



**Sarah Mayer**

General Public Comment - Group 1

**From:** Cassandra Griego (katchina54@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <kwautomail@phone2action.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 8, 2024 2:49 PM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Subject:** Deny Exxon trucking project - Upcoming Board of Supervisors Meeting

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.

Dear Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors,

Let's walk our talk, no off shore drilling

I urge you to deny this dangerous project as recommended by the Santa Barbara Planning Commission.

In addition to the significant and unavoidable risks of spills from trucking the oil, the purported benefit of producing oil from the offshore platforms and processing it on the Gaviota coast would bring with it unacceptable risks of offshore oil spills, air pollution and toxic fire and smoke risks that were not analyzed in the EIR, which focused narrowly on trucking impacts.

The recent oil spill off of Orange County underlines the severity of these risks. In addition, ExxonMobil's facilities were the largest sources of air pollution in the county and contained dangerous and toxic materials in an area that has burned by wildfire twice in the 6 years since the facilities have been shut down. We were fortunate that oil and dangerous gases were not present at the site during the recent Alisal fire, which burned onto ExxonMobil's property.

It is not just that the trucking routes are along sections of road with above average accident rates, there have been specific and recent instances of oil tankers on this route spilling oil into rivers and starting fires. In fact, on October 11 -- the same day as the Alisal fire -- an oil tanker crash near Orcutt caused a fire in Eucalyptus trees.

Thank you for denying this dangerous and unacceptable oil trucking project.

Sincerely,

Cassandra Griego  
1127 n. Third St  
El Cajon , CA 92021  
katchina54@hotmail.com  
(619) 733-4361

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. If you need more information, please contact Member Care at Sierra Club at member.care@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5673.

## Sarah Mayer

---

**From:** Carol Anne Moore <cmoorecas1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 9, 2024 10:23 AM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Subject:** COMMENTS for 3 state-mandated "Housing Element Update" process

**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.**

- I urge that the sites located in the Coastal Zone that are outside the Urban/Rural Boundary be eliminated from consideration for rezoning. This is Rezone Sites 15 [Van Wingerden 1] and 16 [Van Wingerden 2], and Pending Project Site 37 [Bailard].
- Doing so will better adhere to good sound planning principles and will eliminate likely objections from the Coastal Commission that would likely delay completion of the Housing Element Update, extending the window where further Builder's Remedy projects may come in.

### **RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The importance of the Urban/Rural Boundary and the protections of the California Coastal Act in the Coastal Zone are fundamental to good planning and have been critical in protecting the Carpinteria Valley for decades. Our goal is that this legacy of sound planning be

#### **Advantage #1: Adherence to good sound planning principles:**

The three Carpinteria Valley sites that are in the Coastal Zone (Potential Rezone Sites 15 [Van Wingerden 1]) and 16 [Van Wingerden 2], and Pending Project Site 37 [Bailard]) are all also located outside the County's mapped Urban/Rural Boundary. In fact, they are the only sites in the entire County being analyzed in this PEIR that are outside the Urban/Rural Boundary.

The existing carefully defined and stable Urban/Rural Boundary is an important planning tool for preventing sprawl and its associated problems. The purpose of the Urban/Rural boundary is to mark the outer limit beyond which urban development will not be allowed. Its aim is to discourage sprawl by containing urban development.

It is unacceptable to expand this boundary solely because it is inconvenient and restricts where new high-density housing can be built. The whole point of County policy defining the Urban/Rural Boundary is to prevent development that is inappropriate in this location.

Section 3.8.2 of the County's Coastal Land Use Plan states: "Within the County's coastal zone, the need for clearly defined urban/rural boundaries is especially apparent on the South Coast, where prime coastal agriculture has given way to urban expansion in a rapidly developing area." That document continues with a description of how the Urban/Rural Boundary was determined for the purpose of preserving existing agricultural lands, not as a transitional land use but for agricultural use over the long term. Expanding the Urban/Rural Boundary now disregards existing County policy and sound planning principles.

#### **Advantage #2: Expediency in completing the Housing Element Update by avoiding the need for Coastal Commission approval of rezones in the Coastal Zone.**

Coastal Commission approval is required for rezones in the Coastal Zone. Rezoning sites that are outside the Urban/Rural Boundary and therefore expanding the Boundary is likely to be met with resistance

(possibly significant resistance) from the Coastal Commission. Working through this is likely to delay completion of the Housing Element Update compared to completion of a Housing Element Update that does not include rezones that expand the Urban/Rural Boundary.

Any further delay to completion of the Housing Element Update extends the window where further Builder's Remedy projects may come in. That would be very undesirable.

**CONCLUSION:**

Therefore, we urge that the sites located in the Coastal Zone that are outside the Urban/Rural Boundary be eliminated from consideration for rezoning. This is Rezone Sites 15 [Van Wingerden 1] and 16 [Van Wingerden 2], and Pending Project Site 37 [Bailard].

Doing so will better adhere to good planning principles, and will eliminate likely objections from the Coastal Commission that would likely delay completion of the Housing Element Update, extending the window where further Builder's Remedy projects may come in.