

BRIAN KRAMER
Santa Ynez, California 93460

December 9, 2015

SENT VIA FACSIMILE & EMAIL

Supervisor Doreen Farr
Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
105 E. Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, California 93101
Facsimile No. (805) 568-2883

Supervisor Janet Wolf
Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
105 E. Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, California 93101
Facsimile No. (805) 568-2283

Supervisor Peter Adam
Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
105 E. Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, California 93101
Facsimile No. (805) 737-7703

Supervisor Salud Carbajal
Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
105 E. Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, California 93101
Facsimile No. (805) 568-2534

Supervisor Steve Lavagnino
Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
105 E. Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, California 93101
Facsimile No. (805) 346-8404

Re: Proposed Term Sheet for December 10, 2015, Meeting with Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians

Dear Supervisors Farr, Adam, Wolf, Carbajal, and Lavagnino:

My wife and I live in Santa Ynez, California, and we are neighbors of the Chumash Tribe with respect to Camp 4. I am an attorney of 35 years and I have a degree in Urban and Regional Planning from the University of Southern California. I am an Appellant in the matter currently pending before the U.S. Department of the Interior, Assistant Secretary-Indian Appeals, involving the Chumash Fee-to-Trust application. Santa Barbara County is also an appellant.

I am writing to you in connection with the "Proposed Term Sheet" provided for the December 10, 2015, meeting with the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians. It is admirable the parties are attempting to reach a resolution. However, the "Proposed Term Sheet" does not adequately address the adverse environmental issues of the proposed development and the adverse impact that development will have on the adjoining communities.

Initially, no development should be allowed prior to 2023 in accordance with the Williamson Act and the representations made by the Tribe in the Final Environmental Assessment (Final EA). Secondly, an environmental assessment must be performed based on development conditions in 2023, not on current conditions. Lastly, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is needed as the Final EA is factually and legally erroneous and violates NEPA as Santa Barbara County correctly states in its Notice of Appeal of the Decision of the Pacific Regional Director (See County's Statement of Reasons, Pages 12-21).

My wife and I, as neighbors of Camp 4, along with my neighbors, are concerned about the negative impact the development of Camp 4 will cause as set forth in our Notice of Appeal and Opening Brief filed in connection with the Decision of the Pacific Director. I direct your attention to the Opening Brief of Brian Kramer and Suzanne Kramer which addresses the

Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
December 9, 2015
Page 2

following concerns which must be addressed in any discussion with the Tribe and any agreement that may be reached.

BIA is transferring land into trust the tribe does not own. (Page 9)

The Final EA, FONSI and NOD are erroneous, legally deficient and fail to comply with NEPA. (Page 10)

The Final EA, FONSI and NOD violate NEPA. (Page 11)

The Final EA, FONSI and NOD fail to apply the proper baseline and fail to adequately analyze or evaluate the impacts when the proposed development will take place . (Page 14)

The Final EA, FONSI and NOD do not adequately address or evaluate the negative impacts the proposed development will have on neighboring wells. (Page 16)

The Final EA, FONSI and NOD do not adequately address or evaluate the potential traffic impacts of the proposed development. (Page 18)

The Final EA, FONSI and NOD do not adequately evaluate the impact the development will have on modifying the urban-wildlife interface and adverse edge effects. (Page 20)

The Final EA, FONSI and NOD do not adequately evaluate the incompatibility of the proposed project with the surrounding community. (Page 21)

The Final EA, FONSI and NOD do not adequately evaluate the significant negative impact the Tribal Facility and its activities will create. (Page 21)

The Final EA, FONSI and NOD do not adequately evaluate the significant cumulative negative impact the development will create. (Page 22)

The Final EA, FONSI and NOD are based on a factually and legally defective Economic Impact Analysis, dated March 7, 2012. (Page 23)

The Mitigation Measures Are Inadequate to Avoid Significant Negative Impact. (Page 24)

I believe Santa Barbara County has asserted the same or similar issues in its Notice of Appeal. The above must be addressed to comply with NEPA and the well being of all involved.

In addition, greater setback requirements are needed as the setback requirements set forth in paragraph 4c of the "Proposed Term Sheet" are inadequate and allow unrestricted development to abut adjacent landowners. The proposed setback requirements do not offer any protection to the residential community and properties immediately east of Parcels 2 and 4 that are the subject of the "Proposed Term Sheet."

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me at BrianKramerLaw@aol.com or my office at 1230 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 300, Manhattan Beach, California 90266, Tel. (310) 536-9501.

Very truly yours,


Brian Kramer

Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
December 9, 2015
Page 3

cc:

Michael C. Ghizzoni, Esq.
Amber Holderness, Esq.
Office of County Counsel
105 East Anapamu Street, Suite 201
Santa Barbara, California 93101
aholderness@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

FACSIMILE NO. (805) 568-2982

U.S. Congresswoman Lois Capps
United States House of Representatives
2231 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C., 20515

FACSIMILE NO. (805) 349-3832
FACSIMILE NO. (202) 225-5632
FACSIMILE NO. (805) 546-8368

Santa Barbara News-Press
P.O. Box 1359
Santa Barbara, California 93102

FACSIMILE NO. (805) 966-6258

Santa Ynez Valley News
Att: Harold Pierce
P.O. Box 647
Solvang, California 93464
haroldpierce@gmail.com