

LATE
DIST

Katherine Douglas *General Public Comment - Grp 1*

From: County Executive Office
Sent: Tuesday, January 6, 2026 2:49 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: FW: Sable Pipeline restart

From: Zackary Young <zwyoung2024@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 6, 2026 2:38 PM
To: County Executive Office <caoemail@countyofsb.org>
Subject: RE: Sable Pipeline restart

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.

The Sable Pipeline restart is great for Santa Barbara. The rejection of the plan by the County Supervisors was a mistake. Their opposition is understandable, but this is a necessary and beneficial project. I encourage you to give it a second look.

Zackary Warren Young
1-6-2026

Katherine Douglas

From: Thomas Becker <tbeckerpower@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:52 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: General public comment, BOS meeting of 1/13/26

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.

During the process of the County determining the transfer of ownership and permits from ExxonMobil to Sable Offshore, the possibility of conflict of interest involving Hartmann became a critical issue. To resolve the issue, County Council contacted the FPPC for advice. In a June 5, 2025 letter to the FPPC, County Council submitted a map apparently prepared by the County Planning and Development GIS specialist. The map is on page 4 of the letter. County Council appears to have possibly informed the FPPC that the location of the pipeline on that map is the actual location, as determined by County Planning. The map appears to possibly indicate the pipeline is at least 900 feet from Hartmann's property.

However, it appears there may be a subdivision parcel map of the property containing the pipeline which shows the location of the pipeline/pipeline easement abutting Hartmann's property. It appears the subdivision map may have been/is available on a real estate website that was/is brokering the lots located on the subdivision. If a subdivision map existed on June 5, 2025, it would have been readily and easily available to both County Council and County Planning at the time County Council sent the June 5th letter to the FPPC.

In addition to the map, there are photographs of petroleum pipeline warning signs in the possession of County Planning. The map showing the location of the warning signs appears to possibly indicate that one of the warning signs, which appears to also be pipeline mile marker 25, is located on or next to Hartmann's property. These photographs were easily and readily available to County Council and County Planning at the time County Council sent the June 5th letter to the FPPC.

Perhaps County Council and County Planning should explain what they knew when County Council sent that June 5th letter. Perhaps County Council misunderstood the map she sent to the FPPC on June 5th. Perhaps they were unaware of the subdivision map and warning sign photos. Perhaps the subdivision map did not exist on June 5th, 2025. Perhaps the map location of the warning signs is incorrect. This is important, because County Council sent that map to the FPPC, and the map may be entered into evidence in a federal court.

Tom Becker