SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

In October 2010, the Santa Barbara County Office of Emergency Management re-convened the Mitigation Advisory Committee to undergo a complete planning process to revise and update this multi-jurisdictional multi-hazard mitigation plan (2011 update). Each section details the revisions made to this plan during the 8 month planning process. All of the incorporated cities participated in the update. In order to better implement mitigation strategies throughout the County and within each incorporated City, the Mitigation Advisory Committee, revised the format of this plan to present the City specific information in City Annexes. These annexes enable each City to focus on their issues and track their mitigation strategies.

The Mitigation Advisory Committee found the statements in Section 1 to remain valid. No significant changes have been made to this section.

Across the United States, natural and manmade disasters have led to increasing levels of death, injury, property damage, and interruption of business and government services. The impact on families and individuals can be immense and damages to businesses can result in regional economic consequences. The time, money and effort to respond to and recover from these disasters divert public resources and attention from other important programs and problems. Santa Barbara County, California recognizes the consequences of disasters and the need to reduce the impacts of natural hazards. The elected and appointed officials of the County also know that with careful selection, mitigation actions in the form of projects and programs can become long-term, cost effective means for reducing the impact of natural hazards.

This *Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan* for Santa Barbara County, California (the Plan), was prepared with input from each incorporated city, interested public, responsible officials, and with the support of the State of California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The process to develop the Plan included nearly a year of coordination with representatives from all of the incorporated cities within the County. The Plan guides the County toward greater disaster resistance in harmony with the character and needs of the County and its communities.

Mitigation is commonly defined as sustained actions taken to reduce or eliminate long-term risk to people and property from hazards and their effects. ***Hazard mitigation*** focuses attention and resources on jurisdictional policies and actions that will produce successive benefits over time.

The impact of expected yet often unpredictable natural and human-caused events can be reduced through planning. History has demonstrated that it is less expensive to prevent disaster damage than to repeatedly repair damage after a disaster has struck. A mitigation plan states the aspirations and specific courses of action jurisdictions intend to follow to reduce vulnerability and exposure to future hazard events. This plan was formulated through a systematic process centered on the participation of citizens, businesses, public officials and other stakeholders, to the extent possible.

It is the County's hope the Plan continues to be used as a tool for all stakeholders to increase public awareness of local hazards and risks, while at the same time providing information about options and resources available to reduce those risks. Informing and instructing the public about potential hazards will help the County and Cities protect themselves against the effects of the hazards, and will enable informed decision making on where to live, play and locate homes and businesses.

The emphasis of the Plan is on the assessment and avoidance of identified risks, implementing loss reduction measures for existing exposures and insuring critical services and facilities survive a disaster. Hazard mitigation strategies and measures avoid losses by limiting new exposures in identified hazard areas, alter the hazard by eliminating or reducing the frequency of occurrence, avert the hazard by redirecting the impact by means of a structure or adapt to the hazard by modifying structures or standards.

Federal legislation has historically provided funding for disaster preparedness, relief, recovery, and mitigation. The Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA 2000) is the latest legislation to improve the delivery of mitigation programs through sound and viable planning (Public Law 106-390). The new legislation reinforces the importance of mitigation planning and emphasizes planning for disasters before they occur. As such, DMA 2000 establishes a pre-disaster hazard mitigation program and new requirements for the national post-disaster Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP).

Section 322 of DMA 2000 specifically addresses mitigation planning at the state and local levels. It identifies new requirements that allow HMGP funds to be used for planning activities, and increases the amount of HMGP funds available to states that have developed a comprehensive, enhanced mitigation plan prior to a disaster. States and communities must have an approved mitigation plan in place prior to receiving post-disaster HMGP funds. County, local and tribal mitigation plans must demonstrate that their proposed mitigation measures are based on a sound planning process that accounts for the risk to and the capabilities of the individual communities.

State governments have certain responsibilities for implementing Section 322, including:

- Preparing and submitting a standard or enhanced state mitigation plan;
- Reviewing and updating the state mitigation plan every three years;
- Providing technical assistance and training to local governments to assist them in applying for HMGP grants and in developing local mitigation plans; and
- Reviewing and approving local plans if the state is designated a managing state and has an approved enhanced plan.

DMA 2000 is intended to facilitate cooperation between state and local authorities, prompting them to work together. It encourages and rewards local and state pre-disaster planning and promotes sustainability as a strategy for disaster resistance. This enhanced planning network is intended to enable local and state governments to articulate accurate needs for mitigation, resulting in faster allocation of funding and more effective risk reduction projects.

FEMA prepared an Interim Final Rule, published in the Federal Register on February 26, 2002 (44 CFR Parts 201 and 206), which establishes planning and funding criteria for states and local communities.

The Plan has been prepared to meet FEMA and Cal EMA requirements thus continuing the County's eligibility for funding and technical assistance from state and federal hazard mitigation programs, such as HMGP, Pre-Disaster Mitigation-Competitive, and Flood Mitigation Assistance programs.

SECTION 2 PLAN PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY

During the 2011 update, the Mitigation Advisory Committee found the statements in Section 2 to remain valid. No significant changes have been made to this section.

Authority to create this Plan is derived from the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (Public Law 93-288), as amended by the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA 2000). The requirements and procedures for mitigation plans are found in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) at Title 44, Chapter 1, Part 201 and the associated Interim Final Rule changes of February 26, 2002, October 1, 2002, October 28, 2003, September 13, 2004, and October 31, 2007. This federal law and associated regulation establishes planning and funding criteria for states and local communities.

- *Enhance Public Awareness and Understanding* – to help residents of the County better understand the natural hazards that threaten public health, safety, and welfare; economic vitality; and the operational capability of important institutions;
- *Create a Decision Tool for Management* – to provide information that managers and leaders of local government, business and industry, community associations, and other key institutions and organizations need to take action to address vulnerabilities to future disasters;
- *Promote Compliance with State and Federal Program Requirements* – to insure that Santa Barbara County and its incorporated cities can take full advantage of state and federal grant programs, policies, and regulations that encourage or mandate that local governments develop comprehensive hazard mitigation plans;
- *Enhance Local Policies for Hazard Mitigation Capability* – to provide the policy basis for mitigation actions that should be promulgated by participating jurisdictions to create a more disaster-resistant future; and
- Provide *Inter-Jurisdictional Coordination of Mitigation-Related Programming* – to ensure that proposals for mitigation initiatives are reviewed and coordinated among the participating jurisdictions within the County.
- Achieve *Regulatory Compliance* – To qualify for certain forms of federal aid for pre- and post-disaster funding, local jurisdictions must comply with the federal DMA 2000 and its implementing regulations (44 CFR Section 201.6). DMA 2000 intends for hazard mitigation plans to remain relevant and current. Therefore, it requires that State hazard mitigation plans are updated every three years and local plans, including Santa Barbara County's, every five years. This means that the Hazard Mitigation Plan for Santa Barbara County uses a "five-year planning horizon". It is designed to carry the County through the next five years, after which its assumptions, goals, and objectives will be revisited and the Plan resubmitted for approval. Section 7 details specific goals and objectives with regard to implementing mitigation activities over the life of this Plan. In Section 8, Santa Barbara County has outlined a more aggressive approach to ensuring the Plan in implemented, evaluated, monitored and updated.

On the following pages are the resolutions that adopted the 2005 and 2011 Plans.

County of Santa Barbara
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minute Order
February 15, 2005

Present: Supervisor Carbajal, Supervisor Rose, Supervisor Firestone, Supervisor Gray and Supervisor Centeno

PUBLIC WORKS and OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES — File Reference No. 05-00216

RE: Adopt a resolution approving the Santa Barbara County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan.

A motion was made by Supervisor Gray, seconded by Supervisor Carbajal, that this matter be Adopted.

a) Received and filed.

b) Referred.

c) Set for April 5, 2005 (EST. TIME: 90 MIN.)

The motion carried unanimously.

County of Santa Barbara 1 *Printed 2/15/2005*

Figure 2.1 2005 Adoption Resolution

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

A RESOLUTION IN THE MATTER OF THE ADOPTION OF THE SANTA BARBARA COUNTY MULTI JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN	Resolution No. 05-040

WHEREAS, the Federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, "the Act", as described in 44 Code of Federal Regulations Section 201.6 (44 CFR § 201.6) mandates local governments to submit and maintain a FEMA approved local hazard mitigation plan; and,

WHEREAS, the County of Santa Barbara Department of Public Works and Office of Emergency Services have coordinated the hazard mitigation planning efforts among the incorporated cities of the county; and

WHEREAS, the Santa Barbara County Multi Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, "the Plan", identifies a county wide risk assessment and mitigation strategies to reduce the impacts of natural disasters on the public; and,

WHEREAS, the Act requires the Plan to be formally adopted by the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors and provided to FEMA for formal approval; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the County of Santa Barbara Board of Supervisors by adoption of this resolution hereby adopts the attached Santa Barbara County Multi Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan.

A-25

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, this 15 day of February, 2005, by the following vote (4/5 vote required):

AYES: Supervisors Carbajal, Rose, Firestone, Gray and Centeno

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

Chair, Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:
MICHAEL F. BROWN
CLERK OF THE BOARD

By: Deputy Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM
BRUCE CARTER

By Manager Office of Emergency Services

APPROVED AS TO FORM
STEPHEN SHANE STARK

By Deputy County Counsel

APPROVED AS TO FORM
ROBERT W. GEIS, CPA
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

By Division Chief

APPROVED AS TO FORM
PHIL DEMERY
DIRECTOR, PUBLIC WORKS

By for Director, Public Works

This is a true certified copy of the original document on file or of record in my office. It bears the seal and signature, imprinted in purple ink, of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

Clerk of the Board, Santa Barbara County, California
Date: 2/15/05 Deputy:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

A RESOLUTION IN THE MATTER OF THE ADOPTION OF THE 2011 SANTA BARBARA COUNTY MULTI-JURISDICTION HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN	**Resolution No.** 11-319

WHEREAS, the Federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 ("Act"), as described in 44 Code of Federal Regulations Section 201.6 (44 CFR § 201.6) mandates local governments to submit and maintain a Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") approved local hazard mitigation plan; and,

WHEREAS, the County of Santa Barbara Office of Emergency Management, working with the Public Works Department and other County departments, and has coordinated the hazard mitigation planning efforts among the incorporated cities of the county; and

WHEREAS, the Santa Barbara County Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan, ("Plan") identifies a county-wide risk assessment and mitigation strategies to reduce the impacts of natural disasters on the public and local government; and,

WHEREAS, identification of hazards in the county assists with response planning, exercise development, public education and awareness, and other emergency management functions; and,

WHEREAS, the Act specifies documentation that the Plan has been approved by the FEMA and formally adopted by the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors; and,

WHEREAS, on July 29th, FEMA approved the County's Plan; and,

WHEREAS, the Office of Emergency Management will coordinate the incorporated cities respective Annexes submitted to FEMA for inclusion in the Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the County of Santa Barbara Board of Supervisors hereby adopts the Santa Barbara County Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan and directs the Office of Emergency Management to continue its work with the incorporated cities to include their respective Annexes to the Plan.

Figure 2.2 2011 Adoption Resolution

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, this 13th day of September, 2011, by the following vote:

AYES: Supervisors Carbajal, Wolf, Farr, Gray & Lavagnino

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

Chair, Board of Supervisors

Date: 9/13/11

ATTEST:
CHANDRA L. WALLAR
CLERK OF THE BOARD

By: _____
Deputy Clerk

Date: 9/13/11

APPROVED AS TO FORM
MICHAEL D. HARRIS
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

By: _____
Emergency Operations Chief

Date: 30 Aug 2011

APPROVED AS TO FORM
DENNIS MARSHALL
COUNTY COUNSEL

By: _____
Deputy County Counsel

Date: August 30, 2011

APPROVED AS TO ACCOUNTING FORM
ROBERT W. GEIS, CPA
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

By: _____
Deputy Auditor-Controller

Date: August 31, 2011

County of Santa Barbara

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minute Order

September 13, 2011

Present: 5 - Supervisor Carbajal, Supervisor Wolf, Supervisor Farr, Supervisor Gray, and Supervisor Lavagnino

COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICE, OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES File Reference No. 11-00653

RE: HEARING - Consider recommendations regarding the adoption of the 2011 Santa Barbara County Multi Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan, as follows: (EST. TIME: 20 MIN.)

a) Receive and file a staff report on identified hazards in the County from emergency management staff; and

b) Adopt a Resolution in the matter of the adoption of the updated Santa Barbara County Multi Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

HEARING TIME: 9:14 A.M. - 9:59 A.M. (45 MIN.)

Conducted public hearing.

A motion was made by Supervisor Wolf, seconded by Supervisor Lavagnino, that this matter be Acted on as follows:

a) Received and filed.

b) Adopted.

RESOLUTION NO. 11-319

Directed staff to clarify and contrast, in communication to FEMA, the Goleta Beach Park Pier Abutment Protection Plan reflected as 2011-43 in Table 0.1 of the staff report, as it relates to the Goleta Beach Plan.

Further directed the establishment of an ad-hoc committee consisting of Supervisor Wolf and Supervisor Farr to work with CEO and OES staff to clarify and identify additional risk factors in Santa Barbara County.

The motion carried by the following vote.

Ayes: 5 - Supervisor Carbajal, Supervisor Wolf, Supervisor Farr, Supervisor Gray, and Supervisor Lavagnino

This page intentionally left blank.

SECTION 3 PLANNING PROCESS

The Mitigation Advisory Committee performed a complete planning process from October 2010 through June 2011 to update this Plan and prepare a public review draft. The planning process is summarized in this section. Irrelevant information from the original Plan adopted in 2005 has been removed.

All eight incorporated cities joined the County of Santa Barbara in the preparation of this multi-jurisdictional hazard mitigation plan. These jurisdictions are listed below:

Participating Jurisdictions:

County of Santa Barbara
City of Buellton
City of Carpinteria
City of Goleta
City of Guadalupe
City of Lompoc
City of Santa Barbara
City of Santa Maria
City of Solvang

This section details the collaborative planning process of these cities and Santa Barbara County during 2010-2011. Milestone meetings with the Mitigation Advisory Committee and local planning team meetings within each city were conducted to review the existing hazard mitigation planning materials, updated risk assessments, and discuss mitigation strategies. This Plan was developed as a county-wide hazard mitigation plan focusing on collaboration to implement mitigation strategies throughout the county, while maintaining accountability within each participating City to identify and track specific mitigation actions.

Each of the following sections detail the methodologies for development and updates since the 2005 Plan. The *Capability Assessment* (Section 4) has been updated to reflect changes in county departments and organizational structure. As necessary, the discussions of local planning documents have been revised to reflect updates since 2005. A separate capability assessment is included for each City in the City Annexes.

The *Hazard Assessment*, detailed in Section 5, presents the methodology in which the MAC reviewed the previously identified hazards and discussed revisions to the prioritization. A profile for each hazard is included which summarizes the type of hazard, location and extent, history of past occurrences, and probability of future occurrences. The hazard identification and ranking documented in this section form the foundation for prioritizing mitigation actions.

The Mitigation Advisory Committee pursued a different approach to the *Vulnerability Assessment*, Section 6, than in 2005. Rather than using out-of-the-box data from HAZUS, the County and each participating city identified critical facilities to be considered for mitigation activities. The inventory of critical facilities was overlaid (using GIS) with the hazard areas identified in Section 5 to conduct an

exposure analysis. The results of this analysis show which critical facilities are exposed to each of the identified hazards.

The Mitigation Advisory Committee reviewed the previous *Mitigation Strategy* and reported on progress made in implementing the listed actions. In addition, based on updates to the hazard identification, profiles, vulnerability assessments, and the capability assessment new mitigation actions were identified. The progress report and new mitigation actions are presented in the updated *Mitigation Strategy* (Section 7). Each participating City has done a similar exercise which is included in the City Annexes.

The County did not effectively monitor and track the mitigation plan over the five year lifespan, but identified a means for doing so over the next five years in Section 8, *Plan Maintenance*.

The MAC held regular meetings and continually worked on the Plan. The Committee coordinated and consulted with other entities and stakeholders to identify and delineate natural hazards within the County to assess the risks and vulnerable property in identified hazard areas. From the start, every attempt was made to establish an open public process to provide an opportunity for all sectors of the overall community to be involved in the planning process. In some cases direct public input was successful and in others the residents were represented in the process by their jurisdictions staff, by necessity.

3.1 COUNTY-WIDE PARTICIPATION

All of the incorporated jurisdictions participated on the Mitigation Advisory Committee (MAC) to discuss and develop consensus on county-wide risk to natural hazards. Each jurisdiction also coordinated internally to identify local concerns and develop local mitigation strategies in collaboration with county-wide efforts. The participating jurisdictions are listed below:

- Santa Barbara County
- Buellton
- Carpinteria (new)
- Goleta
- Guadalupe
- Lompoc
- Santa Barbara
- Santa Maria
- Solvang (new)

As of January 2011, the cities of Carpinteria and Solvang did not have a previously approved hazard mitigation plan. This update serves as a new plan for these jurisdictions.

3.1.1 Mitigation Advisory Committee

The mitigation planning process originally began with the formation of a County Floodplain Management Plan, as required by the National Flood Insurance Programs (NFIP) Community Rating System. A Floodplain Management Planning Committee (FMPC) was formed to complete that plan in November of 2003. Shortly into the planning process, the County made a decision to expand that committee to form a MAC to complete the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. The original MAC was formed in January of 2004 and included the FMPC as a sub-group focused on flooding issues. During the winter, the project was further expanded to become a Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan and City representatives

of the Local Planning Groups were added to the MAC. The MAC was led by Santa Barbara County Public Works Department and Santa Barbara County Fire, Office of Emergency Services and facilitated by the consultants.

In 2010, the County Office of Emergency Management coordinated with each of the incorporated cities to re-convene the MAC and identify representatives from each jurisdiction to participate in updating the hazard mitigation plan. Each participating jurisdiction designated one or a few MAC members to represent the jurisdiction in discussions of county-wide issues. Additionally, the Flood Control District and Public Works department participated on the MAC to address the flooding concerns. The MAC members coordinated with Local Planning Teams within their jurisdiction to identify the specific hazards/risks of concern to their jurisdiction and to prioritize hazard mitigation measures locally. Details regarding each City's internal planning process are presented in the City Annexes.

An updated list of the MAC members for the 2011 Plan is included in **Table 3.1**.

Table 3.1 Members of the Mitigation Advisory Committee 2011

Names	Organization	MAC Member Status
Richard Abrams	Santa Barbara County – Emergency Manager	Returning Member
Dave Rickard	Santa Barbara County – Recovery Manager	Returning Member
Michael Harris	Santa Barbara County – Emergency Operations Chief	New Member
Marc Bierdzinski	City of Buellton – Planning Director/Emergency Services Coordinator	New Member
Linda Reid	City of Buellton – City Clerk	Returning Member
Kristin McGuire	City of Carpinteria – Coordinator Emergency Services	New Member
Dave Durflinger	City of Carpinteria – City Manager/Emergency Manager	New Member
Vyto Adomaitis (POC)	City of Goleta – Director	New Member
Greg Nordyke (alternate)	City of Goleta – Code Enforcement	New Member
Claudia Dato	City of Goleta – Management Analyst	New Member
Jack Owen, Jr. (POC)	City of Guadalupe – Fire Chief	Returning Member
Regan Candalario (Alternate)	City of Guadalupe – City Administrator	New Member
Robert Kovach	City of Lompoc – Battalion Chief	New Member
Alex Ubaldo	City of Lompoc – Engineering Division	New Member
Linual White (Alternate)	City of Lompoc – Fire Chief	Returning Member
Yolanda McGlinchey	City of Santa Barbara – Emergency Manager	Returning Member
Jeffrey Jones	City of Santa Maria – Fire Chief	New Member
Mark Van De Kamp	City of Santa Maria – Management Analyst II	New Member
Roy Dugger	City of Santa Maria – Aware and Prepare Manager	New Member
Mary Ellen Rio	City of Solvang – Certified Municipal Clerk	New Member
Rick Joyner	County Fire – Battalion Chief	New Member
Bob Tanner	County Fire – Captain, Vegetation Management	New Member
Bill Tracy	County Transportation (Geologist)	New Member
Mike Parker	County Flood	Returning Member
Juan Beltranena	County Parks	New Member
Tom Fayram	County Parks Director	New Member
Nathan Eady	County Planning – Senior Planner	New Member

Paul Clementi	County Planning – Assistant Planner	New Member
Guy Tingos	County Agricultural Commissioner's Office	New Member
Zacharias Hunt	County GIS	Returning Member (no longer with the County)
Jim Caesar	UCSB – Emergency Manager	New Member
Jeri Siegel	Cal EMA – Emergency Services Coordinator	New Member
Scott Choquette	Dewberry – Consultant	Returning Member
Corinne Bartshire	Dewberry – Consultant	New Member

*For future updates to this plan, the MAC may wish to consider inviting utility providers to participate and provide information regarding the vulnerability of utility infrastructure to the identified hazards.

3.1.2 Summary of MAC Meetings

All MAC members were provided an overview of hazard mitigation planning elements at the MAC meetings, which led the MAC members through the process of defining the jurisdiction's assets, vulnerabilities, capabilities, goals and objectives, and action items. The County, with support from its consultants, was responsible for facilitating the planning process and developing the Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (HIRA) with input from the MAC and LPTs.

The MAC met several times between October 2010 and June 2011, and convened conference calls as necessary to coordinate among jurisdictions, with the County, and clarify objectives with the consultants. Table 3.2 summarizes the dates and discussions of the MAC's milestone meetings.

Table 3.2 Mitigation Advisory Committee Meetings Summary

Meeting Dates	Summary of Discussions
10/26/2010	MAC Kick Off and Milestone Meeting #1: The MAC reviewed the identified and excluded hazards in the previous Plan. Based on discussion the MAC agreed upon the following revisions to the hazard identification: *add Climate Change consideration throughout the risk assessment *add Agricultural Pests & Disease as an identified hazard *separate Coastal Storm Surge from Tsunami to consider both hazards separately The MAC discussed the probability and likely impact of the identified hazards and updated the hazard ranking using an excel tool. Each jurisdiction was asked to review their previous goals and objectives with a local planning team. The MAC accepted a homework assignment to review and report on progress of previously identified mitigation actions.
3/2/2011	MAC Meeting #2: The MAC reviewed updated hazard profiles and discussed the hazards on a countywide basis, allowing each City to specify particular concerns within the City Annexes. The MAC discussed a revised vulnerability assessment based upon identifying critical facilities and

Meeting Dates	Summary of Discussions
	overlaying them with mapped hazard areas to evaluate exposure. The MAC validated the overall goals/objectives from 2004 and identified revisions to simplify them and remove redundancies. Dewberry presented the STAPLE/E criteria to be used to prioritize mitigation actions. Following this meeting, the MAC issued an online public survey to gather input regarding concern for risk to natural hazards.
05/18/2011	MAC Meeting #3: The MAC reviewed the draft vulnerability assessment and discussed revisions/additions to be made. These included clarification of the Wildland Urban Interface data and how it presents the risk to smaller communities within the County. In addition, the MAC agreed to incorporate shaking potential and liquefaction to the earthquake assessment. The MAC developed consensus on an approach to monitor and track the updated Plan. The County Plan reviewers presented to the MAC draft prioritizations for the identified mitigation strategies and welcomed comments.

See Appendix 3A for sign-in sheets, meeting agendas, and meeting minutes.

3.2 COUNTY LOCAL PLANNING TEAM

Table 3.3 lists the Santa Barbara County Local Planning Team. These individuals collaborated to identify the County's critical facilities, provide relevant plans, report on progress of county mitigation actions and provide suggestions for new mitigation actions.

Table 3.3 County Local Planning Team 2011

	Name	Title
County	Richard Abrams	Emergency Mgr
	Dave Rickard	Recovery Mgr
	Michael Harris	Emergency Operations Chief
Fire	Bob Tanner	Captain
	Rick Joyner	Battalion Chief
Transportation	Bill Tracy	Geologist
Flood	Mike Parker	Engineering, Development Specialist
Parks	Juan Beltranena	Capital Projects Manager
	Tom Fayram	Parks Director
Planning	Nathan Eady	Senior Planner
	Paul Clementi	Assistant Planner
Ag Commissioner	Guy Tingos	Deputy Commissioner
GIS	Zacharias Hunt	(no longer with the County)

3.2.1 County Local Planning Team Meetings and Outcomes

The County Local Planning Team (LPT) met regularly during the planning process to discuss data needs and organize data collection.

Table 3.4 County Internal Collaboration Meetings Summary

Meeting Dates	Summary of Discussions
11/15/2010	Ray provided the Alliant appraisal books for SB Co assets. Richard will review the documents and discuss with GS staff which buildings may be considered critical for government continuity. GS staff may include Paddy Langlands, Jack Williams, Ray Aromatorio, and others as needed. Ray will provide an electronic version of the valuation soon. Richard will research neighboring counties for determining similar critical facility information. A list of critical facilities will be jointly developed by OES-GS, a valuation estimated and the data provided to GIS for shape file information to be developed.
11/17/2010	Discussed critical county facilities and selected assets for the HMP Richard will review the documents and discuss with GS staff which buildings may be considered critical for government continuity. A list of critical facilities will be jointly developed by OES-GS, a valuation estimated and the data provided to GIS for shape file information to be developed.
12/7/2010	Discussed critical facilities and the selection of assets for the HMP Incorporating data from Risk Mgmt Property Schedule to shape file map
12/16/2010	Reviewed mitigation action status, discussed hazard data for incorporation, divided data collection tasks to appropriate county representatives
03/24/2011	Discussed public survey and press release, sharing of efforts from County to incorporated cities.

Records of the County's internal planning meetings are provided in Appendix 3B.

3.3 PUBLIC OUTREACH

3.3.1 Initial Press Release

On February 4, 2011, Santa Barbara County Office of Emergency Management issued a press release (in Spanish and English) announcing the commencement of the hazard mitigation planning process. This announcement invited the public to notify the County of their interest to participate in the planning process or submit comments. A copy of this press release and local publications may be found in Appendix 3C.

3.3.2 Radio Announcement

On March 8, 2011, Emergency Services Managers Richard Abrams, Santa Barbara County and Yolanda McGlinchey, Santa Barbara City spoke on the local radio program *Community Alert* on KZSB-AM 1290. They discussed the hazard mitigation planning process, its importance to building a

resilient community, and how the public can participate. More information about this show and links to audio recordings may be accessed at www.wildlandresidents.org.

3.3.3 Hazard Awareness & Preparedness Survey

On March 28, 2011, the County issued a public survey (in Spanish and English) to seek input on how community members would prioritize hazards facing the county and what government officials could do to better communicate the risk. A bilingual press release was issued on March 28, 2011 announcing the web link to the survey. Hard copy bilingual surveys were also made available on public counters within the County offices and several City planning departments. The survey was available in both English and Spanish on the County website. The County also posted a notification on their Facebook page and sent emails to key stakeholder groups such as the CAER Chapter (a government-industry group) and the Santa Barbara County Fire Safe Council.

Some public comments were posted on www.edhat.com in response to the announcement. The County Office of Emergency Management reviewed these comments and found no significant input for this plan. Copies of the announcement, website postings, surveys, and public comments are included in Appendix 3C.

The survey was open for more than 30 days. 510 Santa Barbara County residents responded to the Santa Barbara County Hazard Mitigation Plan Survey.

The survey respondents confirmed the priority rankings for the identified hazards indicating that earthquake, wildfire, and flooding are of most concern. Additionally, a significant number of respondents indicated they have made improvements to their property to reduce risk of damage including defensible space landscaping and roof retrofit using fire resistant material. The survey allowed the County an opportunity to expand the list of stakeholders. Several respondents provided contact information and were given an opportunity to review/comment on the complete draft prior to adoption. As the County continues to increase awareness of hazard mitigation, the suggested stakeholders will be considered for involvement in future mitigation planning discussions.

The results of the survey provide valuable information for the County as they continue in their preparedness efforts. These responses may be used as a bench mark for future measurements of improvement. For example, the County's CERT program may choose to focus on educational outreach about the benefits of insurance or emergency preparedness kits. After this type of implementation, a similar survey may be administered to validate the progress and confirm that more residents have improved their preparedness capabilities.

The County will consider the recommendations provided by survey respondents throughout the life of this Plan and prioritize those that can be implemented efficiently and effectively. Below is a county-wide, all-inclusive summary of responses to the survey. More detailed, City specific results can be found in the City Annexes.

1. Respondents were asked which three hazards, out of the seven hazards the MAC identified, are of most concern to their neighborhood or home. Below are responses from all survey respondents (in order of most responses):

Hazard	**Number of Responses**
Earthquake	446

Hazard	Number of Responses
Wildfire	334
Flooding (including coastal surge)	245
Tsunami	118
Landslide/Coastal Erosion	106
Agriculture (pests and disease)	96
Dam Failure	90
Additional Hazards*	89

* Respondents noted the following additional hazards: train incidents, freeway incidents, downed cables, downed trees, climate change induced storms and sea level rise, tornado, extended power outage, environmental pollution, gas leaks, oil rig explosion, chemical exposure, all transportation incidents, Hazmat incidents, poor water quality, high winds, Diablo Canyon meltdown, high voltage wires, high pressure gas lines, 76 Union Refinery, traffic during evacuations, poor evacuation routes, emergency vehicle access, property damage from gangs, rats/raccoons/skunks/mice, natural gas line explosion, looting, radon, fireflow problems, plane crash, pedestrian incidents (no sidewalks), terrorism (on VAFB or Diablo Canyon), and mudslides.

2. Respondents were asked what they are doing to their property or within their home to reduce future damage from the hazards identified above. Below is a summary of responses:

Property Mitigation	Responses
Defensible space landscaping (clear vegetation around house to reduce wildfire risk)	172
Roof retrofit using fire resistant material	108
Other (please specify)	108
Strengthened openings (Doors, windows, and/or garage door to reduce high-hazard wind risk)	60
Installed backflow prevention device(s)	53
Seismic retrofit of the structure and / or foundation	44
Installation of fire sprinklers	31
House elevation or first floor modification to prevent flood damage	30
Installation of fire hydrant or above ground water storage tank	18

*The responses to “Other” were: I rent, hardyboard siding (fire resistant), rope ladder, French drains and other drainage , sandbags, bioswale installation, fire extinguisher, emergency supplies, sheer walls, sheerpaneling, earthquake straps, metal shutters, emergency turn off valve for gas and water, smoke detectors, earthquake jacks on mobile home, catch basins, emergency generator, earthquake tie-downs, rock/vegetation to mitigate flooding and erosion,

3. Respondents were asked if a severe hazard event occurred today, such that all services were cut off from their home and they were unable to leave or access a store for 72 hours, which items they would have readily available. Below is a summary of responses from Santa Barbara County respondents:

Item that is Readily Available	Responses
Can Opener	462
Cooking and eating utensils	446
Flashlight (with batteries)	444
Canned / Non-perishable Foods (ready to eat)	424
First Aid Kit/Supplies	413
Blanket(s)/ Sleeping Bag(s)	410
Extra Clothes and Shoes	383
Gas grill / Camping stove	347
Portable AM/FM Radio (solar powered, hand crank,or batteries)	332
Potable Water (3 gallons per person)	317
Extra Medications	285
Telephone (with batteries)	268
Pet Supplies	235
Cash	234
Important Family Photos/Documentation in a water and fire proof container	146
Handheld "Walkie-Talkie" Radios (with batteries)	129
Gasoline	129
What else do you have in your emergency kit?	105

***** Respondents noted the following additional items in their emergency kits: Tools, diapers, buckets for water, boots, rope, matches, water purifier, tent, gloves, eyeglasses, pens and paper, toilet paper, CERT pack, short wave radio, plastic bags, generator, playing cards, lanterns, dust masks, face masks, eye drops, games for kids, amateur radio equipment, weapons, candles, extra batteries, heater, propane tanks, firewood, tarp, solar cell phone charger, dried food, duct tape, CERT helmet and vests, shovel, towels, plates, cups, pots and pans, whistle, GMRS and HAM radio

5. Respondents were asked if they have a plan for evacuating large animals and pets. Below is a summary of responses:

- 165, or **34.6%** of respondents, answered that they **have a plan for evacuating their pets (cats, dogs, etc).**
- 3, or **.63%** of respondents, answered that they **have a plan for evacuating large animals (horses, cows, etc).**
- 92, or **19.3%** of respondents, answered that **they have pets but have not planned for their evacuation.**
- 6, or **1.3%** of respondents, answered that **they have large animals but have not planned for their evacuation.**
- 211, or **44.2% of respondents,** answered that **they have no large animals or pets.**

6. Respondents were asked if they are familiar with the special needs of their neighbors in the event of a disaster situation. Below is a summary of responses:

- 194, or **40.4%** of respondents, indicated that they **are familiar with the special needs of their neighbors**.
- 286, or **59.6%** of respondents, indicated that they **are not** familiar with the special needs of their neighbors.

- 29 respondents skipped this question.

7. Respondents were asked if they are a trained member of their Community Emergency Response Team (CERT). Below is a summary of responses:

- 117, or **25.2 %** of respondents, indicated that **they are part of CERT**.
- 168, or **36.2%** of respondents, indicated that **they are not a part of CERT, but would like to learn more about CERT.**
- 179, or **38.6%** of respondents, indicated that **they are not interested in being a trained CERT**.
- 45 respondents skipped this question.

Respondents were asked to share why they are a trained CERT member, or why they are not part of CERT. The received responses are listed below:

- I was not aware of CERT
- I want to help where I can
- To be prepared
- There isn't one in my area
- My job requires me to have CERT training
- So I can be called to help in emergencies
- Does not fit into my schedule
- I was in Riverside County earthquake and vowed to be better prepared
- To meet local fire authorities
- I am too old
- It is essential to the community's welfare to have trained volunteers ready to substitute for emergency personnel who are busy/not available when disaster strikes.
- I am a member of other emergency preparedness groups
- I am a nervous person

8. Respondents were asked what the most important thing local government can do to help communities be more prepared for a disaster. Below is a summary of responses:

Things Local Government can do to Help Prepare	**Responses**
Disseminate effective emergency notifications and communication	381
Community outreach regarding emergency preparedness	341
Make a plan to use volunteer residents to help in a disaster	322
Provide training and education to residents and business owners on how they can reduce future damage	303
Being aware of special needs and vulnerable populations	237
Other*	53

The responses to "Other" were: Install sirens and/or community loud speakers for emergency announcement/directives, organize homeowners and condo associations to organize and attend meetings, ensure public infrastructure is updated, smart community planning, keep a supply of and notify residents of emergency food and water supplies, ensure proper evacuation routes, more specific warning and notifications, better emergency dispatch system, better evacuation plan during wildfires, reverse 911 call system, information on the web and community board posts at shopping centers, radio ads promoting emergency preparedness, enforce zoning laws, fire department to inspect brush cleaning, fund emergency services, collaborate with other agencies (local, parks, etc), audible alarms, hold a neighborhood get together so everyone can meet their neighbors, a coordinated emergency disaster plan, assistance in purchasing earthquake insurance, a tsunami warning system, radiation detectors, work with private sector organizations (Red Cross, Chamber of Commerce, etc), a system to organize all emergency volunteers, identify vulnerable populations, learn from past disaster events, support CERT and other training programs.

9. Respondents were asked if they live in an apartment building or home with a living space above a garage or parking area.

- 408, or **83.6%** of respondents, indicated that they **do not** live in an apartment or home with living space above a garage or parking area.
- 80, or **16.4%** of respondents, indicated that they **do** live in an apartment building or home with living space above a garage or parking area.
- 21 respondents skipped this question.

Those respondents who indicated that they do live in an apartment building or home with living space above the garage or parking area were asked to describe their level of concern for the building to collapse in a large earthquake event. 19 respondents indicated that they are "extremely concerned", 12 respondents indicated that they have "high concern", 58 respondents indicated that they have "moderate concern", 28 respondents indicated that they have "little concern", and 20 respondents indicated that they have "no concern".

10. Respondents who are homeowners were asked if they have adequate homeowners insurance to cover the hazards that could impact their home. Below is a summary of responses:

Answer	**Responses**
Yes, my insurance coverage should be adequate	239
No, I don't believe my insurance coverage would be adequate for a major disaster	75
Unsure	38
I do not have an insurance policy	6
Not applicable, I rent my current residence	118

11. Respondents who are renters were asked if they have renter's insurance. Below is a summary of responses:

Answer	**Responses**
Yes	52
No	89
Not applicable, I own my residence.	276

12. Respondents were asked if they have earthquake insurance. Below is a summary of responses:

Answer	**Responses**
Yes, I own my home and have earthquake insurance.	131
Yes, I rent my home and have earthquake insurance.	11
No, but I am interested in reviewing earthquake insurance options.	87
No, earthquake insurance is too expensive.	183
No, I do not need earthquake insurance.	51

13. Respondents were asked if they have flood insurance. Below is a summary of responses:

Answer	**Responses**
Yes, I own my home and have flood insurance.	84
Yes, I rent my home and have flood insurance.	15
No, but I am interested in reviewing flood insurance options.	76
No, I do not need flood insurance	260

14. Respondents indicated the following as additional insurance listed for their home or property:

- **Jewelry**
- **Car**
- **Fire**
- **Theft**
- **Condo**
- **High Fire Zone insurance**
- **Umbrella**
- **Home Owner**

15. Respondents were asked if they work in Santa Barbara County.
    - 381, or **79.5%** of respondents, indicated that they **do** work in Santa Barbara County.
    - 98, or **20.5%** of respondents, indicated that they **do not** work in Santa Barbara County.

16. Respondents were asked if their place of work is in an area susceptible to natural hazards. Below is a list of natural hazards and responses from survey respondents:

Natural Hazard	**Response**
Earthquake fault zone	202
High-risk flood zone	143
I don't know	117
Wildland Urban Interface (wildfire risk area)	98
Liquefaction zone	69
Other*	52
Landslide Risk Area	37

The responses to "Other" were: close distance to freeway, train incidents, sea level rise zone, tsunami, construction, urban fire damage, retired, high wind event, downed trees, old buildings, radiation from Diablo Canyon

17. Respondents were asked if their employer has a plan for disaster recovery in place.

- 267, or **62%** of respondents, **indicated that their employer does have a disaster recovery plan in place.**
- 58, or **13.5%** of respondents, **indicated that their employer does not have a disaster recovery plan in place.**
- 106 respondents were **unsure** if their employer has a disaster recovery plan in place.
- 78 respondents skipped this question.

18. Respondents were asked if their employer has a workforce communications plan to implement following a disaster so they may contact their employees.

- 278, or **64.2%** of respondents, indicated that their **employer does** have a workforce communications plan.
- 48, or **11.1%** of respondents, indicated that their **employer does not** have a workforce communications plan.
- 107, or **24.7%** of respondents, indicated that they are **unsure** if their employer has a workforce communications plan.
- 76 respondents skipped this question.

19. Respondents were asked to list any studies that they are aware of being conducted within their community or the county regarding the risk to future hazard events. 79 respondents replied to this question. These answers are summarized below. 430 respondents skipped this question.

- Tsunami inundation maps
- Ground liquefaction zones
- Disaster plan at my mobile home park
- URM studies
- Dam inundation studies
- Safety Element of General Plan
- Seismic Retrofit Program
- Wildland Fire Plans
- Flood Maps
- Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Nuclear regulatory commission study on Diablo Canyon
- Disaster mitigation plan
- Evacuation plan for Mission Canyon
- Goleta Valley Community Plans and EIRs
- Emergency Operations Plans
- CWPPs
- Geologic Maps
- Former oil wells
- Fire history and extent
- Santa Maria levee

20. Respondents were asked what recommendations they have for Santa Barbara County and the incorporated cities to improve identification, prioritization, and implementation of actions intended to reduce future damage and increase resiliency. The following recommendations were received:

Recommendations for Santa Barbara County	Responses
Provide training and materials on how residents can be prepared for the identified risks	292
Perform outreach to ensure people are aware of their environment and the inherent risks	256
Enforce/update building codes	183
Other*	62

*The responses to "Other" were: Continue educating the public with programs such as first aid, CPR, and CERT, help provide grants to retrofit homes, provide information on how to retrofit homes, more street crossings over the railroad tracks, provide accurate emergency information, support CERT teams, distribute emergency preparedness kits, ensure proper evacuation routes, create one source of emergency information so the news is not varied, retrofit county owned critical facilities, provide training in unincorporated areas such as Orcutt, Los Alamos, or the Vandenberg Village area, help with the cost of retrofits and earthquake insurance, continue Reverse 911, keep infrastructure such as storm drains updated, provide a way for residents to know what hazard zone they are located in, a program that would allow volunteer geologists and engineers to assist the County in the event of a major disaster, encourage neighborhood group meetings to discuss hazard awareness and preparedness, require employers with a certain amount of employees to have a disaster management plan.

21. Respondents were asked to recommend any companies or local associations that should be involved in the Santa Barbara County hazard mitigation planning process. The following contacts were given:

- Countywide fire departments
- US Forest Service
- State Parks
- School districts
- Joy Fire Sprinkler
- 76 Union Refinery
- Habitat for Humanity
- Marborg Industries
- USCG
- PTO's
- Water districts
- Natural History Societies
- Isla Vista Association
- PG&E
- CERT
- Wildland Residents Association
- Salvation Army
- Santa Maria Corps
- Environmental Defense Center
- Tetra Tech
- Santa Barbara Equine Evac
- Ranch Club Estates CERT
- Commercial nurseries and agricultural operations
- Vendenberg AFB
- Direct Relief International
- Goleta Valley Community Center
- Santa Ynez Community Services District
- Preservation of Los Olivos
- Encina Royale
- ARES
- Atterdag Village Senior Living Facility
- CAER (Community Awareness and Emergency Response)
- Santa Barbara Bank and Trust
- Santa Barbara Technology and Industry Association

22. Respondents were asked if they would like to review and comment on a draft of their jurisdictions annex to the Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan.

- 101, or **25.6%** of respondents **said they would** like to review and comment on the draft plan.
- 280, or **74.4%** of respondents said **they would not** like to review and comment on the plan draft.
- 128 respondents skipped this question.

207 respondents included their contact information.

23. Respondents were asked to provide any additional comments/suggestions/questions. The responses are summarized below:

- Radiation dangers are a concern
- CERT training was great
- Make presentations to business groups
- I would like to see a Citizens Corp Council started to allow all volunteer organizations to have a place to share capabilities and resource information
- This is very important
- Concerned about wildfires
- Train citizens at Diablo for a meltdown event
- Provide shelter locations
- Make Bradbury Dam Inundation study accessible to those that live in the inundation zone
- We need an effective warning system
- Make sure schools are prepared
- Retrofit infrastructure
- Help citizens figure out what hazard zones they are located within so they can prepare
- It would be beneficial to have cooperation from utility providers
- Provide information on how to retrofit and mitigate hazards at my home and on my property
- I am worried about tsunamis

3.3.4 Public and Stakeholder Review

Santa Barbara County Office of Emergency Management posted a complete draft of this plan on their website and requested public review and comment. The County's press release indicated that any comments received prior to July 22, 2011 would be considered for incorporation into this version of the plan. Any comments received after that date are being catalogued by the County Office of Emergency Management and will be reviewed prior to future revisions of this plan.

An email notification of the public review period was distributed to identified stakeholders. These include survey respondents who provided an email address and agencies/organizations recommended by the survey respondents where an email address was available. Additionally, the County issued a press release in both English and Spanish advertising the public review opportunity.

A copy of the email distribution notice, press release, and website posting are included in Appendix 3C.

The following comment was received on July 21st. The ideas noted within including those regarding mitigation strategies designed to improve communications will be discussed by the MAC and implemented as appropriate throughout the life of this plan.

South Coast Disaster Resiliency Planning

Goals 2 and 3 of the draft Plan identify an intent to improve community capacity and commitment to become less vulnerable to hazards through assets, people, and better coordination and communication.[1] The public survey conducted by the County in March-April 2011 also indicated strong interest in further activity to improve communications and the community's ability to respond during an emergency. [2] However, the draft Plan Mitigation Actions are mostly physical facility improvements, and do not identify other types of programs to improve communications and community resiliency in furtherance of these goals. There are ongoing operational plans and efforts of local agency emergency management offices, however, more could be done. With limited local agency resources, it is recommended that a broader, community-based effort be organized to identify existing community resources and help improve local communications and resiliency.

As part of their recent discussion about upcoming work to update the City's General Plan Safety Element[3], members of the Santa Barbara Planning Commission characterized this resiliency issue as a gap in emergency preparedness, noting the need for local self-sufficiency in the event that freeways are cut off for an extended period, as has already occurred in recent years. They recommended that a regional process should be conducted on the South Coast to identify existing local resources and people that could assist during an extended emergency response period.

It is recommended that the Plan include a program for a broad, cross-sector process on the South Coast to further organize information and communications about existing community resources and persons that could help provide relief during emergencies. The result should be a data base of maps and inventories of relief facilities, resources, businesses, and volunteers that can help; the identified means for informing the public of the resources data base; a process for maintaining and updating the data base; and identification of other programs and projects that could improve local resiliency (such as communications improvements; further training and use of volunteer citizens during disasters; neighborhood preparedness plans; etc.).

The community process for identifying the resource information and other program needs should engage public agencies (cities, special districts) but also neighborhood groups, businesses, non-profit groups, and other entities; health care facilities and practitioners (e.g., hospital, clinics); relief supply agencies and volunteers (e.g., Red Cross, DRI), hotels and institutional facilities (e.g. schools, Fairgrounds); local agriculture, grocery stores, and restaurants; companies and agencies involving water, wastewater, waste management, energy and utilities, communications, transportation; animal care; vector control, funereal services, etc.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the plan. Please contact me if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Barbara Shelton, Project Planner/ Environmental Analyst
City of Santa Barbara Community Development Department

Notes:

[1] p. 7-2 . *Goal 2: Build and support capacity and commitment for existing assets, including people, critical facilities/infrastructure, and public facilities, to become less vulnerable to hazards.*

Goal 3: Enhance hazard mitigation coordination and communication.
[2] p. 3-10. *Survey results for questions #8. Most important thing local government can do to help communities be more prepared for a disaster: (1) Disseminate effective emergency notifications and communications; (2) Community outreach regarding emergency preparedness; (3) Make a plan to use volunteer residents to help in a disaster (4) Provide training and education to residents and business owners on how they can reduce future damage; (5) Being aware of special needs and vulnerable population.*
[3] *July 7, 2011 meeting of City Planning Commission; Agenda Item IV;*
http://www.santabarbaraca.gov/Government/Boards_and_Commissions_N-Z/Planning_Commission/Videos.htm

The following comment was received on October 11th. The ideas noted have either been integrated into the plan or noted for inclusion in the next plan update.

I have some feedback for the Review Draft of the City of Santa Barbara annex to the Santa Barbara County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan 2011 Update.

I am a geologist and will only speak to those things that I am familiar with, but there are some issues with the section on Hazard Assessment, specifically relating the earthquakes and faults sections.

1. Minor. Regarding Table 5.8, The Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale (MMI) for Earthquakes. I understand the desire to be brief, but some liberties have been made in summarizing the MMI that make Table 5.8 inaccurate. First there is no true correllation between MMI and Ritcher Scale Magnitudes - these should be referred to as "Typcial" and second an MMI of II is not typically a <4.2, and an earthquake of 4.2 typically is not "only felt by some." I think this has been mistranslated and should have been associated with the "IV" intensity.

2. Minor and probably not of significance. You define liquefaction but have omitted that the soils must be saturated. It should read "loose, saturated soils."

3. Minor and probably not of significance. Under history of earthquakes, the table (no table number) is incomplete, doesn't include information summarized in the section it is enclosed in and should either be omitted or completed. There is also a section here taken *verbatim* from UCSB's Crustal website.

4. *Significant*. Section 5.6.3, Location and Extent. Beyond grammar and nomenclature there is a significant issue with: "This map highlights the Zaca Creek and Cuyama Alquist-Priolo (AP) faults, which are the only AP faults studied by the California Geological Survey in the Santa Barbara County region." There are no Zaca Creek fault and I don't believe you have correctly identified the Cuyama fault. Either way the Cuyama Fault, while active is not listed under the AP Fault Zone Act. The only AP listed fault (singular) in Santa Barbara County is a portion of the Los Alamos fault, sometimes called the W. Baseline fault, which is the fault indicated on Figure 5.17. The confusion may lie in that it is mapped on the Zaca Creek Quadrangle.

5. Minor - I don't understand why there is a reference to the Quaternary Faults and Folds database. What information was obtained there and what is the significance?

6. Page 5-56 referrs to the office of the County Geologist, which I don't believe the County has a geologist or an office. Relevance?

7. Moderate error in the Landslides section: 5.7.2, History of Landslides, refers to a specific 1980 event "depicted in this SB County specific map (no figure number)." Looking at the map there is no event depicted unless the event included the entire southeast corner of the county. Very confusing.

8. Throughout out the Landslide section there is no refernece to the 2000 Sycamore Canyon landslide, which has been the one of the most significant landslide events in the south County.

Hope some of this helps. Good luck.
--
Robert Price