

**Abib, Daniela**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 02, 2015 3:52 PM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Subject:** PLEASE!

The Gaviota Coast should be protected against further industrialization. **Please, Board of Supervisors do NOT use public funding to expand and extend use of the Tajiguas Landfill.**

The Santa Barbara Ranch Project is the wrong project for this exceptional coastal property. **Please, Board of Supervisors deny the transfer request, terminate the Inland Development Agreement and take the necessary steps to ensure that the developer pursues a different project.**



Tajiguas Funding 7-4-15

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF SANTA BARBARA

July 5, 2015

County Board of Supervisors  
County Administration Building  
Santa Barbara, Ca 93101  
sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

Re: Funding for the Resources Recovery Project at Tajiguas Landfill  
Hearing on 7-7-1015 Agenda Item 3

Dear Chair Wolf and Members of the Board,

The League of Women Voters of Santa Barbara has been following the planning for the Tajiguas Landfill since 2002. As you may remember, a number of issues have caused us concern during the entire development of this solution. The League is firmly committed to the reduction of solid waste and recycling of all materials, and therefore supports the need for the Material Recovery Facility (MRF) and the Anaerobic Digester (AD) in concept.

Consequently, the League today supports the County's effort to find outside sources of funding. We understand that this project may be eligible for a grant from CalRecycle's Cap and Trade Organics Grant Program, and this would be an appropriate use of those funds. We urge the Board to authorize your staff to prepare and submit the grant application.

Lindsey Baker, Co-President for Program and Action

contact person: Connie Hannah, Co-President for Program and Advocacy

## Abib, Daniela

---

**From:** ~ ~  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 05, 2015 4:09 PM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Subject:** Comments for July 7th Board hearings

My comments on Hearing items are listed below.

### **LAS VARAS RANCH PROJECT (File #15-00548)**

- The Las Varas Ranch Project is inconsistent with County policies protecting agricultural land:
  - The Project would facilitate the sale of individual lots to different owners, fragmenting the ownership of lands currently owned and managed as a single viable agricultural operation.
  - Individual lots are not agriculturally viable, and collective management of the ranching operation cannot effectively be enforced with CC&Rs as proposed.
  - Proposed development envelopes will enable spill-over of residential uses that will adversely impact the agricultural operation.
- The Project is inconsistent with County policies protecting visual resources:
  - The Project intensifies residential development potential in the iconic viewshed and Rural Historic Landscape on Las Varas Ranch visible from Highway 101, and on the coastal bluff visible from the railroad, beach, and ocean.
  - Up to two-acres of contiguous residential development and additional structures including horse stables and agricultural employee dwellings will degrade scenic coastal views across these open and historically significant landscapes.
- The Project is inconsistent with County biological resource protection policies:
  - New residential uses including introduced pets and equestrian use will adversely impact sensitive native plant communities and sensitive wildlife species including California red-legged frog, southwestern pond turtle, and many species of sensitive raptors and bats.
  - Future development of large rural estates including unlimited amounts of agriculturally related structures such as horse stables and greenhouses will fragment foraging areas, interrupt wildlife movement, and degrade native vegetation.

### **SANTA BARBARA RANCH - DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT TRANSFER (File #15-00585)**

- The future of Naples is exceptionally important to the public, given its unmatched scenic, ecological, cultural and recreational value.
- The Board should deny Standard Portfolios' request to consent to the Transfer Agreement.
  - Standard Portfolios' submittal does not provide sufficient evidence of its financial condition, history and reputation to demonstrate that the developer can fulfill the obligations of the Development Agreement.
  - Matt Osgood, a key member of the Standard Portfolios' team, orchestrated the 2008 approvals of the financially unfeasible project that went into foreclosure in 2010, leading to First Bank ownership of SBR. Mr. Osgood's reputation casts doubt on the ability of Standard Portfolios to fulfill the obligations of the Development Agreement.
  - Standard Portfolios has not demonstrated the ability to develop the Project consistent with the Development Agreement. Several changes in circumstances indicate that the approved Project

cannot be developed including the current drought and changes at Dos Pueblos Ranch (DPR) affecting the Agricultural Conservation Easement (ACE).

- The Project remains financially unfeasible as approved.
- The Board should terminate the Inland Development Agreement.
  - The Inland Development Agreement is not effective until the ACE is recorded, and accordingly may be terminated by the Board.
  - The Inland Development Agreement should be terminated because conditions have changed that affect the ability of the developer to perform the obligations under the Development Agreement.
  - The Naples property requires a sensitively designed Project that strikes an appropriate balance between open space preservation, public access, agricultural resource protection, and residential development. The 2008 approvals are fatally flawed and the developer must start again with a more appropriate proposal.

#### **TAJIGUAS LANDFILL - RESOURCE RECOVERY PROJECT FUNDING (File # 15-00497)**

- The County should not expand and intensify operations at the Tajiguas Landfill. The proposed new facilities will have severe adverse impacts to the Gaviota Coast.
- Responsible and timely closure of Tajiguas Landfill is imperative to safeguarding the coastal resources of the Gaviota Coast.
- The County is going further out on a limb in considering using public funds for what had been described as a privately-funded project. The need and basis for this material change in financing has not been publicly disclosed in advance of the hearing.
- From the outset, the RRP was promised as financially self-supporting and would be constructed and operated at no cost to the public. Public funds should not be risked for this ill-conceived and financially unsustainable project.

Thank you very much for considering my comments.  
Mr. Greg Sweel