subject: RE: Questions for Caltrans Appeal

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.

Hi Ciara,

Thanks for the info and discussion yesterday.
The current area of the TOJ's are 2.45 acres at the inlet and 2.56 acres at the outlet.
A meeting with the project team to try and have the areas reduced if possible is being set up.
I will keep you informed of any changes.

Thanks,
Mitch

From: Ristig, Ciara
Sent: Thursday, July 9, 2020 11:02 AM
To: Dallas, Mitch@DOT
Subject: RE: Questions for Caltrans Appeal

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

Mitch,

Thanks for taking the time to speak the other day. Below are answers to the questions you posed.

Set Hearing- this hearing is to ensure that noticing is done in time for the actual hearing, September 1st. There is nothing you need to do for the set hearing, August 18th.

Submittal Deadline- please send me a powerpoint presentation at least a week before the hearing. Any additional submittals can be accepted by the Clerk of the Board up until noon the Friday before the hearing.

Time Allowed- 10-15 minutes will be allowed for your presentation, with a 5 minute rebuttal

Communication w/Supervisors- communication with the Board won't go through P&D- Caltrans should reach out to them independently

Thanks,
Ciara

From: Dallas, Mitch@DOT <mitch.dallas@dot.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 2:22 PM
To: Ristig, Ciara <cristig@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>
Subject: RE: Questions for Caltrans Appeal

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.

Hi Ciara,

Please see the response to the questions below.

Please let me know if there are any questions or if any clarification is needed.

I would like to know about providing a formal response to the appeals for the hearing if that's possible? Let's discuss further during or phone call tomorrow.

Thanks,
Mitch

Can the existing culvert remain in place for crossing? What is the reason for filling it in instead of retaining as is? [The purpose for abandoning by back filling is to ensure that the roadbed above and the roadway embankment are not compromised should the box culvert fail due to deterioration associated with cracked concrete, and exposed reinforcement bars in the floor, walls, soffits and joints. Settlement of the box culvert has also been observed. In addition, the project proposes to repair the sinkhole at the inlet side of the existing box thereby burying the existing culvert that will be backfilled.](#)

How was it determined that no wildlife corridors are present? Because of lack of habitat or other studies? [Please see the attached response "SB Co CDP Appeal Response Bio" with mapping.](#)

Was State land transferred to Caltrans ownership?

[A transfer of jurisdiction \(TOJ\) between the 2 State of California Departments is being planned for this area and we have begun the process. A Parks Right of Entry Permit was obtained to do this work, with the understanding that there will be a TOJ for these areas.](#)

If so, was there compensation paid? [Yes, an appraisal was completed for these areas. The compensation will be paid to Parks as part of the TOJ process, which will involve a review of the appraisal from the Dept. of General Services.](#)

Or is the impact limited to the encroachment of the culvert, which State Parks gave permission for?

[The impact is limited to the encroachment of the culvert. The TOJ from Parks to DOT is being made for this encroaching area so the Department Of Transportation can construct and maintain the culvert, as well as the mitigation planting.](#)

Was Gaviota Creek considered for mitigation? If not, why not? [Please see the attached response "Mitigation Response Coastal Appeal".](#)

From: Ristig, Ciara <cristig@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>

Sent: Thursday, July 2, 2020 11:42 AM

To: Dallas, Mitch@DOT <mitch.dallas@dot.ca.gov>

Subject: Questions for Caltrans Appeal

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

Hi Mitch,

Have some questions regarding our response to the appeals, see below.

Depending on timing, it might be good to also touch base by phone next week sometime, if that sounds possible.

Can the existing culvert remain in place for crossing? What is the reason for filling it in instead of retaining as is?

How was it determined that no wildlife corridors are present? Because of lack of habitat or other studies?

Was State land transferred to Caltrans ownership? If so, was there compensation paid? Or is the impact limited to the encroachment of the culvert, which State Parks gave permission for?

Was Gaviota Creek considered for mitigation? If not, why not?

Thanks,



Ciara Ristig
Planner

Planning & Development
Development Review
123 E. Anapamu St.
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
805-568-2077

crstig@countyofsb.org

<http://www.countyofsb.org/plndev/home.sbc>

In light of the measures recommended by the CDC and State Government, Planning & Development has enacted a "work remotely" program. We are committed to advancing projects and will stay in regular communication. While we regularly check voicemail, it is best to contact us via email. Thank you.