



Sheila de la Guerra *Public Comment*

From: Thomas Becker <tbeckerpower@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 26, 2026 3:33 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public comment, BOS meeting of 4/27/26, closed session
Attachments: Page 1 of 2.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.

Please see attached public comment, BOS meeting of 4/27/26, closed session.

4/26/26

Public comment, BOS meeting of 4/27/26, closed session.

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 lead planner for the SYU transfer of ownership project. I have preserved the entire 2-day email chain. On January 6th, I asked the lead 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 lead 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 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 lead 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 lead 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