

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF APPROVING) RESOLUTION No. 87-616
AMENDMENTS TO THE SANTA BARBARA)
COUNTY COASTAL ZONING ORDINANCE)
AND LAND USE MAPS FOR THE)
CARPINTERIA AREA)

WITH REFERENCE TO THE FOLLOWING:

A. On January 7, 1980, by Resolution No. 80-12, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara adopted the Santa Barbara County Coastal Plan; and

B. It is now deemed in the interest of the orderly development of the County and important to the preservation of the health, safety and general welfare of the residents of the County to make the following changes to the Local Coastal Plan, as follows:

1. Amend the local coastal program land use plan to add South Coast Consolidation Planning Area and associated policies, as set forth in Exhibit I and which is hereby incorporated by this reference; and amend the Coastal Zoning Ordinance (87-0A-7 CZ), Division 2 and 9 of Article II of Chapter 35 of the County Code, by amending Section 35-58, "definitions", to add South Coast Consolidation Planning Area, and amendment of Section 35-154 by adding new findings, and standards required for approval of oil and gas projects, and provisions for facility and site abandonment which amendments are identified and contained in Exhibit II and incorporated herein by this reference;

2. Amend the land use designation of the Local Coastal Plan for over approximately 5 acres of Accessor's Parcel Number 1-160-26, located immediately north of the coastal zone boundary, from A-I-40 Agriculture to A-I-10 Agriculture and to rezone same by amending Section 35-54 of Article II, Chapter 35 by adopting referenced zoning map identified as in Exhibit III to rezone from AG-I-40 Agriculture to AG-I-10 Agriculture; and

3. Amend the land use designation of the Local Coastal Plan for Accessor's Parcel Number 1-030-26, located on the South side of Casitas Pass Road, from AG-I-10 to Recreation and rezone same by amending Section 35-54 of Article II, Chapter 35 by adopting referenced zoning map identified in Exhibit IV to rezone from AG-I-10 to Recreation.

C. The Planning commission of the County of Santa Barbara, after holding duly noticed public hearings on the above described items has endorsed and transmitted to this Board said recommended changes by its Resolutions No. 87-9, 87-10 and 87-11, pursuant to Government Code Section 65354.

D. This Board has held a duly noticed public hearing on the above described items as required by Government Code § 65355.

E. These amendments to the Local Coastal Plan are consistent with the provisions of the Coastal Act of 1976.

F. This Board now wishes to submit these amendments to the California Coastal Commission.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:

1. The above recitations are true and correct.

2. Pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 65357, the above described changes in the Coastal Plan of Santa Barbara County are adopted as an amendment to the above mentioned Plan Text and Maps.

3. This Board certifies that these amendments are intended to be carried out in a manner fully in conformity with the said California Coastal Act.

4. The Board submits these amendments to the Local Coastal Program to the California Coastal Commission for review and certification.

5. The Chairman and the Clerk of this Board are hereby authorized and directed to sign and certify all maps, documents and other materials in accordance with this Resolution to show the above mentioned action by the Board of Supervisors.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED By the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, this 14th day of December 1987, by the following vote:

AYES: David M. Yager, Thomas A. Rogers, William B. Wallace, DeWayne Holmdahl, Toru Miyoshi*

NOES: None

ABSENT: Toru Miyoshi

William B. Wallace
Chair, Board of Supervisors

* Supervisor Miyoshi did not vote on item No. 3.

ATTEST:

CLERK OF THE BOARD
OF SUPERVISORS

By Thomas J. Parsh
Deputy

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

KENNETH L. NELSON
COUNTY COUNSEL

By William M. Dillon
William M. Dillon, Deputy

EXHIBIT I

Oil transportation is one of the key issues associated with oil development in Santa Barbara County. Pipelines have been found to be environmentally superior to tankers. Tanker transportation presents greater impacts to marine, visual, recreation and air resources than do pipelines. General pipeline "feasibility" will be determined through the market based on producer choice of refining center, refining capacity in that center, and economic feasibility being tested through ability to obtain financing and the choice to build and operate the pipeline. Once constructed and operational to the refining center of a producer's choice (e.g. Houston, San Francisco, Los Angeles), pipelines shall be the required mode of transportation because they are less environmentally damaging than other modes of transportation. This requirement is based on the assumption that, when operational, pipelines serving various refining centers will have adequate capacity and that the tariffs and costs of transporting the oil to its ultimate refining destination will be reasonable. This "reasonableness" will be based on the balancing of public and private interests in economic and environmental factors.

The County should assure that producers have access to competitive markets, however, the County need not provide unlimited flexibility to all refining centers, other methods of oil transportation are needed for production that precedes pipeline construction and operation and for refining centers not served by pipeline.

The County recognizes the potential for transportation demand to exceed system capacity and should take affirmative measures to ensure equitable, pro-rata access to the transportation system by all shippers consistent with the County's goals of consolidation.

Because of uncertainty regarding crude oil production volumes, industry economics, and permits, there is a need for periodic review of the County's oil transportation policies.

WHERE

Existing areas currently in coastal dependent oil and gas development are designated as Coastal Dependent Industry in the land use plan. For areas outside of the South Coast Consolidation Planning Area (as defined in Policy 6-6B below), oil and gas processing facilities are encouraged to expand within these existing processing sites rather than opening up of new sites. In addition, it is recommended that within the South Coast Consolidation Planning Area, the County has designated Las Flores Canyon and Gaviota as consolidated oil and gas processing sites to minimize the industrialization of the South Coast. The land use designation for these two sites is Coastal Dependent Industry.

In accordance with existing County procedures and regulations, processing facilities required for production from onshore oil wells are permitted in Agriculture II as well as on sites designated as Coastal Dependent Industry, and are conditionally permitted uses in several other land use classifications (refer to Table 3-1).

2. Amend Chapter 3.6, Industrial and Energy Development, by amending Subsection 3.6.4, Land Use Plan Proposals, replacing policy 6-6 with policies 6-6B through 6-6G with the current language of policy 6-6 retained as part of policy 6-6B and all references to policy 6-6 shall now pertain to the new reference number 6-6B:

Policy 6-6A applies to oil and gas processing facilities and sites that serve offshore producers. Policy 6-6B applies to all oil and gas processing facilities located outside the South Coast Consolidation Planning Area. Policies 6-6C through 6-6G, which comprise the County's South Coast Consolidation Policies, apply to oil and gas facilities located within the South Coast Consolidation Planning Area (SCCPA).

Policy 6-6A If upper throughput limits exist in any new oil transportation system, the County shall, to the maximum extent feasible and legally permissible, assure equitable, pro-rata access for all shippers. Permits for oil transportation systems shall require the permittee to achieve the County's goals for consolidation. County shall retain continuing permit jurisdiction to assure that these goals are met. For the purposes of this plan, "shipper" shall refer to the entity in legal ownership of the oil to be transported.

Policy 6-6B: Except for facilities not directly related to oil and gas processing as referenced in Policy 6-11B (Marine Terminals), this policy applies to areas of the coastal zone that are outside the South Coast Consolidation Planning Area (SCCPA).

The SCCPA is the unincorporated area from Point Arguello to the western boundary of the City of Santa Barbara, and from the ridge of the Santa Ynez Mountains to the three-mile offshore limit.

If new sites for processing facilities to serve offshore oil and gas development are needed, expansion of facilities on existing sites or on land adjacent to existing sites shall take precedence over opening up additional areas, unless it can be shown that the environmental impacts of opening up a new site are less than the impacts of expansion on or adjacent to existing sites. Consideration shall also be given to economic feasibility.

Policies 6-6C through 6-6G (applicability): The intent and purpose of Policies 6-6C through 6-6G apply to the South Coast Consolidation Planning Area (SCCPA), delineated as the unincorporated area from Point Arguello to the City of Santa Barbara, and from the ridge of the Santa Ynez Mountains to the three-mile offshore limit line.

The terms "new production" and "new oil and gas production" and "new gas production" are used to refer to:

1. The development of any oil and/or gas after the adoption of these policies which requires new discretionary local, state, or federal permits unless its from an existing well or platform; or

2. The development of any oil and/or gas which, after the adoption of these policies, requires approval of a new platform, or a new subsea or onshore well completion.

If the operator contends that a Constitutionally-protected vested right exists within the context of existing permits to process new production at a facility which is not at a County-designated consolidated site, the operator may file a request for a determination to allow processing of that production at the nonconsolidated site.

Policy 6-6C Consolidation of Oil and Gas Processing Facilities in the South Coast Consolidation Planning Area.

New oil and gas production from offshore reservoirs or zones shall be processed at facilities approved for consolidated processing to the maximum extent technically and environmentally feasible. Commingled processing shall be required to avoid or reduce project and cumulative impacts -- considering environmental, socioeconomic, safety, and land use concerns -- that otherwise would result from construction and/or operation of redundant processing capacity, redundant pipelines, or redundant ancillary facilities. Construction of new processing facilities at consolidated sites will be considered only if the Planning Commission determines that said facilities are not redundant, finding that one or more of the following conditions apply:

Condition 1: Existing and approved processing capacity at the sites designated for consolidation is insufficient to accommodate proposed new production for a period of time that would render development of the offshore reservoir(s) infeasible. In making the determination that existing and approved capacity is insufficient, the County shall consider feasible delays in development of the offshore reservoir(s) to maximize use of existing and approved processing capacity. The County also shall consider expansion of facilities at consolidated sites to provide sufficient processing capacity for the new production.

Condition 2: The specific chemical characteristics and physical properties of oil or gas from a particular reservoir would render development of the resource technically infeasible unless specialized units can be built. Specialized units may include partial dehydration equipment if it is required to adapt a resource to the technical requirements of a processing facility. Modifications or additions to existing units at consolidated sites shall be favored over construction of an entire separate processing facility insofar as such modifications or additions render the resource characteristics and the technical processing requirements of a facility compatible with one another.

Condition 3: Commingling the production in currently approved facilities at consolidated sites is environmentally unacceptable.

Policy Implementation

Approval of a new processing facility at a consolidated site shall be contingent upon shared use of existing ancillary facilities to the maximum extent feasible.

Policy 6-6D Consolidation of Oil and Gas Processing Sites in the South Coast Consolidation Planning Area.

The oil and gas processing sites at Gaviota (APNs 81-130-07 and APN 81-130-44) and Las Flores Canyon (APNs 81-220-14 and 81-230-19) are designated as consolidated sites for processing oil and gas production from offshore reservoirs and zones. Any new oil and gas production from offshore reservoirs or zones that is processed within the SCCPA shall be processed at these two sites.

Policy 6-6E Equitable, Nondiscriminatory Access to Consolidated Facilities and Sites.

Operators and owners of County-designated consolidated facilities and sites shall make their facilities and property available for commingled processing and consolidation of oil and gas facilities on an equitable and nondiscriminatory basis.

If existing processing capacity is insufficient to accommodate proposed production and new facilities are not permittable pursuant to the County's consolidation policies, operators of consolidated facilities shall reduce throughput on a pro-rata basis to accommodate other developers.

Policy 6-6F

Review of Oil and Gas Facility Permits.

The Planning Commission shall review permits that are approved after August 12, 1985 for new or modified oil and gas facilities when throughput, averaged (arithmetic mean) over any twelve (12) consecutive months, does not exceed 3 percent of the facility's maximum permitted operating capacity. The review shall be conducted in a duly-noticed public hearing to determine if facility abandonment or facility modifications are appropriate.

Policy 6-6G

Review of South Coast Consolidation Policies.

The County shall periodically review the South Coast Consolidation policies in view of new or updated information such as: revised production forecasts, revised air quality data, advancements in technology for reduction of air emissions, and results of impact monitoring programs. The results of the policy review shall be presented in a duly-noticed public hearing, and appropriate revisions in the policies shall be pursued as deemed necessary by the County.

3. Amend Chapter 3.6, Industrial and Energy Development, by amending Subsection 3.6.4, Land Use Plan Proposals, to modify policy 6-7 as follows:

Policy 6-7: The sections of the Petroleum Ordinance, Ordinance No. 661, and "Statement of Policy Relative to the Location of On-shore Facilities" (Statement) that address oil and gas processing facilities are hereby incorporated by reference in the land use plan. The Statement does not apply, however, to the South Coast Consolidation Planning Area, which is defined in Policy 6-6B.

EXHIBIT II

ORDINANCE NO. 3673

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING DIVISIONS 2 AND 9 OF
ARTICLE II OF CHAPTER 35 OF THE
SANTA BARBARA COUNTY CODE BY AMENDING SECTION 35-58,
DEFINITIONS, TO ADD SOUTH COAST CONSOLIDATION
PLANNING AREA; AND BY AMENDING SECTION 35-154,
BY ADDING NEW FINDINGS AND STANDARDS

Case No. 87-OA-7(CZ)

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara ordains as follows:

SECTION 1:

Section 35-58, Definitions, of Division 2 of Article II of Chapter 35 of the Santa Barbara County Code, is hereby amended to add a definition of South Coast Consolidation Planning Area to read:

SOUTH COAST CONSOLIDATION PLANNING AREA (SCCPA) - The unincorporated area from Point Arguello to the City of Santa Barbara, and from the ridge of the Santa Ynez Mountains to the three-mile offshore limit line to the south and southeast.

SECTION 2:

Section 35-154, Onshore Processing Facilities Necessary or Related to Offshore Oil and Gas Development, of Division 9 of Article II of Chapter 35 of the Santa Barbara County Code is hereby amended by amending Section 35-154.1 to read:

1. Applicability. The specific regulations of this section shall apply to structures, equipment, or facilities necessary and incidental to:
 - a. Dehydration and/or separation of oil, gas and condensate obtained from an offshore hydrocarbon area and,
 - b. Gas processing and/or gas treatment plants.For the specific regulations listed under 35.154.4B, the terms "new production" or "new oil and gas production" or "new gas production" refer to:
 - c. the development of any oil and/or gas after the adoption of these policies which requires new discretionary local, state, or federal permits unless its from an existing well or platform; or
 - d. the development of any oil and/or gas which, after the adoption of these policies, requires approval of a new platform, or a new subsea or onshore well completion.

An operator who claims a constitutionally-protected vested right exists within the scope of existing permits to process new production at a facility which is not at a County-designated consolidated site may request the Planning Commission for a determination of exemption to allow processing of that production at the nonconsolidated site.

The request must be accompanied by evidentiary support reasonably available at the time of filing. The Planning Commission shall hold a hearing on the request within 60 days of filing. The Planning Commission shall determine the scope of the applicant's existing permits and whether the applicant, by obtaining and relying on such permits prior to the adoption of these policies, has ~~acquired~~, under California law, a vested right to process new production at a facility other than a County-designated consolidated site.

The Commission may continue the hearing (1) with the consent of the applicant and the County or (2) to permit or require the applicant or the County to submit additional evidence or legal analysis. No more than 90 days total continuance shall be granted unless the parties consent or the Commission finds that additional evidence is needed ~~or~~ a decision cannot feasibly be presented within the allotted time. The Commission shall decide the matter within 30 days after all such evidence and analysis has been submitted.

The applicant shall reimburse the County for all reasonable costs incurred in determining the claim of exemption.

SECTION 3:

Section 35-154, Onshore Processing Facilities Necessary or Related to Offshore Oil and Gas Development, of Division 9 of Article II of Chapter 35 of the Santa Barbara County Code is hereby amended by amending Section 35-154.4 to read:

4A. Findings Required for Approval of Development Plans Outside the South Coast Consolidation Planning Area.

In addition to the findings for Development Plans set forth in Sec. 35-174.7 (Development Plans), no Preliminary or Final Development Plan is to be approved for a project in an area outside the South Coast Consolidation Planning Area unless the Planning Commission also makes all of the following findings:

- a. Consolidation or colocation on or adjacent to an existing processing facility to accommodate the proposed production is not feasible or is more environmentally damaging.
- b. There are no feasible alternative locations for the proposed processing facility that are less environmentally damaging.
- c. Where consolidation or colocation on or adjacent to an existing processing facility is not proposed, for coastal areas east of ~~PCH/CR/CR/CR/CR~~ the City of Santa Barbara, there are no existing processing facilities within three (3) miles of the proposed site.
- d. The proposed facility is compatible with the present and permitted recreational and residential development and the scenic resources of the surrounding area.

4B. Findings Required for Approval of Development Plans for Facilities in the South Coast Consolidation Planning Area.

In addition to the findings for Development Plans set forth in Sec. 35-174.7 (Development Plans), no Preliminary or Final Development Plan for processing facilities shall be approved unless the Planning Commission also makes one or more of the following findings:

- a. Existing and approved processing capacity at the County-designated consolidation sites is insufficient to accommodate proposed new production for a period of time that would render development of the proposed offshore reservoir(s) infeasible. This finding shall take into account feasible delays in development of the offshore reservoir(s) to maximize use of existing and approved processing capacity, and feasible expansion of existing processing facilities to provide sufficient capacity.
- b. The specific properties of oil or gas from a particular reservoir -- considering available information on the physical and chemical characteristics of the stock, including but not limited to API gravity, sulfur and water content, viscosity, and pour point -- would render development of the resource technically infeasible unless specialized units can be built. Such finding shall consider partial dehydration as a specialized unit if it is required to adapt a resource to the technical requirements of a processing facility. Modifications or additions to existing facilities shall be favored over construction of redundant processing capacity insofar as such modifications or additions render the resource characteristics and the technical processing requirements of a facility compatible with one another.
- c. Commingling the production in existing or already-approved facilities at designated consolidated sites is environmentally unacceptable.
- d. The expansion of existing facilities or construction of new facilities are to be located at a County-designated consolidated oil and gas processing site at Gaviota or Las Flores Canyon.
- e. The proposed facilities will use, to the maximum extent feasible, existing ancillary facilities at the consolidated site.

SECTION 4:

Section 35-154, Onshore Processing Facilities Necessary or Related to Offshore Oil and Gas Development, of Division 9 of Article II of Chapter 35 of the Santa Barbara County Code is hereby amended by amending Section 35-154.5 to add item k. to read:

- k. Within the South Coast Consolidation Planning Area, operators and owners of County-designated consolidated facilities and sites shall make their facilities and property available for commingled processing and consolidation of oil and gas facilities on an equitable and nondiscriminatory basis. If existing processing capacity is insufficient to accommodate proposed production and necessary new facilities are not

permissible pursuant to the County's consolidation policies, operators of consolidated facilities shall reduce throughput on a pro-rata basis to accommodate other developers.

SECTION 5:

Section 35-154, Onshore Processing Facilities Necessary or Related to Offshore Oil and Gas Development, of Division 9 of Article II of Chapter 35 of the Santa Barbara County Code is hereby amended by adding Section 35-154.6 to read:

6. Facility and Site Abandonment Within the South Coast Consolidation Planning Area:

- a. The County shall review permits that are approved after August 12, 1985 for new or modified oil and gas facilities when throughput, averaged (arithmetic mean) over any twelve (12) consecutive months, does not exceed 3 percent of the facility's maximum permitted operating capacity. The review shall be conducted in a duly-noticed public hearing to determine if facility abandonment or facility modifications are appropriate.

SECTION 6:

Except as amended by this ordinance, Section(s) 35-58 and 35-154 of Article II, of Chapter 35, of the Code of the County of Santa Barbara, California, shall remain unchanged and shall continue in full force and effect.

SECTION 7:

This ordinance and any portion of it approved by the Coastal Commission shall take effect and be in force thirty (30) days from the date of its passage or upon the date that it is certified by the Coastal Commission pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 30514, whichever occurs later; and before the expiration of fifteen (15) days after its passage it, or a summary of it, shall be published once, together with the names of the members of the Board of Supervisors voting for and against the same in the Santa Barbara News-Press, a newspaper of general circulation published in the County of Santa Barbara.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, this 14th day of December, 1987, by the following vote:

AYES: David M. Yager, Thomas A. Rogers, William B. Wallace,
DeWayne Holmdahl, Toru Miyoshi

NOES: None

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: None

ATTEST:

KENNETH A. PETTIT
County Clerk-Recorder

By Betsy Seaman
Deputy Clerk-Recorder

William B. Walker
Chairman, Board of Supervisors
of the County of Santa Barbara
State of California

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

KENNETH L. NELSON
County Counsel

By William M. Dillon
Deputy County Counsel
3906E

EXHIBIT III

ARTICLE II (REZONE ONLY)

ORDINANCE NO. 3675

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 35-54,
ADOPTING NEW ZONING ORDINANCES AND MAPS, OF ARTICLE II OF
CHAPTER 35 OF THE CODE OF SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA,
BY ADOPTING BY REFERENCE ONE ZONING MAP, IDENTIFIED AS
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS EXHIBIT NO. 35-54.1.9,
TO REZONE A PORTION OF ASSESSORS PARCEL NUMBER(S) 1-160-26
FROM AG-I-40, AGRICULTURE, 40 ACRE MINIMUM PARCEL SIZE
TO AG-I-10, AGRICULTURE, 10 ACRE MINIMUM PARCEL SIZE.

CASE NO. 86 -RZ- 24(cz)

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara do ordain as follows:

SECTION 1.

Section 35-54, "Adopting New Zoning Ordinances and Maps," of Article II, of Chapter 35, of the County Code of the County of Santa Barbara, California, is hereby amended by the Adoption by reference of ONE zoning map identified as Board of Supervisors Exhibit No. 35-54.1.9, which rezones Assessor's Parcel Number(s) a portion of ASSESSORS PARCEL NUMBER(S) 1-160-26 from AG-I-40, AGRICULTURE, 40 ACRE MINIMUM PARCEL SIZE to AG-I-10, AGRICULTURE, 10 ACRE MINIMUM PARCEL SIZE District, and which is made a part of said section by reference, with the same force and effect as if the boundaries, locations, and lines of the districts therein delineated and all notations, references, and other information shown on said overlay map were specifically and fully set out and described herein.

SECTION 2.

The Chairman of the Board of Supervisors is hereby authorized and directed to endorse said Exhibit No. 35-54.1.9 to show that said map has been adopted by this Board.

SECTION 3.

Except as amended by this ordinance, Section 35-54 of the Code of Santa Barbara County, California, shall remain unchanged and shall continue in full force and effect.

SECTION 4

This ordinance and any portion of it approved by the Coastal Commission shall take effect and be in force thirty (30) days from the date of its passage or upon the date that it is certified by the Coastal Commission pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 30514, whichever occurs later; and before the expiration of fifteen (15) days after its passage it, or a summary of it, shall be published once, together with the names of the members of the Board of Supervisors voting for and against the same in the SANTA BARBARA NEWS PRESS, a newspaper of general circulation published in the County of Santa Barbara.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, this 14th day of December, 1987 by the following vote:

AYES: David M. Yager, Thomas A. Rogers, William B. Wallace, DeWayne Holmdahl

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Toru Miyoshi

ATTEST:

KENNETH A. PETTIT
County Clerk-Recorder

By *Barbara*

Deputy Clerk-Recorder
Supervisors

Barbara

William B. Wallace

Chairman, Board of
of the County of Santa
State of California

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

KENNETH L. NELSON
County Counsel

Kenneth L. Nelson
Deputy County Counsel

EXHIBIT IV

ARTICLE II (REZONE ONLY)

ORDINANCE NO. 3677

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 35-54,
ADOPTING NEW ZONING ORDINANCES AND MAPS, OF ARTICLE II OF
CHAPTER 35 OF THE CODE OF SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA,
BY ADOPTING BY REFERENCE ONE ZONING MAP, IDENTIFIED AS
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS EXHIBIT NO. 35-54.1.10,
TO REZONE ASSESSORS PARCEL NUMBER(S) 1-030-26
FROM AG-I-10, AGRICULTURE 10 ACRE MINIMUM LOT SIZE
TO REC, RECREATION DISTRICT.

CASE NO. 87- RZ- 6

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara do ordain as follows:

SECTION 1.

Section 35-54, "Adopting New Zoning Ordinances and Maps," of Article II, of Chapter 35, of the County Code of the County of Santa Barbara, California, is hereby amended by the Adoption by reference of ONE zoning map identified as Board of Supervisors Exhibit No. 35-54.1.10, which rezones Assessor's Parcel Number(s) 1-030-26 from AG-I-10, AGRICULTURE (10 ACRE MINIMUM PARCEL SIZE) to REC, RECREATION DISTRICT, and which is made a part of said section by reference, with the same force and effect as if the boundaries, locations, and lines of the districts therein delineated and all notations, references, and other information shown on said overlay map were specifically and fully set out and described herein.

SECTION 2.

The Chairman of the Board of Supervisors is hereby authorized and directed to endorse said Exhibit No. 35-54.1.10 to show that said map has been adopted by this Board.

SECTION 3.

Except as amended by this ordinance, Section 35-54 of the Code of Santa Barbara County, California, shall remain unchanged and shall continue in full force and effect.

SECTION 4

This ordinance and any portion of it approved by the Coastal Commission shall take effect and be in force thirty (30) days from the date of its passage or upon the date that it is certified by the Coastal Commission pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 30514, whichever occurs later; and before the expiration of fifteen (15) days after its passage it, or a summary of it, shall be published once, together with the names of the members of the Board of Supervisors voting for and against the same in the Santa Barbara News-Press, a newspaper of general circulation published in the County of Santa Barbara.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, this 14th day of December, 1987 by the following vote:

AYES: David M. Yager, Thomas A. Rogers, William B. Wallace, DeWayne Holmdahl, Toru Miyoshi

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

ATTEST:

KENNETH A. PETTIT
County Clerk-Recorder

By Betsy Sanchez

Deputy Clerk-Recorder
Supervisors

Barbara

William B. Wallace

Chairman, Board of
of the County of Santa
State of California

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

KENNETH L. NELSON
County Counsel

William M. Dillon

Deputy County Counsel