

Chapter 4 Comments and Coordination

Early and continuing coordination with the general public and appropriate public agencies is an essential part of the environmental process to determine the scope of environmental documentation, the level of analysis, potential impacts and mitigation measures, and related environmental requirements. Agency consultation and public participation for this project have been accomplished through a variety of formal and informal methods, including project development team meetings, interagency coordination meetings, and public outreach meetings. This chapter summarizes the results of Caltrans' efforts to identify, address, and resolve project-related issues through early and continuing coordination.

Santa Barbara County, the Cities of Carpinteria and Santa Barbara, and the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments are active participants in the planning, development, and funding of the proposed project.

101 In Motion

The current project stems from a large community and multi-agency (including Caltrans) consultation effort known as *101 In Motion* that is based on a policy directive to find long-term solutions to the growing congestion problem along the U.S. 101 corridor in southern Santa Barbara County. Under the sponsorship of the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments over a multi-year period, the *101 In Motion* team worked to develop a package of solutions to achieve broad-based community support. Since the initiation of *101 In Motion* in November 2003, the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments staff and the consulting team actively met and worked with the community to provide education about the process, the results of the analyses during each step, and the consensus recommendations:

- Community workshops—5
- Activity center booths—13
- Community presentations—54
- Countywide Stakeholders Advisory Committee meetings open to the public—11
- Meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee, with representation from the cities, county, Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District, Caltrans, Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District, California Highway Patrol, and Ventura County Transportation Commission—31

- Unanimous adoption of the final consensus package by the SBCAG Board on October 20, 2005

Notice of Preparation and Scoping Meetings

A Notice of Preparation for this project was circulated for 30 days, beginning May 1, 2009. The packets were mailed to the State Clearinghouse and directly to the appropriate agencies—agencies with jurisdiction, responsible agencies and interested agencies. Packets were also mailed to members of the public, historical societies and preservation groups, and Chumash groups and individuals who had expressed interest in the project.

Three separate scoping information meetings/open houses were held. The meetings were held from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m., with a presentation at 6:30 p.m. The dates and locations of the meetings were as follows:

July 7, 2009—Canalino Elementary School in Carpinteria

July 8, 2009—Montecito Country Club in Montecito

July 16, 2009—Summerland Presbyterian Church (scheduled after the Summerland Citizens Association requested a third meeting)

The meetings in Carpinteria and Montecito were announced by postcards mailed to addresses within 1,000 feet of the project limits as well as property owners along the project route that live outside the immediate project area. Also, meetings were announced in four newspapers: *Daily Sound* (June 27, 2009); *Ventura County Reporter* (June 25, 2009); *Coastal View News* (June 25, 2009), and *El Mexicano* for Spanish-speaking members of the public (June 24, 2009 and July 7, 2009).

The purpose of the meetings was to present the project purpose and need; identify initial scope expectations, and to obtain the public's ideas, comments, and concerns about this proposed project; and to introduce the public to members of the project team. Caltrans, local agency representatives, and Santa Barbara County Association of Governments staff members were present to answer specific questions about the project. A court reporter and a Spanish translator were also available.

California Coastal Commission

In response to Caltrans' Notice of Preparation for the project (May 12, 2009), the Coastal Commission replied by letter on May 29, 2009 identifying information needs,

jurisdictional species, critical habitat in the project area, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration contact for the project (biologist Matthew McGoogan).

Caltrans environmental staff holds quarterly coordination meetings with Coastal Commission staff as a way to report on the status of various projects going on in the district and to establish schedules. Staff met and discussed the status of the proposed project as well as other projects located in Santa Barbara County on the following dates, beginning with the Notice of Preparation coordination:

January 12, 2009	November 5, 2012
June 30, 2009	May 14, 2013
March 1, 2011	November 4, 2013
October 3, 2011	May 12, 2014
March 5, 2012	

In addition to the above Coastal Commission Coordination meetings, over the last year, there have been coordination meetings held with the various agencies involved in the Local Coastal Plan Amendment for the City of Carpinteria. Coordination for the amendment has involved numerous meetings with the Coastal Commission and the City of Carpinteria as well as the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments. The meetings discussed both the South Coast 101 HOV Lanes project and Linden Avenue and Casitas Pass Road Improvements project because the Local Coastal Plan Amendment covers both. The meetings typically discussed proposed language for the amendment.

The following meeting dates have occurred:

February 4, 2013	August 12, 2013
March 4, 2013	September 9, 2013
April 2, 2013	October 28, 2013
May 6, 2013	November 18, 2013
June 3, 2013	November 30, 2013
July 22, 2013	December 18, 2013

November 2011 Public Information Meetings/Open House

Three separate information meetings were held to provide a project update, plus an overview of alternatives under study, preliminary findings for soundwall locations that have been considered, and outlines of other environmental and technical studies. The importance of the public input process once the draft environmental document is

released was also emphasized. The meetings were held from 5:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., with a presentation at 6:30 p.m.

The dates and locations of the meetings were as follows:

- November 15, 2011—Montecito Country Club in Montecito
- November 16, 2011—Carpinteria High School in Carpinteria
- November 17, 2011—QAD in the community of Summerland

Caltrans, local agency representatives, and Santa Barbara County Association of Governments staff members were present to answer specific questions about the project. No formal public hearing process occurred, and no public comments were taken for the record.

The meetings were announced by postcards mailed to addresses within approximately 1,000 feet of the project limits as well as property owners along the project route that live outside the immediate project area. In addition, meeting announcements were placed in the following newspapers: *Daily Sound* (November 8, 2011), *Montecito Journal* (November 2, 2011), and *Coastal View News* (November 3, 2011).

Public Circulation of Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment

The Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment for the South Coast 101 HOV Lanes project was circulated for public review and comment between March 23, 2012 and July 9, 2012. The original comment deadline was May 25, 2012; however, based on requests made by the California Coastal Commission and Santa Barbara County, the comment period was extended to July 9, 2012.

Two public hearings were held to further solicit public comment on the document. Both meetings were held from 5:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. The dates and locations of the meetings were as follows:

- April 24, 2012—Montecito Country Club in Montecito
- April 25, 2012—Carpinteria High School in Carpinteria

The meetings were well attended. A court reporter was available at both public hearings listed above. The reporter transcribed oral comments to text for those who elected to use this format instead of submitting their comments in writing.

The meetings were announced by postcards mailed to addresses within 1,000 feet of the project limits as well as property owners along the project route that live outside the immediate project area. In addition, meeting announcements were placed in the following newspapers: *Santa Barbara Independent* (March 29, 2012), *Daily Sound* (March 23 and April 17, 2012), *Montecito Journal* (April 13, 2012), *Montecito Messenger* (March 23, 2012), and *Coastal View News* (March 29, 2012).

Refer to Appendix M (Volume IV) for a more detailed breakdown of comments and responses as well as the entire set of comments and responses.

Community Coordination

Multiple community outreach meetings (more than eight meetings each) were also conducted with the Montecito Association 101 Subcommittee and the Summerland Citizens Association. Coordination also occurred with the Carpinteria Valley Association, the Padaro Lane Homeowner's Association, the Coast Village Road Business Association, and the Save Our Village homeowners group.

Montecito Association Involvement

As a result of the association's ongoing concerns about how the proposed project would affect its community, substantial coordination with the Montecito Association took place over the past four years. This group was outspoken about the proposed removal of two left ramps as well as removal of mature vegetation that would produce negative changes to the aesthetics. In addition to meetings intended for the general public, Caltrans scheduled several meetings specifically directed toward the Montecito Association. All meetings are listed below:

Spring 2009—A project overview and update were presented to the Montecito Association.

July 2009—Three public scoping meetings were held during release of the Notice of Preparation (refer to above description).

Spring 2010—A Montecito Association subcommittee was formed.

Spring 2010 through Spring 2013—Caltrans and the Montecito Association met at least 10 times.

May 2011—The Montecito Association subcommittee proposed the J Modified configuration for the Cabrillo Boulevard/Hot Springs Road interchange.

July 2011—Caltrans presented the J Modified configuration findings to the Montecito Association subcommittee; Caltrans developed configurations F Modified and M Modified.

November 2011—Caltrans held three public information meetings (refer to November 2011 public meetings/open house (previously described above).

March 2012—Caltrans released the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment for public review; comment period was 109 days.

April 2012—Caltrans held two public hearings (refer to public circulation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment).

May 2013—Caltrans staff gave a presentation to the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments board with a primary focus on two Montecito Association proposals for the Cabrillo Boulevard/Hot Springs Road Interchange (see Volume II, Appendix I).

January 2014—Caltrans staff presented their final information on the left ramp-related topics before the SBCAG board. A vote was taken by the board to have the project move forward (see Volume II, Appendix I).

Cultural Resources

There has been substantial coordination with the State Historic Preservation Officer per Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The correspondence is summarized as follows (refer to Appendix D for related correspondence):

- Caltrans submitted the Historic Property Survey Report to the State Historic Preservation Officer on November 4, 2010. The document determined the Area of Potential Effects (APE); identified cultural resources located within the Area of Potential Effects, and provided an evaluation of properties for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places. Caltrans identified one archaeological site within the Area of Potential Effects eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, and 11 historic-period properties within the architectural Area of Potential Effects that have either been listed on or determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The State Historic Preservation Officer concurred on the adequacy of the identification effort and the revised and current eligibility determinations on January 26, 2011. The State Historic Preservation Officer, however, was

unable to agree or disagree with Caltrans' determination of eligibility for three built-environment properties under Criterion C. To resolve this indecision, on February 2, 2011, Caltrans agreed to accept the State Historic Preservation Officer's recommendation to assume eligibility for the three properties under Criterion C for the purposes of this project only. The State Historic Preservation Officer confirmed the agreement in an email dated February 16, 2011.

- Caltrans submitted a Finding of Adverse Effects (February 2011) to the State Historic Preservation Officer on March 3, 2011 and concurrently submitted the finding to members of the Chumash community consultation group and the Historic Landmarks Advisory Committee. The Finding of Adverse Effects concluded that the project would have an adverse effect on the portion of the National Register-eligible archaeological site (Via Real Redeposited Midden, P-42-003943) within the Area of Direct Impact. The Finding of Adverse Effects further concluded that none of the proposed project's alternatives would have any direct or indirect effects on the National Register-eligible built-environment resources, including from the proposed installation of soundwalls, retaining walls, structures, or construction-related ground-borne vibration. The State Historic Preservation Officer concurred with the Finding of Adverse Effects on April 7, 2011.
- Caltrans submitted a Revised Finding of Adverse Effects (September 2011) to the State Historic Preservation Officer on October 3, 2011 following minor project changes during the preparation of the draft environmental document and project mapping. The conclusions of the Revised Finding of Adverse Effects, however, did not change; they are the same findings the State Historic Preservation Officer concurred with April 7, 2011. The State Historic Preservation Officer concurred with the Revised Finding of Adverse Effects on November 16, 2011.
- To resolve the project's adverse effects, Caltrans continued consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer. Caltrans submitted a Draft Memorandum of Agreement and Data Recovery Plan to the State Historic Preservation Officer on December 6, 2012. Comments received by Caltrans were incorporated into the documents.
- Subsequent project design revisions in the vicinity of the Via Real Redeposited Midden shifted the preferred alternative (Alternative 1) toward the median in an effort to minimize potential impacts to the midden. Based on these design

revisions, Caltrans revised the Draft Memorandum of Agreement and included a Treatment Plan along with the Data Recovery Plan to address not only any impacts to the midden but also any potential archaeological discoveries made during construction. Caltrans submitted the revised Draft Memorandum of Agreement and the Treatment and Data Recovery Plan to the State Historic Preservation Officer on May 2, 2013.

- After additional consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer on May 28–30, 2013, the Draft Memorandum of Agreement was restructured as a Programmatic Agreement, with the Treatment and Data Recovery Plan appended as Attachment B.
- The State Historic Preservation Officer signed the Programmatic Agreement on June 20, 2013 and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation acknowledged receipt of the fully executed Programmatic Agreement on December 24, 2013. As a result, adverse effects will now be resolved in accordance with the *Treatment and Data Recovery Plan for the South Coast 101 HOV Lanes Project, Santa Barbara County, California*, which is Appendix B of the June 20, 2013 Programmatic Agreement between the California Department of Transportation and the California State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding the South Coast 101 HOV Lanes Project, U.S. Route 101, Santa Barbara County, California (see Appendix D, State Historic Preservation Officer Correspondence).

Caltrans has conducted a multi-year effort to involve the public, local government, historic preservation community, and Chumash groups and individuals in both the Section 106 process and the broader National Environmental Policy Act process.

Native American Consultation

During the initial stages of the preparation of the Historic Property Survey Report, Native American consultation was initiated with local Chumash individuals and groups. Consultation with interested Native American representatives included mail, telephone calls, copies of cultural resource reports and study summaries, meetings and field reviews, and Native American monitors being present during field excavations. Interested Native American representatives, individuals, and groups were identified by the Native American Heritage Commission. Individuals with knowledge of Barbareño ancestry were identified by John Johnson, curator of the anthropology collection at the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History. The consultation list was also expanded to include members of the Barbareño and Samala

(Santa Ynez) tribes who have contacted Caltrans and wish to be kept informed about projects within a specific geographic area.

The following coordination occurred:

- August 18, 2008—Caltrans initiated consultation by mailing letters to members of the Chumash community asking if they wanted to be consulted. The letter provided a description of the project and the initial results of previous studies.
- September 10, 2008—Caltrans mailed letters with enclosed copies of the draft archaeological evaluation proposal and analysis of locations with sensitivity for buried archaeological deposits to members of the Chumash community for review. This second letter also advised the consulting group that a project meeting and field review would be held in October. After the archaeological evaluation proposal was sent, a follow-up call ensured receipt of the document, answered initial questions, and provided an opportunity to propose dates for a field review meeting. All individuals on the consultation list were called, and in many cases they provided additional information about sites within the study area.
- October 15, 2008—A project field meeting and information gathering was held near the survey area at Lookout County Park, Summerland. Caltrans staff and Chumash representatives Janet Garcia, Freddie Romero (Picay), Patrick Tumamait, Gilbert Unzueta, Frank Arredondo, and John Ruiz attended. The Chumash representatives and Caltrans staff discussed the project, alternatives, and studies conducted to date. All participants noted the importance of testing for potential buried archaeological sites and the importance of having Native American monitors during the archaeological studies and ground-disturbing activities. Comments made by the consultants during the meeting were integrated into the draft testing proposal. Participants also discussed the designation of the Most Likely Descendant, in the event that human remains were encountered. A draft copy of Caltrans District 5 policies on the treatment of human remains/burials (which conforms to Public Resources Code 5097.9 through 5097.99, as amended by Assembly Bill 2641) was provided to all participants at the meeting for their review and comment.
- October 16, 2008—Caltrans submitted a copy of the revised draft policies on the treatment of human remains/burials to the participants for review and comment. No comments were received.

- February 6, 2009—After incorporating written comments about the testing proposal from the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians Elders Council, Caltrans sent a copy of the final testing proposal to the Chumash consultants, along with a copy of the Archaeological Survey Report.
- February 24–27, 2009—Extended Phase I archaeological excavations took place, with Patrick Tumamait performing the monitoring duties at all test locations. Daily-monitoring record forms were completed and are part of the project archaeological file.
- April 20, 2009—Caltrans mailed a letter to all Chumash consultants that provided an initial summary of the Extended Phase I backhoe trenching program and a project update.
- August 26, 2009—Caltrans mailed a letter detailing the Extended Phase I excavations, recommended National Register of Historic Places findings, and copies of the supporting draft evaluation report to all members of the Chumash consultation group. Comments were received from Freddie Romero (Picay) and Patrick Tumamait regarding the Via Real Redeeposited Midden and were incorporated into the final document.
- December 22, 2009—Caltrans mailed a letter to all individuals and groups in the consultation group. The letter included a summary of the study results and the final archaeological evaluation report completed in November 2009.
- March 3, 2011—Caltrans mailed copies of the proposed Finding of Adverse Effect to the Chumash consultation group. In the accompanying letter, Caltrans also notified members of the consultation group that the State Historic Preservation Officer had concurred with the National Register eligibility of the Via Real Redeeposited Midden.
- April 12, 2011—Caltrans mailed letters to the Chumash consultation group, notifying the group that the State Historic Preservation Officer concurred with the Finding of Adverse Effect.
- November 30, 2012—Caltrans prepared a Draft Memorandum of Agreement and Data Recovery Plan and submitted them to the Chumash consultation group. Comments received by Caltrans were incorporated into the documents.
- April 16, 2013—Caltrans prepared a revised Draft Memorandum of Agreement and a Treatment and Data Recovery Plan and submitted them to the Chumash consultation group. The transmittal letter notified the Chumash consultation

group that project design revisions had shifted Alternative 1 (the preferred alternative) toward the median in an effort to minimize potential impacts to the Via Real Redeposited Midden. Caltrans also noted that although the presence of other significant archaeological resources was not anticipated, Caltrans determined it was prudent to consider that the remote possibility of discoveries during construction might still exist. The revised Draft Memorandum of Agreement and the Treatment and Data Recovery Plan incorporated new language to address not only impacts to the Via Real Redeposited Midden but also any potential discoveries during construction. The Treatment and Data Recovery Plan also proposed additional construction monitoring in the vicinity of the Via Real Redeposited Midden and in areas of high archaeological sensitivity not accessed during the Extended Phase I excavations. Comments from the Chumash consultation group were incorporated into the revised document.

- June 12, 2013—After additional consultation (May 28–30, 2013) with the State Historic Preservation Officer, the revised Draft Memorandum of Agreement was restructured into a Programmatic Agreement. Caltrans invited the Chumash representatives to sign the proposed Programmatic Agreement.
- June 17, 2013—Chumash consultant Patrick Tumamait signed the Programmatic Agreement as a Concurring Party.
- June 20, 2013 — The State Historic Preservation Officer signed the Programmatic Agreement. As a result, adverse effects will now be resolved in accordance with the *Treatment and Data Recovery Plan for the South Coast 101 HOV Lanes Project, Santa Barbara County, California*, which is Appendix B of the June 20, 2103 *Programmatic Agreement Between the California Department of Transportation and the California State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding the South Coast 101 HOV Lanes Project, U.S. Route 101, Santa Barbara County, California* (see Appendix D, State Historic Preservation Officer Correspondence). Caltrans will continue to afford Native Americans invited to concur in the Programmatic Agreement the opportunity to participate in the implementation of the undertaking.

Native American Heritage Commission

On July 25, 2008, a letter was mailed requesting a search of the sacred lands file as well as contact information for Chumash representatives who might have concerns or knowledge about resources in the project vicinity. The Native American Heritage

Commission responded that their search did not indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. They provided a list of 11 Native American individuals and groups who might have concerns about the proposed project or special knowledge of cultural resources in the project vicinity. These individuals and groups were added to the project consultation list.

Santa Barbara County Planning and Development Department

October 12, 2012—Caltrans mailed Glenn S. Russell copies of the following reports and findings: October 2010 Historic Property Survey Report and Attachments A–J; February 2011 Finding of Adverse Effects; September 2011 Revised Finding of Adverse Effects; and State Historic Preservation Officer’s concurrence on the Revised Finding of Adverse Effects.

City of Santa Barbara Historic Landmarks Commission

- February 4, 2009—Caltrans mailed an initial project notification letter to City of Santa Barbara urban historian Jake Jacobus to request general information on historic properties within the project limits.
- March 31, 2009—Caltrans made a follow-up telephone call to Jake Jacobus, leaving a message on the answering machine.
- September 29, 2010—Caltrans contacted Jake Jacobus by email for specific information concerning the property at 50 Los Patos Way. Mr. Jacobus responded with information in a return email on October 5, 2010.
- March 3, 2011—Caltrans mailed to Jake Jacobus a copy of the Historic Property Survey Report, copies of correspondence with the State Historic Preservation Officer, and notice of the Caltrans proposed Finding of Adverse Effect for the project.
- April 7, 2011—Caltrans mailed to Jake Jacobus notification of the State Historic Preservation Officer’s concurrence with the project Finding of Adverse Effect.
- October 12, 2012—Caltrans mailed the commission copies of the following reports and findings: February 2011 Finding of Adverse Effect; State Historic Preservation Officer letter of concurrence; September 2011 Revised Finding of Adverse Effects; and State Historic Preservation Officer letter of concurrence.

Santa Barbara County Historic Landmarks Advisory Commission

- August 11, 2008—Caltrans mailed an initial project notification letter to Anita Hodosy-McFaul, Secretary of Historic Landmarks Advisory Commission, requesting information on historic properties within the project limits.
- February 12, 2009—Caltrans made a follow-up telephone call to Anita Hodosy-McFaul, leaving a message and also asking specifically for information concerning the Memorial Oaks. Ms. Hodosy-McFaul returned the call, reporting that the Memorial Oaks had never been officially addressed by the Historic Landmarks Advisory Commission and offered to make the commission's files available for research.
- April 13, 2009—Caltrans presented an overview of the project to the regular monthly hearing of the Historic Landmarks Advisory Commission and described the potential for impacts to the Memorial Oaks. Caltrans also notified the commissioners that the public scoping meeting for the project was scheduled for June 2009. Chairman John Woodward reported that he had appointed Bob Duncan as the commission's representative to serve on the Memorial Oaks Focus Review Group, and that Mr. Duncan had already attended the first meeting held on April 7, 2009. Mr. Duncan also attended all of the subsequent meetings, reporting back to the Historic Landmarks Advisory Commission.
- March 3, 2011—For the Historic Landmarks Advisory Commission, Caltrans mailed a copy of the Historic Property Survey Report, copies of correspondence with the State Historic Preservation Officer, and notice of the Caltrans proposed Finding of Adverse Effect to Anita Hodosy-McFaul.
- April 7, 2011—For the Historic Landmarks Advisory Commission, Caltrans mailed notification of the State Historic Preservation Officer's concurrence in the project Finding of Adverse Effect to Anita Hodosy-McFaul.
- October 12, 2012—Caltrans mailed the commission copies of the following reports and findings: February 2011 Finding of Adverse Effect; State Historic Preservation Officer letter of concurrence; September 2011 Revised Finding of Adverse Effects; and State Historic Preservation Officer letter of concurrence.

Local Historical Societies/Historic Preservation Groups

- August 18, 2008—Caltrans sent a letter to the following interested parties, seeking comment and information pertaining to historic-period architectural and engineering resources adjacent to the existing right-of-way:
 - American Institute of Architects, Santa Barbara Chapter, Architectural Archives
 - American Legion Post 49 (Santa Barbara)
 - American Legion Post 62 (Carpinteria)
 - American Society of Civil Engineers, Santa Barbara/Ventura Branch
 - American Society of Civil Engineers, Los Angeles Section, History and Heritage Committee
 - Architecture and Design Collection, University Art Museum, University of California, Santa Barbara
 - Automobile Club of Southern California
 - Carpinteria Valley Historical Society and Museum of History
 - Carpinteria Valley Association
 - Citizens for the Carpinteria Bluffs
 - Citizens Planning Association and Foundation
 - Davidson Library, Special Collections, University of California, Santa Barbara
 - Los Angeles Conservancy Modern Committee
 - Montecito Association
 - Montecito History Committee
 - Pearl Chase Society, Santa Barbara
 - Public History Information Unit, University of California, Santa Barbara
 - Sahyun Library, Santa Barbara
 - Santa Barbara Historical Society
 - Santa Barbara Public Library (Central Library, and Carpinteria, Eastside, and Montecito Branch Libraries)

- Society of Architectural Historians, Southern California Chapter
 - Summerland Citizens Association
 - Santa Barbara Maritime Museum
 - Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History
 - Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation
 - Ventura County Museum of History and Art
- February 10 to March 31, 2009—Caltrans made follow-up telephone calls to all of the interested parties listed above, asking for both general information on resources in the project area and for specific information on the Memorial Oaks. Caltrans left messages requesting comments and spoke to several individuals at these organizations. Most of the individuals contacted had no comments about historic-period architectural resources, the Memorial Oaks, or the project. One email response was received from the Santa Barbara Public Library providing two sources of historical information, (the Santa Barbara Historical Society and the University of California, Santa Barbara Department of Special Collections). American Legion Post 49 offered to investigate the names of Santa Barbara County World War I soldiers; the Architecture and Design Collection at University of California, Santa Barbara offered to check its files for materials relating to World War I memorials. The Santa Barbara Historical Society, the Carpinteria Valley Historical Society and Museum of History, and University of California, Santa Barbara Davidson Library Special Collections offered to assist with research. The Carpinteria Valley Association provided some information on the Memorial Oaks. The Montecito Committee called for clarification about the study limits.
 - March 11, 2011—Caltrans mailed letters to all of the historical groups listed above, notifying them of the State Historic Preservation Officer’s concurrence on the determination of National Register eligibility of the Via Real Redeposited Midden and the 11 historic-period architectural properties within the project area of potential effects. The letter also provided copies of Caltrans’ correspondence with the State Historic Preservation Officer and Caltrans’ proposed Finding of Adverse Effect for the project.
 - October 15, 2012—Caltrans mailed letters to all of the historical groups listed above, notifying them of the Revised Finding of Adverse Effects and the State

Historic Preservation Officer's concurrence on the Revised Finding of Adverse Effects.

Visual

Memorial Oaks Focus Review Group

Additional public outreach included the formation of a Memorial Oaks Focus Review Group to gather information and hear community concerns about a group of oak trees planted along a portion of the U.S. 101 corridor in 1928 in memory of Santa Barbara County soldiers who died in World War I. Five meetings were held between April 7, 2009 and May 5, 2010 with the following community participants:

- Vera Bensen, Carpinteria Valley Association
- Bob Duncan, Santa Barbara County Historic Landmarks Advisory Commission
- David Griggs, Carpinteria Valley Historical Society and Museum of History
- Gretchen Johnson, Carpinteria Citizen
- Roxie Lapidus, Carpinteria Valley Association
- William Stewart, Vietnam Veterans of America

Staff from the Santa Barbara County Planning and Public Works Department, the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments, JRP Historical Consulting, LLC, and Caltrans also participated in the meetings. The Memorial Oaks are discussed further in Section 2.1.6.

Biology

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Marine Fisheries Service

In response to Caltrans' Notice of Preparation for the project (May 12, 2009), the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries replied by letter on May 29, 2009 identifying information needs, jurisdictional species, critical habitat in the project area, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration contact for the project (biologist Matthew McGoogan). The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration determined the project to be complex and recommended that Caltrans begin early consultation with agency staff.

Two field meetings were held with National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration staff Matthew McGoogan, David Crowder, and Mark Capelli. McGoogan attended the July 16, 2009 meeting, while Crowder and Capelli attended

the August 5, 2009 meeting. Site reviews were conducted at the following locations: Carpinteria Creek, Arroyo Paredon Creek, San Ysidro Creek, Romero (Picay) Creek, and Montecito Creek.

During site visits, it was determined that project build alternatives as proposed would require formal consultation with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act for potential incidental take of Southern California steelhead trout and for work in critical habitat. On July 16, McGoogan indicated that proposed bridge structure work at San Ysidro, Romero (Picay) and Arroyo Paredon creeks would likely need to be assessed to determine if current and proposed conditions could result in hydraulic barriers to steelhead trout movement and recommended coordinating a field visit with Crowder.

McGoogan also noted that Caltrans would need to include de-watering plans for Arroyo Paredon and Romero (Picay) creeks in a Biological Assessment submittal.

On November 23, 2009, Caltrans called an additional meeting in Santa Barbara with National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration staff McGoogan, Crowder and Anthony Spina. Maureen Spencer of the Santa Barbara County Flood Control also attended and discussed potential impacts of proposed bridge designs on fish passage. Following the meeting, it was agreed that further communication would be needed to determine the extent of hydraulic analyses needed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for critical habitat creeks. Discussions regarding hydraulic analyses between Caltrans' hydraulic engineer Lyn Wickham and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration engineer Crowder have been ongoing.

On March 28, 2012, Morgan Robertson and Lyn Wickham met with National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Marine Fisheries staff Kristin Mull, Matthew McGoogan and David Crowder in Carpinteria to familiarize Kristin Mull with the following proposed action areas: Arroyo Paredon Creek, Romero Creek, and San Ysidro Creek.

On April 16, 2012, Caltrans received a letter from Kristin Mull requesting additional information about the South Coast Highway 101 HOV Lanes project.

On February 21, 2013, Caltrans submitted a revised Biological Assessment to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration that included additional information requested in the letter of April 5, 2012.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

On June 29, 2009, Caltrans biologist Ms. Morgan Robertson spoke with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service biologist Steve Kirkland regarding negative survey findings for salt marsh bird's-beak, Gambel's watercress, and other listed plant species. Following a brief discussion of the status of the light-footed clapper rail populations in Carpinteria Marsh, Kirkland concurred that the project would not affect the light-footed clapper rail because the project would avoid the marsh. Robertson also told Kirkland of the survey schedule and negative survey results to date for California red-legged frogs.

On March 24, 2010, Kirkland confirmed that formal consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act would be required for potential incidental take of the tidewater goby at Arroyo Paredon Creek and could require consultation for work at Franklin Creek.

Between March 15, 2012 and July 7, 2012, Ms. Robertson coordinated with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service biologist Mark Elvin to answer questions and provide supplemental information to complete formal consultation for the tidewater goby and provide a conference opinion for proposed critical habitat at Arroyo Paredon Creek.

On August 6, 2012, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service issued Caltrans a Biological and Conference Opinion for the project (see Appendix H).

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

In response to the Caltrans Notice of Preparation for the project (May 12, 2009), the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (formerly Fish and Game) replied by letter (June 2, 2009) identifying information needs and the Department of Fish and Wildlife contact for the project (California Department of Fish and Wildlife environmental scientist Jamie Jackson).

A field meeting with Jackson, Caltrans biologist Morgan Robertson, Caltrans environmental planner Michael Sandecki, and Caltrans hydraulic engineer Lyn Wickham took place on December 10, 2009. Site reviews were conducted at the following locations: Franklin Creek, Arroyo Paredon Creek, Toro Canyon Creek, Romero (Picay) Creek, San Ysidro Creek, and Greenwell Creek. It was concluded that a 1602 permit (streambed alternation agreement) would be required for work in and adjacent to creeks in the project area. Ms. Jackson noted that Caltrans would need to submit de-watering and diversion plans as part of the 1602 permit application, and that riparian vegetation removal would need to be conducted between September 1 and February 15 to avoid potential effects to nesting migratory birds.

Trees removed between February 16 and August 31 would require surveys for nesting birds and clearance prior to removal. Caltrans discussed plans to replant riparian vegetation impacts at a 3:1 ratio within the project area, but noted that flooding concerns from the Santa Barbara County Flood Control would need to be considered when developing planting plans. Jackson noted that offsite mitigation measures could be considered to benefit Southern California steelhead trout populations. Caltrans also discussed plans for Greenwell Creek that would incorporate bio-engineering techniques, such as brush layering with willows.

This page left intentionally blank