

Alexander, Jacquelyne

From: Villalobos, David
Sent: Saturday, August 29, 2015 6:48 PM
To: Board Letters
Subject: Fwd: Las Varas BOS meeting. Tues Sept 1st, 2015
Attachments: Public_Comment_Ltr_8_28_15.doc

Sent from Outlook

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "Chumash People" < >
Date: Sat, Aug 29, 2015 at 6:47 PM -0700
Subject: Las Varas BOS meeting. Tues Sept 1st, 2015
To: "Villalobos, David" <dvillalo@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>
Cc: "Sam Cohen" < >, "Freddie Romero"
"Luque, Alex" < >

'Paul Van Leer'

Hello Mr. Villalobos,

Would you be so kind to forward this to the BOS meeting for Sept 1st. I hope we can also have this included in to the record.

Thanks, Frank

*Best wishes, Frank Arredondo
Ksen~Sku~Mu
Chumash MLD
Po Box 161
Santa Barbara, Ca 93102
Email*



Ksen' SKu' Mu' Chumash

Ksen~Sku~Mu
Frank Arredondo ~Chumash MLD
Po Box 161
Santa Barbara Ca, 93102

August 28, 2015

Santa Barbara County
123 E Anapamu St.
Santa Barbara Ca, 93101

Re: Las Varas Ranch Project Agenda Item 15-00548 (7)

Honorable Chair and Commissioners

I thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above referenced project. My name is Frank Arredondo. I am Chumash/Coastanoan. I am a member of the Native American Heritage commission Most Likely Descendants List (MLD) for the Chumash Territory and listed on the Native American Contact list for Santa Barbara County. My comments today are of my own.

Being of Native American descendant, from the Chumash territory, I have a strong vested interest in the project. I currently provide comment on several Planning and Development projects in the surrounding areas that have cultural resources impacts. I have been an advocate for the preservation of those Cultural Resources within my community and for several years now as well as placing an emphasis on local governments adhering to policies and procedures. I thank you for taking the time to review my comments.

I have been working on this project for several years and have been the only Chumash who has participated consistently with the planning and mitigations. Previously in 2012 I submitted a comment letter (January 6th, 2012) that supported the proposed building footprint alternative 3C. During my review at that time the only trails suggested had to do with the eastern side of the proposed project parcel. The alternative 3C offered avoidance of the known archaeological site on parcel 3 & 2.

Recently I was made aware of additional review of the cultural resource section as well as others. My first reaction was the confusion of why I a Native American on the Native American Heritage commission list was never sent a notice that properly identified my as a Native American for the purpose of consultation as in accordance of establishing and maintaining confidentiality requirements with regards to Archaeological Resources Act and the Public Records Act. What I have been sent is public notices of



hearings taking place and or announcements. Unfortunately neither public notices nor announcements meet the criteria required for Native Americans and privacy and consultation laws. In two months the County will be required to send notices that specifically identify the reason for notice such as “a Native American and purpose for consultation”. This is due to the approval of Assembly bill 52.

As far as the Alternate 3C is concerned I still support the efforts established by developer and the mitigation measures proposed under that alternative. I do have some great concern as to the proposal of a Coastal Trail that extends further than what I was witness too back in 2012.

As the current staff report states;

“Condition No. 82 remains as previously recommended by staff”. The recommendation includes “granting of a lateral easement across the coastal properties (Parcels 1 and 2) to allow for public access along the shoreline, to include on the sandy beach area located seaward of the base of the coastal bluffs”. (pg B-3, revised conditions of approval Attachment B)

Condition 82 states:

82. Shoreline Trail Easement. The alignment of the proposed shoreline trail easement being dedicated to the County by the owner/applicant along the sandy beach above the mean high tide shall be modified to ensure access around Edwards Point during periods of high tide. (pg B-34, revised conditions of approval Attachment B)

The issue I see with this request is that given the high cliff face along parcel 1, it would suggest that if high tide was up, a person would be stranded behind Edwards Point. The shore line leading up too and after Edwards Point has high cliff walls. The request is not rational.

In the vicinity of the proposed shoreline trail easement has been classified as part of the boundaries of a site. I have had the chance to review the most recent field survey conducted by Applied Earthworks (AE) Oct, 2013. That survey followed a proposed coastal trail along the bluff of parcels 1 and 2. During the surface survey along Edwards Point, no resources were visible on the surface and noted in the report. AE also qualified the lack of visible resources due to the abundance of brush that prohibited the view. In the conclusion section of the AE report it strongly stated that the proposed coastal trail through the sites will directly and indirectly impact these sites and is contrary to the County’s coastal land-use policies.

The only information that supports staffs recommendation to keep condition 82 is the surface survey did not identify any resources. A surface survey is not enough to



qualify the implementation of an easement access for beach goes during high tide. For such easement to take place would require additional subsurface studies to determine site boundaries. As it currently stands you're proposing to place beach access on a registered site.

On a lesser point, it is not quite clear why the County would ask for an easement along parcel 1 above the mean high tide when there is no place for a beach goes to go if the tide comes in. The nature of the request is founded under no logical rational based on the material presented. Only parcel 2 maintains an inlet bluff that is above the mean high tide offering some shelter during high tide.

Condition 82 Shoreline Trails Easement lacks standing under CEQA since no conclusive assessment of impacts can be derived from just a surface survey. The only aspect of review along the coastal parcels has been with the proposals of the development envelope. This is a significant failure of the review process and exposes the County to possible litigation.

In my review it appears that all five (5) Policies have been completely ignored by the staff recommendation.

CLUP Policy 10-1: All available measures shall be explored to avoid development on significant historic, prehistoric, archaeological, and other classes of cultural sites.

CLUP Policy 10-2: When developments are proposed for parcels where archaeological or other cultural sites are located, project design shall be required which avoids impacts to such cultural sites if possible.

CLUP Policy 10-3: When sufficient planning flexibility does not permit avoiding construction on archaeological or other types of cultural sites, adequate mitigation shall be required. Mitigation shall be designed in accord with guidelines of the State Office of Historic Preservation and the State of California Native American Heritage Commission.

CLUP Policy 10-4: Off-road vehicle use, unauthorized collecting of artifacts, and other activities other than development which could destroy or damage archaeological or cultural sites shall be prohibited.

CLUP Policy 10-5: Native Americans shall be consulted when development proposals are submitted which impact significant archaeological or cultural sites.

There is no indication that any mitigation measures have been explored, or design avoidance, nor mitigation measures offered with regards to the coastal trail easement proposal. Given the potential for direct and indirect impacts to take place by way of the impacts listed with CLUP Policy 10-4 specifically contradicts the policy prohibition.



Ksen' SKu' Mu' Chumash

Under condition 32,CULT 1-1, I strongly suggest the wording be modified to include Native American Monitor. Any place you require a P&D-qualified archaeologist should include a Native American monitor so the monitor can monitor the archaeologist. See Condition 37 wording for reference.

Lastly, any trail located along the Coastal Bluff that proposed to cross either of the archaeological sites identified in the AE Oct. 2013 report will be met with strong opposition. All sites along the Gaviota Coast line are extremely significant mostly due to the intactness of the sites. Almost little to no disturbances has taken place. Very little surveys have taken place along the Gaviota coast and should be treated much different than what you find in urban settlements.

*Best wishes, Frank Arredondo
Ksen~Sku~Mu
Chumash MLD
Po Box 161
Santa Barbara. Ca 93102
Email 1 _____*

Cc:

Paul Van Leer
NAHC
SY Chumash Elders, Freddie Romero
SY Business Council, Sam Coen

Alexander, Jacquelyne

From: Vince Semonsen
Sent: Monday, August 31, 2015 10:20 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Las Varas Ranch Project

Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I'm sending this email to ask that you follow the Planning Commission's recommendation and deny the Las Varas Ranch Project.

The project is inconsistent with County policies protecting agricultural land, visual resources, biological resources, and cultural resources.

Please uphold County policy and deny the Las Varas Ranch Project.

Thanks!

Vince Semonsen

Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Alexander, Jacquelyne

From: Bill Schaal
Sent: Monday, August 31, 2015 8:39 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Las Varas Ranch Project: Please deny

Dear Supervisors,

It is an uncommon practice for me to interfere with another business man's business. However, the Gaviota Coast is a natural and truly unique treasure. It must be preserved with minimal impact for the sake of nature and those who enjoy nature. Therefore and with maximum passion, I urge the Board of Supervisors to follow the Planning Commission's recommendation and deny the Las Varas Ranch Project. The proposed fragmentation of a historic Gaviota Coast working ranch is inconsistent with County policies protecting agriculture, and with the community's vision for the Gaviota Coast. The project, including the residential development it facilitates, will degrade important public views and compromise sensitive resources. Please uphold County policy and deny the Las Varas Ranch Project.

Respectfully,
Bill Schaal
Santa Barbara, CA

Alexander, Jacquelyne

From: Joy Robledo ·
Sent: Sunday, August 30, 2015 7:17 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Las Varas Development Project proposal

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

We ask you to deny any further development north of Goleta because of the drought and the potential loss of scenic open space.

The drought cries out for a suspension of further developments of any kind, until our water supply for residents is secured. The beauty of the land north of Goleta is awesome for the thousands who drive on 101 daily. Any development is unwelcome by most local residents. We certainly feel strongly it should stay as is. No further development, please!

Dr.& Mrs.

Gilbert Robledo

, Santa Barbara

August 30,

2015

Alexander, Jacquelyne

From: Connie Hannah ·
Sent: Sunday, August 30, 2015 5:13 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Also Las Varas Ranch!
Attachments: Las Varas Ranch 9-15.doc

Las Varas Ranch 9-15

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF SANTA BARBARA

August 30, 2015

Board of Supervisors
Santa Barbara County
sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

Re: Las Varas Ranch Project
Agenda Item # 7 on 9-1-2015

Dear Supervisors,

The Santa Barbara League of Women Voters has followed projects on the Gaviota Coast for many years, because of the unique value this area has for the state of California. It is one of the last, open, natural scenic coasts that remains, and thus deserves special protection.

The League urges you to follow the recommendation of the Planning Commission and deny this project. The proposed fragmentation of the land is inconsistent with the County's agricultural protection policies, and with the preservation of public views and public access that you have always supported.

Because this project conflicts with so many County policies, and with the vision for that Coast that so many people have worked for in past and recent years, we hope that this will be an easy decision for you to make.

Sincerely,

Connie Hannah, Vice-President for Program and Action.
Phone:

Alexander, Jacquelyne

From: Connie Hannah
Sent: Sunday, August 30, 2015 5:05 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Las Varas Ranch Project
Attachments: Las Varas 2-15.doc

Las Varas 2-15

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF SANTA BARBARA

February 8, 2015

Chair Janet Wolf
Santa Barbara Board of Supervisors
105 East Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
cc: Doreen Farr, 3rd District Supervisors
Joan Hartman, 3rd District Planning Commissioner
Cecelia Brown, Second District Planning Commissioner
Glen Russell, Director, Planning and Development
Jack Ainsworth, Deputy Director, California Coastal Commission

Subject : Las Varas Ranch Development Project
Hearing Date: February 17, 2015

Dear Chair Wolf and Board Members,

The League of Women Voters of Santa Barbara has had a long standing interest in the protection of one of the last large open natural spaces on the California Coast., the Gaviota Coast. We are supportive of recreational uses, coastal trails, agricultural uses and coastal access in that area. For that reason we would urge you to acquire a shoreline easement for the California Coastal Trail (CCT) across Las Varas Ranch, with coastal access at Edwards Point. This trail has been many years in the planning, and unless it is close to the ocean, most of its value could be lost.

We know that the Santa Barbara Trails Council is supporting this placement of the trail and we agree. They feel that the Final Environmental Impact Report does not accurately describe all the possible alternatives and the proper location of the CTT.

Because this trail will forever be available to both tourists and our local residents, we hope that this long desired trail and access to the ocean can be guaranteed for the future.

Susan Shank, Program and Action Vice-President

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

Alexander, Jacquelyne

From: Meg West <
Sent: Sunday, August 30, 2015 4:46 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Los Varas Ranch

Dear County supervisors,

I am writing to ask you to follow the Planning Commission's recommendation and deny the Las Varas Ranch Project. The proposed development of a historic Gaviota Coast ranch is inconsistent with County policies protecting agriculture, and with the community's vision for the Gaviota Coast.

There is already a lot of development going on in Goleta, and despite the traffic and congestion that it's causing, I prefer this infill development to sprawl. We are meeting our RHNA housing needs already with all this new housing – no need for new housing in an area that should stay agricultural.

Thanks for your consideration,

Meg

MEG WEST DESIGN
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
OFFICE: 805.504.0606
SANTA BARBARA, CA

www.megwestdesign.com

Alexander, Jacquelyne

From: Karen Maassen
Sent: Sunday, August 30, 2015 4:03 PM
To: sbcob
Cc: Maassen ICE Nevil
Subject: PLEASE deny the Las Varas Ranch Project

We, Nevil and Karen Maassen, of Goleta, California, strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to follow the Planning Commission's recommendation and deny the Las Varas Ranch Project. The proposed fragmentation of an historic Gaviota Coast working ranch is inconsistent with County policies protecting agriculture, and the community's long term vision for our pristine Gaviota Coast. This project, including the residential development it facilitates, will degrade important public views and more importantly, compromise extremely sensitive resources. PLEASE uphold County policy and deny the Las Varas Ranch Project.

Sincerely,
Nevil and Karen Maassen

Alexander, Jacquelyne

From: Maria & Scott -
Sent: Sunday, August 30, 2015 3:35 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Las Varas Ranch Project

To Whom it may concern:

I urge the Board of Supervisors to follow the Planning Commission's recommendation and deny the Las Varas Ranch Project. The proposed fragmentation of a historic Gaviota Coast working ranch is inconsistent with County policies protecting agriculture, and with the community's vision for the Gaviota Coast. The project, including the residential development it facilitates, will degrade important public views and compromise sensitive resources.

Please uphold County policy and deny the Las Varas Ranch Project.

Thank you,
J. Scott Coombs

Alexander, Jacquelyne

From: Maria Coombs ·
Sent: Sunday, August 30, 2015 3:34 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: 9/1/15 - Las Varas Ranch Project

I urge the Board of Supervisors to follow the Planning Commission's recommendation and deny the Las Varas Ranch Project. The proposed fragmentation of a historic Gaviota Coast working ranch is inconsistent with County policies protecting agriculture, and with the community's vision for the Gaviota Coast. The project, including the residential development it facilitates, will degrade important public views and compromise sensitive resources.

Please uphold County policy and deny the Las Varas Ranch Project.

Thank you,
Maria Coombs

Alexander, Jacquelyne

From: A_Ed Bell <
Sent: Sunday, August 30, 2015 3:18 PM
To: sbcob
Cc: Janet Koed, janet at gaviotacoastconservancy.org
Subject: LAS VARAS RANCH PROJECT

- I urge the Board of Supervisors to follow the Planning Commission's recommendation and deny the Las Varas Ranch Project. The proposed fragmentation of a historic Gaviota Coast working ranch is inconsistent with County policies protecting agriculture, and with the community's vision for the Gaviota Coast. The project, including the residential development it facilitates, will degrade important public views and compromise sensitive resources. Please uphold County policy and deny the Las Varas Ranch Project.
- Any subdivision as currently allowed would seem to me inconsistent with the intent of other existent protection laws who's mandate is to protect and preserve the coastal land and marine's natural and cultural resources. This includes sites of special geological features and sensitive biological environments on one side and historical working ranches and identified historical sites of pre-columbian civilizations on an other, this ranch falls within at least all these categories. Let's not forget it is a proven fact that increased population density invariably leads to increased fragmentation of the environment, traffic and ensuing pollution. Please help keep the land together for the benefit of the most species, including ours.

Ed Bell
PO Box 2356
SB, CA 93120

Alexander, Jacquelyne

From: greg sweel
Sent: Sunday, August 30, 2015 3:06 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Las Varas Ranch Project

Dear Honorable Supervisors,

I urge the Board of Supervisors to follow the Planning Commission's recommendation and deny the Las Varas Ranch Project. The proposed fragmentation of a historic Gaviota Coast working ranch is inconsistent with County policies protecting agriculture, and with the community's vision for the Gaviota Coast. The project, including the residential development it facilitates, will degrade important public views and compromise sensitive resources. Please uphold County policy and deny the Las Varas Ranch Project.

Thank you for considering my request.

Sincerely,

Greg Sweel

Alexander, Jacquelyne

From: Daniel McCarter <
Sent: Sunday, August 30, 2015 2:40 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Las Varas Hearing

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I urge you, the Board of Supervisors to follow the Planning Commission's recommendation and deny the Las Varas Ranch Project. The proposed fragmentation of a historic Gaviota Coast working ranch is inconsistent with County policies protecting agriculture, and with the community's vision for the Gaviota Coast. The project, including the residential development it facilitates, will degrade important public views and compromise sensitive resources. Please uphold County policy and deny the Las Varas Ranch Project.

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.

Locating future residential development in the midst of orchards and cattle pastures would introduce significant land use conflicts that will further 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.

The Project is inconsistent with County cultural resource protection policies:

The Project site qualifies as a significant cultural resource with both a Rural Historic Landscape and significant archaeological resources including CA-SBA-80.

The Project intensifies development potential within the Rural Historic Landscape and in proximity to CA-SBA-80 in a manner inconsistent with County policy requiring the avoidance of development on significant historic and archaeological sites when possible.

Project infrastructure and future residential development will degrade the site's significant cultural resources.

Thank you,
 Dan McCarter

Alexander, Jacquelyne

From: Lindsey Reed
Sent: Sunday, August 30, 2015 12:40 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Planning Commission is right on Las Varas project: Please deny approval of this degradation of the Gaviota Coast

Dear Members of the County Board of Supervisors:

We urge you to follow the Planning Commission's recommendation on the Las Varas project and deny approval of this degradation of the Gaviota Coast.

The proposed subdivision and lot line adjustment would divide up a working Gaviota Coast ranch that has been in agricultural production since the 1700's, to maximize the land's value for estate residential development. The Project includes residential development envelopes on seven lots, ranging in size from 2.5 to 5 acres, and a private water system and roadway infrastructure to serve 14 homes (1 primary residence, and 1 guest house on each of the 7 lots). The Project would intensify residential development potential in the coastal zone, by shifting one lot from the inland to the coastal side of Highway 101. Two of the residential development envelopes are proposed on the coastal bluff, immediately above Edward's Point and just down coast from El Capitan State Beach. Easements for public trails offered by the Applicant are inappropriately located, and very unlikely to provide viable public access in the foreseeable future.

You have a legacy to protect here and I urge you to do the right thing and preserve this beautiful stretch of land along our Gaviota Coast. We should not succumb to the pressures that counties to the south of us did. This is your chance to prove that Santa Barbara County is truly something different. Thank you for your consideration.

Lindsey Reed and James S. Dominguez

Los Alamos