

Katherine Douglas

Public Comment

A-31



From: Thomas Becker <tbeckerpower@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2026 12:03 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public comment, item A-31, Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisor's Meeting of 5/12/26,
Attachments: Page 1 of 2.pdf; BOEM letter (4).pdf

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

5/7/26

In May/June of 2025, Santa Barbara County Counsel submitted a Request for Advice Letter to the California Fair Political Practices Committee (FPPC). In that letter, County Counsel made a representation of a material fact, stating the county did not know for certain the location of Sable pipeline 325 on the Zaca Preserve property. County Counsel also made a representation of a material fact that the pipeline was "likely" 900 feet, the length of 3 football fields, away from the location the county told the FPPC in a 2017 Request for Advice Letter.

This agenda item A-31 is asking the BOS to approve a final tract map for the Zaca Preserve property. As can be seen, the map includes a depiction of the easement for the line 325 pipeline. This agenda item also references the March 29th, 2017 Planning Commission meeting, where the tentative map was approved. During that meeting, Santa Barbara County planners displayed a map depicting the location of the pipeline easement, and made an explicit representation that the oil pipeline was located within the depicted easement.

If the map depicted in A-31 is approved by the BOS, the depiction of the pipeline easement and the representations made by County Staff on March 29th, 2017 are also being approved as accurate and true. This directly contradicts the material facts submitted to the FPPC by County Counsel in May/June 2025. In December 2025, when confronted by irrefutable evidence, County Counsel was compelled to admit the material facts submitted to the FPPC in May/June 2025 were false.

The tentative tract map approved in March, 2017 was easily and readily available to County Counsel, Hartmann and P&D in May/June 2025 to the present.

The State Attorney General and Santa Barbara County District Attorney were also aware in May/June 2025 of the false material facts County Counsel submitted to the FPPC. There is no indication that the State AG or County DA made any effort to prevent the false material facts from being used to remove Hartmann's recusal requirement. This damaged Sable Offshore's right to a fair tribunal, contaminated the federal court-ordered hearings of November 4th and December 16, 2025, and damaged the people's right to have official proceedings conducted in a manner free of false representations of material facts.

Please also see attached.

Tom Becker

Submitted for item A-31, BOS meeting of 5/12/26

In May/June of 2025, County Counsel submitted a Request for Advice letter to the FPPC. The request was for advice on Supervisor Hartmann's need to recuse from hearings involving ownership transfers for Sable Offshore. County Counsel submitted material facts representing Sable's pipeline as being 900 feet from Hartmann's property.

FPPC pointed out to County Counsel that a previous 2017 Request for Advice letter from the County stated the pipeline was 50 feet from Hartmann's property. FPPC asked County Counsel to clarify the discrepancy.

County Counsel stated to the FPPC that the county had performed further evaluation of mapping and permitting data of the pipeline location, and determined the pipeline was likely further away from Hartmann's property than the 2017 estimate of 50 feet.

In January 2026, I emailed the supervising planner for the SYU transfer of ownership project. I have preserved the entire 2-day email chain. On January 6th, I asked the supervising planner, "Does the county have a map showing the location of the [Sable] pipeline easement?" She replied "not to my knowledge, no." On January 7th, I reminded the supervising planner of her previous, "not to my knowledge, no" reply, and informed her I was seeking the actual map P&D had used to determine the location of the Sable pipeline/easement. The supervising planner then sent an email stating no further action by staff was currently required.

The entire email chain requesting public documents was sent under the CPRA. A request under CPRA does not require the requestor to follow a specific formant.

The supervising planner of the SYU transfer project said, in an email responding to a CPRA request, that she had no knowledge of any map in the county's possession showing the location of Sable's pipeline easement. That is highly implausible.

My requests were made so I can see how County Counsel and P&D determined mapping and permitting data changed the 2017 50-foot estimate by County Counsel, to 900 feet in 2025. The difference is the length of nearly 3 football fields.

The county is in possession of a tentative subdivision map depicting the pipeline easement abutting Hartmann's property. The quasi-judicial Planning Commission hearing where the map was approved was recorded and in the possession of the County. The recorded hearing contains a representation by county staff that the pipeline is located within the 50-foot-wide easement. That puts the pipeline within 50 feet of Hartmann's property. All of this was and is readily available to County Counsel, P&D and Hartmann from before May/June 2025 to the present. In December 2025, County Counsel and Hartmann were confronted with evidence that compelled them to acknowledge the information submitted to the FPPC in May/June 2025 was factually false. This forced Hartmann to recuse from the December 16, 2025 BOS hearing.

When the actions of County Counsel, Hartmann and the P&D project supervising planner are taken together, a reasonable person can conclude there is a systemic problem, to put it mildly, in County Government.

This should be considered new and relevant information.

And it should be given to any applicant for the County Executive Officer's position, so they have a clearer picture of the huge issues they are stepping into.

Tom Becker

1/20/26

To: The Honorable Doug Burgum, Secretary of the Interior.

U.S Department of the Interior

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM)

From: T. Becker Power Systems

Subject: Public comment for the 11th National OCS Oil and Gas Leasing Program, docket # BOEM-2025-0483.

This is a public comment letter submitted for the proposed 11th National OCS Oil and Gas Leasing Program.

T. Becker Power Systems is located in Santa Barbara County, California. Santa Barbara County is, and will continue to be, the epicenter of the debate over offshore oil development in the OCS. With a history of large oil developments, and the problems that go with that history, this county will play an oversized role in the development of the proposed leasing program.

I support President Trump's plan to make the United States the dominate energy producer in the world, and the effort to secure this country's energy independence. The State of California is a massive consumer of petroleum derived fuels and products. Californians love gasoline, diesel fuel and jet fuel. Californians buy so many petroleum derived products, the State imports close to 1 million barrels of oil every day from foreign sources to meet the demand.

On January 20, 2025, President Trump signed Executive Order 14156, declaring a national energy emergency. This country is in a state of crisis. We are \$38 trillion dollars in debt. We are adding 1-2 trillion every year. Inflation is causing extensive damage to the wealth of private citizens and businesses. AI is coming at us like a freight train, and we are not prepared.

Energy plays a massive role in the security and prosperity of the United States. Electrical energy and energy from liquid, gaseous and solid fuels power our military, hospitals and transportation system. Soon, AI will consume more energy than the U.S. military does. When energy prices go up and supply becomes scarce, the impact on the economy is devastating. Buying energy from foreign sources adds to the deficit and makes the country vulnerable.

The United States is in an energy crisis that justifies the development of oil resources in the OCS. Federal preemption of state statutes that are being misused to block development of oil resources and disrupt interstate commerce is also justified.

Here in Santa Barbara County, Coastal Act statutes are being misused, and it can be argued misused with malice. On December 17, 2025, PHMSA took jurisdiction over pipeline safety and operations from the Office of the State Fire Marshal for the Las Flores pipeline. This step was justified due to the actions of both the State of California and the County of Santa Barbara. PHMSA then acted under the authority of EO 14156 and granted an emergency waiver to the owner/operator of the pipeline.

The abuse of process and violations of property rights by state and local governments with jurisdiction over oil and gas developments is rampant in California and Santa Barbara County. It has gotten so egregious that federal preemption over oil and gas production and support facilities necessary for national security and prosperity is justified.

The County of Santa Barbara submitted suspect documents to state investigative agencies that tainted and influenced a federal court-ordered vote on permits for the Las Flores Pipeline.

This is the most recent example of how the State of California and the County of Santa Barbara abuse the Coastal Act to block oil projects and disrupt interstate commerce. The County government, through County Counsel, submitted a map to the State Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) claiming the map depicted the location of the Las Flores pipeline in relation to property owned by a member of the Board of Supervisors. The Supervisor, who is opposed to oil and gas development in the OCS, was previously required to recuse herself from hearings on the pipeline permits. The recusal was required because the pipeline abuts the Supervisor's property, creating a conflict of interest. The Supervisor contacted County Counsel about the recusal requirement. County Counsel asked County Planning and Development to determine the location of the pipeline in relation to the Supervisor's property. County P&D prepared a map indicating the pipeline is 900 feet from the Supervisor's property. The map was submitted by County Counsel to the FPPC. The FPPC used the suspect map to declare the Supervisor did not have a conflict of interest. On November 4th, 2025 the Supervisor participated in a hearing where she voted to deny the transfer of permits. The hearing and vote were conducted pursuant to an order from the Federal District Court.

However, a parcel/subdivision map was available to County Counsel and P&D before the suspect map was submitted to the FPPC. The parcel/subdivision map clearly depicts the Las Flores pipeline easement abutting the Supervisor's property. In addition to the parcel/subdivision map, photographs of pipeline warning signs identified as abutting the Supervisor's property are on

file with P&D. Both the parcel/subdivision map and the photographs were easily and readily available to P&D, County Counsel and the Supervisor. To make matters worse, the pipeline warning signs may be easily visible to anyone standing on the Supervisor's property.

After the November 4th vote, the pipeline owner/operator submitted a satellite/ aerial photo of the property in question. The photo depicts the location of the pipeline abutting the Supervisor's property. On December 16, during the final vote on the permits, the FPPC, County Counsel and the Supervisor all accepted the owner/operator's photo as possibly depicting the true location of the pipeline. The Supervisor recused herself, but the damage had already been done. There is no indication County Counsel ever notified the FPPC of the parcel/subdivision map which clearly depicts a pipeline easement.

The photo submitted by the pipeline's owner/operator depicts the location of the pipeline in the identical location as the easement depicted on the parcel/subdivision map. Again, the parcel/subdivision map was easily and readily available to P&D, County Counsel and the Supervisor. Both County Counsel and the Supervisor are attorneys. Their legal training and experience make it highly improbable they are unaware that parcel/subdivision maps are easily accessible. Their legal training and experience also make it highly improbable they are unaware that parcel/subdivision maps depict easements. I'm a simple tractor mechanic. I found the parcel/subdivision map in 2 minutes using google search, and saw the pipeline easement within seconds of viewing the map.

The history of the Las Flores pipeline repair and restart project is replete with examples of similar abuses of process, by both the State and the County. PHMSA would be totally and legally justified to take ALL jurisdiction over the Las Flores Pipeline away from state and county agencies.

The State of California and the County of Santa Barbara can be expected to continue to commit abuses of process with all projects, approvals and actions involving oil and gas development in the OCS. Federal preemption to prevent the intentional obstruction of federal property rights and interstate commerce would be justified.

The State of California has substituted oil produced in California with 1 million barrels per day of oil imported from foreign sources.

In 2025, the State, on average, imported close to 1 million barrels of foreign oil per day. The increase in imports occurred while the State and county governments aggressively attacked local oil production. The imported oil value was around \$18 billion. The State faces a \$20 billion deficit in its 2025-2026 fiscal year. The oil is tankered into California ports, with little concern expressed by the people opposed to oil development in the OCS.

Importing oil from foreign sources damages the national interest and national security. Replacing imported oil with oil produced in California is in the national interest and improves national security.

But of course, reducing all imports from foreign sources is in the national interest and would improve national security. Producing oil, gas, vehicles, appliances, electronics, farm and construction equipment and steel in the U.S., instead of importing from foreign sources would be a game changer, to the U.S.A.'s advantage.

Oil is part of a larger picture.

The State of California and County of Santa Barbara have intentionally inflated alternative transportation usership to falsely claim oil production is not needed.

For decades, the State of California and County of Santa Barbara have been making false claims about alternative transportation usage. They inflate the numbers to show oil production is no longer needed, claiming people are walking and riding bikes instead of driving cars. In reality, bike lanes are empty of bike commuters, while motor vehicle commuting traffic is unaffected by phantom bike riders and pedestrians. Yet, the parking lots at government buildings are filled with government employee cars, and rallies against offshore oil are attended by people driving gasoline powered SUVs. The falsification of alternative transportation statistics in Santa Barbara County is well documented. For a recent example, it was announced in November that the promised Metrolink commuter train between Ventura and Santa Barbara was being cancelled. In 2016, when the "Lane and a Train" plan was approved, it was noted that the tracks the train would be operating on are owned by Union Pacific, were already being operated at capacity, and the low population density between Ventura and Santa Barbara could not support a commuter train. The State and the County inflated the estimates of ridership to support the false narrative that the train would reduce car usage, reducing gasoline consumption. 10 years and millions of dollars later, the commuter train is dead, with the County now saying the Amtrak Pacific Surfliner will make a wonderful commuter train, so what if the commuter usage is a fraction of what was promised.

The State of California and County of Santa Barbara can be expected to use misleading alternative transportation statistics to show new oil production is not needed. These statistics are easily proven false by simply conducting proper commuter usage counts, such as bike lane counts during commute hours, and comparing the observed usage to the usage claimed by the State and the County.

The California Air Resources Board has rejected proposals to reduce gasoline consumption. The result is a massive increase in oil imported into California from foreign sources.

Over the last 20 plus years, CARB has created rules and regulations to reduce the emissions of CO2 from California sources. CARB has also attempted to force other states to adopt CARB's agenda by wielding the State's market clout, forcing manufacturers to conform to California's regulations on all their products, including products sold in other states.

During the rulemaking process for all of these regulations and rules, alternatives were proposed to CARB, alternatives that would reduce petroleum consumption in the state without imposing California's agenda on states that don't want products made to CARB's specifications. The biggest regulation was the Advanced Clean Cars II (ACCII).

For all intents and purposes, the ACCII was a mandate that would have forced automakers to produce nothing but battery powered cars by 2035. Because of California's market share clout, automakers would not be able to make both electric cars for California, and gas cars for all the other states. They would be forced to make only battery powered cars, and consumers in all 50 states would be forced to buy battery powered cars, or pay steep prices for gas powered cars, if they were even available.

I proposed an alternative to the ACCII regulation. I proposed the State reduce statewide VMT by 50% from a 2014 baseline, and have motor vehicle fuels be a blend of 50% ethanol/butanol with gasoline. CARB rejected my alternative, sticking with their battery car agenda. Butanol is a drop-in fuel that is produced from the same feedstocks as ethanol. In May of 2025, the U.S.

Senate killed the ACCII regulation. Today, California is importing close to 1 million barrels a day from foreign sources, thanks to CARB's refusal to consider any plan that competed with their ACCII scheme.

And just to show the massive negative impact caused by California's push for electric cars, Ford announced they were taking a \$9 billion dollar hit on their electric car program, a program foisted on Ford by California's CARB.

BOEM, PHMSA, BSEE, and other involved Federal agencies should be taking steps now to preserve infrastructure that will be needed to support oil development in the OCS.

In Santa Barbara County, Freeport McMoRan has submitted a plan to County P&D to decommission, abandon and demolish the Point Arguello Unit platforms, pipelines and onshore facilities. The unit consists of 3 platforms located in the OCS, pipelines that run to the Gaviota Processing Facility, and the Gaviota Processing Facility located at Gaviota. The pipelines cross federal waters, state waters and land along the Gaviota Coast. The pipelines and onshore facilities are irreplaceable, and if demolished, infrastructure vital for the development of the Sword Unit and possibly the Lion Rock Unit will be lost.

Sword and Lion Rock are the big oil plays off Santa Barbara County. The Point Arguello Unit is located between Sword and Lion Rock. The Point Arguello pipelines connect to Sable Offshore's line 325, which transports oil into Kern County, where it goes to refineries in Los Angeles. That Arguello pipeline may be crucial for OCS development off Santa Barbara County.

The Federal government should consider purchasing the Point Arguello facilities from Freeport to be used as oil production support facilities. The platforms have had their wells capped, so they no longer produce oil. Freeport has indicated they wish to divest themselves of their oil business assets and concentrate on their core business. Repurposing the facilities by the Federal government would save Freeport the expense of demolition. And if state and county governments oppose the repurposing, it can be pointed out the State had the opportunity to reduce foreign oil importation and failed to do so, making development in the OCS necessary. One thing for sure: Jurisdiction over any project involving the Point Arguello Unit should be taken away from Santa Barbara County. Their behavior during the Las Flores pipeline restart should disqualify the County from ever having any jurisdiction over any oil and gas project anywhere in the County, or offshore.

To summarize and conclude this public comment

- Oil production from the OCS is in the national interest and necessary for national security.
- California imports close to 1 million barrels of oil from foreign sources every day.
- California has shown no concern about the damage importing foreign oil does to the national interest or national security.
- Foreign oil imports harm the national interest and weaken national security.
- California's importation of foreign oil is against the national interest and jeopardizes national security.
- The Federal government can preempt California jurisdiction over oil production and related projects if preemption is required to protect the national interest and protect national security.
- The Federal government should consider purchasing the Point Arguello Unit to preserve infrastructure that may be needed to develop the Sword and Lion Rock Units in the OCS.
- The Federal government should take jurisdiction over Point Arguello Unit projects from the County of Santa Barbara.
- Insubordinate federal employees who unlawfully refuse to implement the President's national energy emergency EO, must be quickly replaced with people who will obey orders.