

June 6, 2013

To: Bob Braitman Executive Officer  
Santa Barbara LAFCO

Dear Mr. Braitman,

We would like to express our support in favor of the expansion of the Santa Rita Hills Community Services District's (SRHCSD) Sphere of Influence and revisions to the resolution of formation LAFCO Resolution 03-13 for construction of an access roadway outside of District Boundary and acquisition of necessary right of way.

We have owned our parcel in the SRHCSD since 1978 and purchased it with the thought that we would be able to develop the parcel when it came out of the Special Services District at the start of 1986. As you know that was not the case because of difficulty in permitting suitable access roads to allow building.

We urge the Commission to support these changes.

Ted and Gerda Knudson

Received into the record at the  
6/6/13 LAFCO meeting

Reference: Santa Rita Hills CSD, Agenda item # 10

To: Members of LAFCO

From: Art Hibbits

I believe several of you were on LAFCO at the time the subject CSD was originally formed. You may recall that the neighbors and interested parties were concerned about giving Eminent Domain Powers to a small group of parcel holders, in a rural area, with limited access, location half-way between Buellton and Lompoc.

We were assured by Bob Braitman that all they were doing was providing a way to finance the building of their INTERNAL roads, and I believe the approved CSD limited their powers to only that function.

Now a few years later they (the CSD) are back, wanting to expand their Sphere of Influence and subsequently use Eminent Domain to condemn a right of way, through the neighboring Ranch to the West.

The access issue is not new...it was well known at the time of the original approval and at least twenty years prior to that. This is the classic "Bait and Switch" tactic.

In effect you are being asked to take sides in a long-standing dispute over access through a neighbor's ranch. It seems to me that isn't anything that LAFCO should get involved in...arming one side with the heavy weapon of Eminent Domain, to use against their neighbor, seems a totally inappropriate use of LAFCO's powers.

It has come to our attention that this item was not properly noticed. In violation of clearly stated LAFCO Policy, neighbor and other interested parties were NOT provided prior notice of this hearing. In addition the Ag Advisory Committee, (AAC) and the Planning and Development Dept. were also not properly Noticed.

With reference to notification of interested parties and neighbors: At the previous hearing, many people testified and there is a record of their concerns AND addresses. Clearly, at a minimum, they should have been notified of today's hearing.

Our recommendation is for you refer this item to the AAC for their review and input. In addition, reference has been made to a possible existing old County Road Easement that would make this all unnecessary. Clearly this should be further researched prior to taking any action.

In view of all of the above, please continue this item to a future date. If you wish to proceed today, our recommendation is to deny all requests related to this expansion of the Sphere of Influence and granting Power of Eminent Domain.

Thank you for your consideration.

Art Hibbits  
1251 E. Highway 246  
Lompoc, Ca. 93436

Received into the record at the  
6/6/13 LAFCO meeting

# LAFCO

---

**Santa Barbara Local Agency Formation Commission**

105 East Anapamu Street ♦ Santa Barbara CA 93101

805/568-3391 ♦ FAX 805/647-7647

www.sblafco.org ♦ lafco@sblafco.org

June 6, 2013

TO: Members of the Commission

FROM: Bob Braitman   
Executive Officer

SUBJECT: **Additional Materials for June 6 Commission Meeting**  
**Santa Rita Hills Community Services District**

The following materials are in addition to the packet previously distributed for this meeting;

- Letter from Mark and Wendy Horvath dated June 3, 2013
- Letter from Evan Chen dated June 4, 2013
- Letter from Joseph Jerome dated June 5, 2013
- Letter from Ariel and Angela Lavie dated June 5, 2013
- Letter from Dale Petersen dated June 5, 2013
- Letter from Patrick Morris dated June 5, 2013
- Response to Patrick Morris from the Executive Officer dated June 5, 2013
- Letter from Patrick Morris dated June 6, 2013

These materials are part of the record for this proceeding.

Received into the record at the

6/6/13 LAFCO meeting

MARK AND WENDY HORVATH  
JANE HORVATH  
3182/8184 BASELINE AVENUE  
SANTA YNEZ, CALIFORNIA 93460

June 3, 2013

Bob Braitman  
Santa Barbara LAFCO  
105 East Anapamu Street  
Santa Barbara California 93101

RE: Santa Rita Hills Community Services District

Dear Santa Barbara Local Agency Formation Commission:

We have owned Parcel 28 in the Santa Rita Hills Community Services District since August 2000. Our intent in purchasing the property was development of a vineyard. Due to existing road conditions in the District and ongoing disputes with regard to the improvement of the roads, we have been constrained from proceeding with development of our vineyard. We fully supported formation of the Community Services District as the best means available to us and the other parcel owners to have the district roads made accessible and to keep them properly maintained.

We now fully support the expansion of the Santa Rita Hills CSD's sphere of influence to the terminus of Sweeney Road and authorization to construct an access road outside the District boundary but within the expanded sphere of influence from the terminus of Sweeney Road to the district and authorization to exercise the power of eminent domain to acquire property necessary for the construction of this access road.

Sincerely,

Wendy D. Horvath  
Mark G. Horvath  
Jane Horvath

June 4, 2013

Dear Mr. Braitman,

In brief, I am the owner of parcel #1 in the Lakeview Estates, and I wholeheartedly support the Santa Rita Hills Community Services District's endeavors to build access roads to this beautiful area. Please allow us to connect Sweeney Road to the CSD boundary.

My parents moved to Vandenberg Village in 1972, and I grew up there. They purchased parcel #1 (the one in the very northwest corner) around the time I was graduating from Cabrillo High School, way back in the late 80's. The property owners in the subdivisions have been working to resolve this same access road issue even back then, and there have been many meetings with the owners of the land that surrounds the access road, as well as numerous meetings spanning many years with planning officials and county staff. It's so difficult for any of the owners to enjoy and be productive with their parcels because our land is so hard to access. I remember this issue caused all the owners, especially my parents, a lot of stress. My parents have both since passed, my mother just last year, and now I've inherited this parcel. I'm saddened by the fact that in their lifetime, they never saw any progress made on this issue. I certainly hope this isn't the case when it's my turn to go.

On the bright side, in all these years, this is the first time I've witnessed some real headway being made with the joint efforts of LAFCO and the SRHCSD. Thank you for being a big part of that, and I think both organizations have done an outstanding job and deserve a big congratulations for having come this far. I hope we continue to foster this effective relationship. This gives me great hope that we're very close to resolving the road access issues.

Thank you, and please feel free to get in touch for anything.

Sincerely,

Evan T. Chen  
Owner, Parcel #1  
[evantchen@yahoo.com](mailto:evantchen@yahoo.com)  
cell 714-609-9197

June 5, 2013

Dear LAFCO Members,

While I have not personally lived through the decades of difficulty and conflict that has plagued the Lakeview community, as the newest landowner I have recently become very well versed in the history and issues before you.

It is my sincere hope that the commission now expand the CSD's sphere of influence to encompass the land necessary to achieve the goals and objectives upon which the CSD was founded in 2009.

Thank you all very much for your time and efforts.

Best wishes,

Joseph Jerome  
Sweeney Road #11

---

Joseph Jerome  
SVP - Business Affairs & Legal  
CBS Television Distribution  
4024 Radford Ave., Building R  
Studio City, CA 91604  
(818) 655-4894

June 5, 2013

Dear Mr. Braitman and LAFCO members

We are writing to request that LAFCO approve the petition from the Santa Rita Hills CSD to expand the sphere of influence. The section of road being petitioned is an absolute necessity for our district to proceed with establishing critical infrastructure.

With your support, our district will be able to create the access so that our properties can be used as zoned and this access will be consistent with other roads in the county.

Due to the fact that there is a county easement on record, we feel strongly that this should not be a contentious manner, and is a logical solution to a long standing problem. The existing MOA established long before many of us were landowners has proven to be an ineffective document. We need LAFCO's support - please approve this petition so that our district may move forward with creating a safe and durable access road.

Sincerely,

Ariel & Angela Lavie  
12 Sweeney Road  
P.O. Box 943  
Lompoc, CA 93438

June 5, 2013

Dear Honorable Members of the Santa Barbara LAFCO Commission:

Unfortunately, I am unable to attend today's meeting due to my son's High School Commencement Ceremony.

I wish to express my full support of the Application for Modification of Resolution 03-13 and Application to Amend District Sphere of Influence, as outlined in the letter emailed to LAFCO May 28, 2013.

The construction of the access road from the end of Sweeney Road to the district boundary has been, and continues to be, the biggest hurdle for the property owners within the District. There have been numerous failed attempts with the adjoining property over the alignment of the access road. Without the Modification of Resolution 03-13, the Santa Rita Hills CSD is basically dead in the water.

Respectfully,

Dale Petersen  
Board Member  
Santa Rita Hills CSD



---

# LAW OFFICES OF E. PATRICK MORRIS

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

---

June 5, 2013

**VIA email ONLY**

[bob@braitmanconsulting.com](mailto:bob@braitmanconsulting.com)

Bob Braitman

Executive Officer

Santa Barbara Local Agency formation Commission

Santa Barbara, CA 93406

Re: Santa Rita Hills Community Service District Applications for  
Reorganization, and increase in Sphere of Influence

Dear Mr. Braitman:

I do appreciate you responding so promptly to my recent communications, given that time is of the essence due to the recent receipt of your positions on these now apparently combined measures, which are of vital importance to my clients (as they were the last time they were broached.)

I apologize for having to respond after hours, but that is sometimes the nature of my business.

You have insisted that I respond to a number of issues, which I hope to do hereby. Your questions are in *italics*, while my responses are in regular type:

*On what basis and for what reasons do you protest my "involvement" with the applications on LAFCO agenda? Do you feel I am not functioning in my capacity as the Executive Officer for the Commission? If so, what is your basis for feeling this way?*

As defined in Section 56384, an Executive Officer of LAFCO is appointed to "conduct and perform the day-to-day business of the commission."

SBLAFCO notes that your role is "The Executive Officer implements the policies and directives established by the Commission, manages the LAFCO office, prepares and administers the budget, represents the Commission at meetings, et cetera. The Cortese/Knox Act sets forth the following specific statutory responsibilities: Conduct and perform the day-to-day business of the Commission; Review each application which is filed and prepare a report, including recommendations thereon, and; Prepare impartial analyses of ballot propositions for approval by the Commission when required."

Chapter 3 of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 ("LAFCO Act") delineates the powers of SBLAFCO. The powers of SBLAFCO, to my knowledge, do not extend to working with a local agency to spend public funds not authorized by its Board after public meeting, for purposes outside of its Sphere of Influence ("SOI"), on projects specifically not allowed by the agency's formation documents.

From the information you have provided, it appears that this is exactly what you have done for nearly a year. Your communications since at least December of last year with Mr. Blanco, Mr. Seitz, Mr. Wallace, and Ms. Morgan all had to do with promoting activities of the CSD outside its SOI, and which it was expressly prohibited to provide until its SOI was amended.

We do not understand your role to allow you to, in advance of any application to expand an SOI, to travel to areas outside the boundaries of the CSD and its SOI; meet there with CSD members and/or staff at cost to the CSD; conduct investigations which included discussions of matters outside the CSD and its SOI, including with adjoining landowners; or engage in communications with others discussing possible objections to an application that has not yet been submitted to SBLAFCO.

It is our contention that your role as Executive Officer is limited to providing the references to publicly available documents necessary, in this case, to permit the CSD to apply first to expand its SOI, and thereafter, *only* if it was successful in that endeavor, to apply for reorganization.

Your primary job is to impartially evaluate the applications, and make unbiased recommendations, but *only* once the applications are actually submitted. Your job is not to provide in advance of an application "direction and efforts on behalf of the CSD membership at large."

Finally, you have been notified by me, with at least as much veracity as the statements of Mr. Wallace about the reasons for the applications that you repeated in your "evaluation" of the proposals on the agenda for Thursday, that the underlying applications are contested as to legal bases, format, law, and facts.

My clients and I expect you, as Executive Officer of SBLAFCO, and consistent with the LAFCO Act, to confirm with the CSD that the expenditures for the development of these applications, including "staff," engineering, legal, and other expenditures, which you are personally aware started as early as October of last year, never were brought before the Board of the CSD at any public meeting, and thus were unauthorized as a matter of law. These were not part of any CSD agenda, nor were they authorized expenditures by the CSD Board. Even the fees to be paid were never the subject of any public disclosure or discussion, having been made part of the approval of the "warrant register" without public knowledge.

This is not something I should address to the CSD and Mr. Seitz; I address them to you, the "Executive Officer" of SBLAFCO, the agency which will make the determination on the issues, and the one who has undertaken to make recommendations thereon to the Commission.

We will address the many inaccuracies contained within the two applications separately to the Commission and to you, but to the degree you have repeated them as part of your recommendation to the Commission, **we demand that you advise the Commission, before the hearing, that you have not conducted any independent investigation of the "factual" claims being made in the applications; you cannot verify the accuracy thereof; and that you make your "recommendation" based at least in part upon the unsupported assumption that the information provided by the applicant is true, without having confirmed same.**

Nothing less would be fair.

Additionally, you are well aware that the access to the CSD boundary is already governed by an existing easement agreement, the MOA with which you are familiar. That MOA has long been approved by the County of Santa Barbara, as well as identified by the County as the only plan for access acceptable to the County, something you also know, but fail to acknowledge to the Commission in this instance. You have failed properly to advise the Commission regarding these issues.

Your report to the Commission contains a number of readily verified inaccuracies about the MOA. For instance, you claim it was "adjudicated by the Superior Court." It was not. The County of Santa Barbara planning department helped mediate the dispute created when the Lakeview Owners sued the Cargasacchi Ranch owners, at that time Giovanni and Clementina Cargasacchi. No Court was not directly involved in the negotiated settlement.

The MOA was the product of mutual agreement, and is of record, contractually binding every property owner in the CSD (but not the CSD itself) and binding also each parcel, regardless of who is its owner. The Commission needs to be acutely aware of this, given the claim of the applicants that there is no other alternative for access but to grant the applications.

Additionally, you incorrectly claim "the Rancho Santa Rita Access Association is the agency referred to build the access road" in the MOA. This is not true, either. No such organization is mentioned in the MOA.

Your claim that there is some "lack of cooperation" attributable to my clients is likewise in error. It is the Lakeview owners who refuse to abide by the terms of the MOA, not my clients.

My clients invite now, as they have in the past, the Lakeview Owners (not some governmental agency currently ruled by a board that we do not believe consists of registered voters residing within the District as required by law, especially as no one other than a few persons may legally reside there) to commence construction of the MOA road, forthwith, as long ago agreed.

There is simply no legal or factual basis for asserting that the CSD, a government agency, is "successor" to a defunct, private corporation, or to a private, contractual agreement between private landowners. Do you have a shred of factual basis or legal principle for these absurd conclusions?

Are you aware that we have, numerous times, asked the CSD to explain how it might be the "successor" to the Lakeview owners' obligations in the MOA and that Mr. Wallace and Mr. Seitz have steadfastly refused to address this issue?

These errors in your "facts" are what occur when you do not conduct any independent investigation, and instead rely on the hearsay, biased, and baseless claims of those who have been trying since the MOA was signed to avoid the terms of the agreement, and have used every possible avenue to condemn my clients' land, of which the CSD, and its totally baseless new applications, are only the most recent permutations.

If you are not so aware (and I doubt you are not, given your obvious relationship with Mr. Blanco), there are already existing plans to build the MOA road in a form approved by the Cargasacchi Ranch owners (the servient tenement owners under the MOA) and the County, which plans simply need to be implemented, but which many of the Lakeview Estates owners (thus, many of, but not all of, the CSD constituents, but not the CSD itself) refuse to implement because they want to negate other conditions of the MOA through the use of governmental eminent domain and condemnation of my clients' property.

Mr. Blanco of course has a vested interest in negating the MOA provisions restricting uses within the CSD as he inherited, because of the late Chris Marks' fraud on him, the monstrosity of a building located within the CSD boundaries which he wants to sell as a winery, a use that would overburden the Cargasacchi Ranch, in direct violation of the MOA to which his parcel is bound, but which he might be able to argue it is no longer bound with condemnation of my clients' land. Mr. Blanco has vast experience in litigation, and can afford to and has hired expensive law firms to achieve his personal goals, regardless of the interests of others, or the merits of his positions.

We note that your recommendations to the Commission make absolutely no mention of these facts.

We also object to your statements about there being no CEQA requirements. The pending requests are not limited to the creation of a "funding mechanism," so the reference

thereto from the original formation you and the CSD Board have made is irrelevant. What is pending before the Commission is not the same as what was proposed for the formation of the CSD as you claim, and you know it.

As indicated on the application itself, and in your own supporting document, the request is limited to one, very specific project. What is being proposed is a specific activity, the construction of an access road in one of three locations. This is a project mandated for CEQA review.

No proper CEQA evaluation was made part of the application, and in order to honestly represent the issue to the Commission, you need to change your remarks regarding the alleged inapplicability of CEQA to these proposals.

The determination that the prior SOI did not invoke CEQA was noted in the records of SBLAFCO to be specifically because the SOI was "coterminus with the District boundary." Now, the application is to expand the SOI beyond the CSD boundary, thus negating this conclusion, and invoking CEQA compliance.

Further, in your Executive Officer's report of December 9, 2007 at page 9 in connection with the original formation, you discussed the issues raised in connection with the CSD's formation, including but not limited to objection to possible condemnation, and also the allegations of a public right of way.

You noted at that time two County counsel letters which effectively disclaim any such right of way and that such a right of way is not asserted by the County. You stated then that the mere creation of a "funding mechanism" made these topics "background." They no longer are mere "background;" you and the CSD have placed them "front and center."

Certainly this information is now germane to a full and fair report to the Commission now that an application is being presented seeking to condemn property along an alleged County right of way to build one single road, is it not?

Of course, in 2009 you asked the Commission to ignore the letter from Peter Cargasacchi raising these issues, noting then "Forming the CSD does not alter any of the legal rights of landowners or other participants with respect to access easements or other property issues." Clearly, that is not the case here where the application, based upon your pre-application recommendations and actual edits, is to provide one, single road, thus these prior issues should be deemed re-made and should be fully considered by you and the Commission in evaluating these applications.

Based upon all of the above, we question how you could be so involved in assisting this CSD's process without proper public notice or opportunity for the parties affected to be heard, but ignore these other issues while blindly accepting the CSD application claims,

unless you had a vested and/or personal interest in the outcome, monetary or otherwise. We do not feel that you have made an unbiased, much less complete, recommendation to the Commission regardless.

For further instance, while personally identifying me as someone who might be “gumming” up the CSD’s plans (thus evidencing extreme bias against my clients – especially since you had no first hand knowledge to support the accusation), and despite (apparently) numerous meetings and other communications with the CSD, Hank Blanco and others, not once have you ever bothered even to offer to communicate with me or my clients about these issues, much less to personally meet with me, or my clients, to discuss these issues.

What greater evidence could there be that you are far from impartial in your analysis of the proposals?

I do not disagree that it is your role to make sure applications are presented in the proper “format,” or to advise applicants about “procedures.” You actually editing proposals in advance, to ensure that the wording and arguments therein will be more favorably received, which is what you have done, is a far greater involvement, as is expressing well in advance of any applications, edited by you or otherwise, enmity toward the opposing parties and/or their representatives. All of this demonstrates extreme bias toward my clients, whose property the CSD proposes, with the approval of SBLAFCO, to condemn and take from them, in what is the ultimate exercise of power of government over land and personal rights.

*What documents did you receive on May 30 that you feel show no proper legal notice was timely provided?*

This was addressed in my communication of last night. Additionally, LAFCO’s failure to provide notice to at least three affected landowners who requested notice, as well as their lawyer who requested notice, presents a notice problem for proceeding on these items on Thursday.

*What do you mean by “proper applications “are filed? What information or documents do you think are missing?*

As already noted, and acknowledged by you, the “conditions: sought to be modified are a restriction against providing services outside the boundaries of the CSD (“service change” #1) and addition of the power of condemnation (“service change” #2), as well as the rights to build and maintain an access road from the nearest public road to the CSD boundary (“service change” #3.)

You have specifically acknowledged that the first of the two applications is for "Authorization for the Santa Rita Hills Community Services District to Provide Additional Special District Services." "Services" is plural, not singular, in your own description.

Page 2 of your letter to SBLAFCO specifically notes that the CSD seeks permission to conduct the specific governmental activity of condemning the land of another (a "service" within the meaning of that term in LAFCO Act Section 56074), and the right to construct (and, also, to maintain) an access road (a second "service" within the meaning of LAFCO Act Section 56074.)

We accept your premise that the requested change in SOI is designed to allow the CSD to create new boundaries in one of three places as shown on the map. Not only would this not meet the requisite specificity for a boundary and/or sphere change, it would be in essence a boundary change once the eminent domain power is exercised. Thus, even by your own admissions in writing, the application by the CSD is for "reorganization," and thus must comply with the several requirements

Thus, under the definitions in Government Code Sections 56021 and 56073, the requested "Authorization for the Santa Rita Hills Community Services District to Provide Additional Special District Services" (as you describe it) action is a "re-organization," whether disguised as an application to "modify conditions" or otherwise.

"The conditions" being modified are to change limits of boundaries, and increase and expand more than one service, now being made in a single application process given the recent combination of these into a single agenda item. The application is to change two or more conditions, as well as boundaries. Thus, contrary to your claim that it "is not a change or organization (**sic**)", it is exactly that.

Applications for reorganization have specific requirements not met by this applicant. No proper application for re-organization was filed (maps, etc.), only a two page request document. The "application" lacks numerous components required for a complete application for re-organization.

That is what I mean.

*What do you mean by "proper notice" be given to affected landowners? How was the notice that we provided faulty or not in compliance with the law?*

To my knowledge, LAFCO did not provide notice to each owner of the Cargasacchi Ranch or persons requesting special notice. Please identify who was given notice. All you have provided to me are documents sent to Giovanni Cargasacchi (who is one of two trustees of a Trust owner) and Peter Cargasacchi. There are three other owners of that land who I understand requested notice at the time of the initial formation process in

2003, and I requested special notice as well in my email of last year to which you just responded. I certainly did not receive the required notice 21 days before the hearing date.

That is what I mean.

*What do you mean by the LAFCO executive director (sic) provide documents required by the Public Records Act other than what we have already done?*

You could begin with the so-called "confidential" letter. On that basis, you claim as Executive Officer, you "did not feel it was advisable or required to provide this particular document." I know of no reference in the Public Records Act permitting a public agency to determine what documents requested are "advisable" to release. To my knowledge, the Act was established to eliminate such discretion.

On what grounds is this otherwise public record being withheld? If it is not "required" to be produced, then it must fall into one of the recognized exceptions under the Act. Which section applies, please?

"Public" and "confidential" are essentially mutually exclusive concepts. This was a communication from one agency to another, not from any attorney to a client, or generated within an agency as part of any "deliberative process."

What exception are you, as Executive Officer of SBLAFCO invoking under the Public Records Act for refusing to produce this document?

Also, Lonnie Lepore's email to you on March 11, 2013 indicates it has attached thereto "information for further discussion." Where is the information? Additionally, your March 12, 2013 communication back to Ms. Lepore indicates it has attached thereto a "draft" document you authored. This was not provided. There is a single, watermarked as "DRAFT" "redline" document which might be one of the documents, but the email exchange refers to two different documents, even assuming this document was one of them.

On December 19, 2012 you emailed Hank Blanco, inviting him to see "the attached." What was attached? Mr. Blanco's response indicates there was a "letter." Where is the letter?

That is what I mean.

Hopefully, by this letter I have addressed your questions, and provided the support for my positions on behalf of my clients, who also own 21% of the lots located within the CSD and will be substantially burdened with their share of the minimum costs for this single project in excess of \$2,000,000 (a fact not disclosed in any CSD proceeding) - even without the costs of the proposed condemnation, all while a simple, already



negotiated, and perfectly viable solution that is ignored by the applications and your report to the Commission, but accepted by the County, already exists.

I strongly urge you to reconsider our role, your recommendations, and your involvement in the matters to be heard by the Commission on Thursday. At best, I demand that you recommend a delay in any vote thereon until the full range of information already known to you, both in favor of the proposals and against, can be impartially disseminated to the Commissioners.

As always, I await your response hereto as the authorized representative of SBLAFCO. Your response will be deemed to bind SBLAFCO unless you specifically state otherwise.

By this communication, no client of this office makes any admission, nor waives any right, claim, remedy, or defense, all of which are expressly reserved hereby.

Very truly yours,

**LAW OFFICES OF E. PATRICK MORRIS, PC**

E. Patrick Morris, Esq.

Cc: Clients, SBLAFCO Commissioners

June 5, 2013

E. Patrick Morris, Esq.  
Law Offices of E. Patrick Morris  
137 East Anapamu Street  
Santa Barbara CA 93101

**Santa Rita Hills Community Services District – Request for Sphere Expansion and  
Authorization to Construct Access Road Outside of District**

Dear Mr. Morris:

I am responding to your June 5 letter in which you make a great number of statements regarding the applications by the Santa Rita Hills CSD to locate and construct an access road that would extend from Sweeney Road to the District.

A portion of your letter attempts to define my “role” as Executive Officer and seems to be critical of my actions with regard to the particular proposals which are before the Commission.

In response, it has always been a LAFCO staff function, given our knowledge and understanding of State laws that govern local government boundaries and public services, and the policies and practices of the Commission, to routinely confer with potential applicants for LAFCO approvals. This is done to insure is a clear understanding of the applicable laws and procedures, and to insure that requests or proposals are complete. We have not interacted with representatives of the Santa Rita Hills CSD differently than we have with others.

As recent examples, on May 21 we met with representatives of the Adizes Graduate Institute near Carpinteria, County staff and Carpinteria Sanitary District staff regarding a possible District Sphere expansion and provision of services to the facility.

On May 22 we met with representatives of the County and private businesses in Los Olivos regarding the possibility and alternatives for providing sewage collection, treatment and disposal services for portions of that community

We wish to insure that applications that are submitted are complete and provide the information needed for the Commission to fairly examine the proposal. Our behavior with respect to conferring with representatives of the Santa Rita Hills CSD and the property owners therein is no different than other locales within Santa Barbara County.

E. Patrick Morris, Esq.  
June 5, 2013  
Page 2

I do not share your view that LAFCO staff should determine whether local agencies such as the Santa Rita Hills CSD are using their funds in an authorized manner. We are not auditors nor do we monitor how local agencies decide to fund staff, legal, engineering and other expenditures.

It is clear from your letter that I have not adequately explained that the District has submitted is not a change of organization or reorganization. I will try again here:

Government Code Section 56021 defines a “change of organization” as any of the following:

- (a) A city incorporation.
- (b) A district formation.
- (c) An annexation to a city.
- (d) An annexation to a district.
- (e) A detachment from a city.
- (f) A detachment from a district.
- (g) A disincorporation of a city.
- (h) A district dissolution.
- (i) A consolidation of cities.
- (j) A consolidation of special districts.
- (k) A merger of a city and a district.
- (l) Establishment of a subsidiary district.
- (m) The exercise of new or different functions or classes of services, or divestiture of the power to provide particular functions or classes of services, within all or part of the jurisdictional boundaries of a special district as provided in Article 1.5 (commencing with Section 56824.10) of Chapter 5 of Part 3 of this division.

Section 56073 defines “reorganization” as two or more changes of organization contained within a single proposal.

The Santa Rita Hills CSD has not initiated any of the actions described in Section 56021. A modification of a Sphere of Influence is not a “change of organization” nor does the District propose to exercise new or different functions or classes of services.

Your continued use of the terms reorganization or re-organization is not accurate nor does it assist in evaluating the actual proposals that have been submitted.

Your letter states that although I have met with others who are interested in this subject “not once have you ever bothered even to offer to communicate with me or my clients about these issues, much less to personally meet with me, or my clients, to discuss these issues.”

E. Patrick Morris, Esq.  
June 5, 2013  
Page 3

I assure you that had you or your clients contacted me to arrange such a meeting I would have been pleased to meet with you. Your office at 137 East Anapamu is a block from the LAFCO office at 105 East Anapamu. If you felt we should have met you should have contacted me as did the others who are involved in this matter.

As a public servant I make myself available to meet with those who have an interest in matters that pertain to LAFCO. I am not a member of the Commission nor do I have a vote in what the Commission does, but as the staff I am responsible to the Commission and to the public.

Last, I take respectful exception to the statement on the last page of your letter that my response "... will be deemed to bind SBLAFCO unless you specifically state otherwise."

As I am sure you appreciate, as Executive Officer I provide staff analysis and recommendations to the Commission but in no way does our staff work "bind" the Commission. The Commission acts independently taking into account not only the staff report but other written documentation and testimony from public agencies and members of the public.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you care to discuss this matter further.

Sincerely,



BOB BRAITMAN  
Executive Officer

cc: Each Member of the Commission  
John Wallace, General Manager, Santa Rita Hills CSD

---

# LAW OFFICES OF E. PATRICK MORRIS

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

---

June 6, 2013

Bob Braitman  
Roger Aceves, Chair  
Doreen Farr, County Member  
Janet Wolf, County Member  
Craig Geyer, District Member  
SBLAFCO  
105 E. Anapamu Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Re: June 6, 2013 Agenda Item 10; Santa Rita Hills Community Service District

Dear Members of the Commission, and Mr. Braitman:

By way of introduction, this office is retained to protect and advance the interests of Giovanni and Clementina Cargasacchi, individually and as Trustees of the Cargasacchi Family Trust, and John, Laura, Peter and Mark Cargasacchi. Collectively, these persons are the owners of record of the land referred to as Cargasacchi Ranch, immediately adjacent to the Santa Rita Hill Community Services District.

This office also is retained to protect and advance the interests of John, Laura, Peter and Mark Cargasacchi as owners of lots 2 and 10 of the "Lakeview Estates" subdivision created by recordation of the Record of Survey prepared by Mr. Simpson in 1968; John and Paula Cargasacchi, owners collectively and individually of lots 25, 26 and 27 of Lakeview Estates; and Peter and Julia Cargasacchi owners of lots 30, 31 and 36 of Lakeview Estates.

This document serves to set forth in part the position of these parties regarding the above agenda item, which they contend should be considered as two separate agenda items.

## **Preliminary statement**

The Commission is hereby advised that the materials provided to it by the Santa Rita Hills Community Services District ("CSD") and the Commission's Executive Officer, who apparently has been secretly working for many months at taxpayer expense with the CSD to present these Applications without notice to the CSD constituents, are woefully incomplete and insufficient for a governmental entity to extend condemnation power.

Additionally, much of the applicant's assertions are factually incorrect, vague, and/or unsupported, as are many of the claims in the Executive officer's report and

recommendation.

With very limited time to refute the claims, especially those made only recently by this Commission's Executive Officer, these opponents can only too briefly set forth reasons for rejecting the proposed changes. and request at the least a continuance of these proceeding so that a full, fair, and sufficiently documented opposition can be provided for the Commission's consideration, especially given that this Commission's Executive Officer has apparently been working with the applicant for more than eight months, in secret, assisting it with the applications for which the Executive Officer recommends approval, without any independent or unbiased investigation.

### **Issues before the commission**

From the so-called "application for modification" and "questionnaire for amending a sphere of influence," this Commission is effectively being asked to reverse the explicit conditions under which this CSD was formed by expanding its sphere of influence, allowing it to perform additional "services" (Gov. Code §56074) it previously was prohibited from providing, thereby dramatically changing the environment within the CSD and an adjoining parcel, as well as materially modifying existing agreements between the landowners within and outside the CSD's boundaries which agreements have been recently affirmed by the County of Santa Barbara and the Superior Court of the State of California, in and for the County of Santa Barbara, as the binding methods of providing the same outcome sought by the applicant.

### **Rationale for reversing prior conditions**

Why should this Commission make these changes to the existing conditions of operation for the CSD?

The applicants claim, without any specific facts (as noted in greater detail herein below), that circumstances have changed, and this Commission's support for reversing its earlier findings is warranted. The Executive Officer, in recommending approval, cites no facts that have been independently verified, and merely reports the conclusions and hearsay assertions of the applicant, which has conducted its business in bad faith, and in violation of several laws, including the Brown Act and the Public Records Act.

The indisputable facts are that no circumstances have changed, and a reversal of the earlier findings and conditions is not warranted by any fact, circumstance, or condition.

The issues before this Commission are exactly the same ones which led the Commission ultimately to limit the activities of this rather unique "community services district" to its physical boundaries. and to specifically deny it the right to conduct services outside its boundaries.

Not only has nothing changed since the CSD was formed, as recently as February 2011 the Board, through its President, Mr. Marks, advised LAFCO that it should adopt only the area within the CSD boundaries as its sphere of influence.

There will be no evidence of any kind before this Commission that anything changed between February 2011 and the making of the applications other than that some of the CSD constituents became concerned that the CSD was spending their tax money without getting them what they had been promised when they were persuaded to support the CSD, a condemned road over Cargasacchi Ranch.

### **The Santa Rita Hills Community Services District: Formation, Operation, and Application**

Contrary to the claim in the application to modify the conditions previously imposed on the Santa Rita Hills Community Services District ("CSD"), this CSD was not "**formed on the basis of a petition of owners.**"

The CSD was formed based on a petition signed by only five persons. All five were members of the same family, the Marks family, all of whom claimed to live on one, tiny three quarter acre parcel, improved with one small house (called "Rancho Dos Mundos"), which is adjacent to the 38 40+ acre parcels spread over the 1,590 acres that comprise the much larger "Lakeview Estates" subdivision.

This miniscule parcel also happens to be adjacent to the property known as "Cargasacchi Ranch," purchased in the mid-1980s by Giovanni and Clementina Cargasacchi from the estate of the former owner, also named Cargasacchi, who was only distantly related to the present owners of the Ranch, Giovanni and Clementina as Trustees of a trust, and Mark, Peter, John and Laura Cargasacchi, the children of Giovanni and Clementina.

The four other Marks family members who signed the formation petition for this CSD were directed by the late Chris Marks, their father and/or husband, to register to vote on this miniscule parcel because a prior petition to form the CSD had fraudulently been submitted, containing signatures that were invalid.

Other than this one family, all residing on one parcel not even a part of Lakeview Estates, **not a single Lakeview resident signed the petition to form this CSD.**

From the outset, the "Board" of the CSD was populated by members of the Marks family, the late Chris Marks, his wife Kristi Marks, and their son, Casey Marks. The other two Board members were Dale Petersen and Thomas Freeman.

Given the restrictions on the establishment of residences within the CSD boundaries imposed by the County of Santa Barbara since at least 1986, these opponents believe that Mr. Petersen does not qualify to serve on the Board.

Likewise, Casey Marks is not believed to reside within the CSD, and should be required to prove his residency, as he appears to reside elsewhere, based upon public records. Upon Chris Marks' untimely death, the Board, with less than a quorum present, elected Mario Moreno. Kristi Marks has not attended a Board meeting for at least eight months, but no effort has been made to fill her position on the Board.

Thus, the present applications are made by a Board whose legal right to pass and promote such matters is highly disputed.

Additionally, records provided by SBLAFCO indicate that its Executive Officer has been working with the CSD since at least October 2012 to prepare and promote these applications, including attending meetings on the Cargasacchi Ranch, outside the CSD boundaries, for the purpose of discussing CSD activities outside its boundaries.

Records of the CSD reflect that substantial expenditures of public funds have similarly been made to further activities of the CSD beyond its borders, yet at no time did this process appear on any agenda of the CSD for public input, comment, or objection, nor was the activity or the expenditures the subject of any Board vote or direction made within the requirements of the Brown Act.

Further, all of these actions took place while the CSD's sphere of influence was restricted to activities within its boundaries, and its certification expressly prohibited it from engaging in any activity related to the access road from Sweeney to its boundaries.

Over a year ago, the CSD Board placed an item on the agenda to budget for an survey to be conducted within the CSD boundaries, at a cost of approximately \$20,000.

Yet, internal records of the CSD obtained under the Public Records Act reveal that after this budget was proposed, and was approved in open session, Board president Chris Marks, without notice or public hearing, unilaterally and secretly authorized a 25% increase in the budget to conduct a survey, not within the CSD boundaries, but of the Cargasacchi Ranch for purposes of constructing the access road. Again, these activities took place while the CSD's sphere of influence was restricted, and it was prohibited from engaging in these activities.

Records obtained through the Public Records Act also disclose that without public scrutiny, one or more CSD Board members authorized engineering studies to be done at public expense regarding construction of the access road. These applications did not come before this Commission until many months after all of this illegal conduct had already taken place, and not until the Board secretly authorized substantial expenditures to prepare the applications.

**The "Memorandum of Agreement" and its Influence on the CSD Formation and Operation, and These Applications.**



The records of this body in originally forming this CSD and imposing the conditions upon it, which are only partially referenced in the recommendation by its outgoing Executive Officer, are detailed, and important to this body's consideration of these proposals, and should be carefully and fully reviewed before this Commission makes any final decision on these applications.

Those records reflect that the current restrictions were predicated on the concerns raised by the Cargasacchi Ranch owners that the CSD was being formed, not to provide any real services within the CSD boundaries, but rather to negate and avoid a contractually binding agreement between the Lakeview Estates and Rancho Dos Mundos properties to create an access road over Cargasacchi Ranch on very specific conditions, which included its specific location, design, width, drainage, gating, and use.

That document, recorded in 1990 as instrument number 90-17789 titled "Memorandum of Agreement and Easement Location Document," more commonly known as the "Memorandum Of Agreement" or "MOA" is the governing instrument for the creation and maintenance of access to Rancho Do Mundos and Lakeview Estates.

The MOA is an extremely detailed roadmap and design outline for the access road to the CSD governed parcels. Its location and design was created by highly respected civil engineer Sid Goldstein, who was retained by the Lakeview owners, not the Cargasacchis, to design and locate the road they wanted.

Contrary to the Executive Officer's un-researched report, the MOA was not "adjudicated by the Superior Court." The MOA was a settlement agreement brokered by the County of Santa Barbara between the Lakeview/Dos Mundos owners, who had sued the Cargasacchi Ranch owners, and Cargasacchi Ranch's owners.

The County became involved because some of the design criteria agreed to would normally have violated County requirements. In the interest of seeing the long standing (even then!) problem resolved, the County waived numerous requirements in favor of building a useable private road that the Lakeview owners, not the County, would build and maintain.

The Executive officer's report is also inaccurate in its claim that claim "the Rancho Santa Rita Access Association is the agency referred to build the access road" in the MOA. This is not true, either. No such organization is mentioned in the MOA.

Such an organization was created to build the road, but became defunct when Chris Marks persuaded the Lakeview owners that they could avoid many of the obligations they had agreed to in the MOA by forming the CSD, condemning the road, and making it a "public" road. That effort progeny re these applications.

Specifically, the portions of the MOA that some of the Lakeview owners want to make void by condemning a road over the Cargasacchi Ranch deal with certain controls

which were bargained for as part of the MOA's settlement of the Lakeview owner's lawsuit against Cargasacchi Ranch.

In particular, the MOA requires certain improvements be installed as part of the access road to accommodate farming on Cargasacchi Ranch. Additionally, Cargasacchi Ranch is allowed to install gates on the road as it sees fit.

Most critically, in order to settle the lawsuit, the Lakeview/Dos Mundos owners, all of whom had attorneys representing them, specifically agreed to limit their use of the new road over Cargasacchi Ranch to those uses in existence at the time the MOA was signed. They agreed that they would not increase either the use of the road on Cargasacchi Ranch, nor increase any burdens on Cargasacchi Ranch, without the permission of the Cargasacchi Ranch owners.

Almost from the day the ink dried on the MOA, numerous Lakeview owners tried to weasel out of the agreement they had just signed. In particular, it was clear that several were suffering from a severe case of "buyer's remorse." Among these was none other than the current CSD's alleged Board member, Dale Petersen.

For year after the MOA was recorded, Mr. Petersen, and in particular in conjunction with Chris Marks, tried every possible avenue to avoid complying with the MOA. At no time has Mr. Petersen ever offered to build the MOA road.

Instead, he has joined a number of organizations, predominantly spearheaded by Chris Marks, whose purpose was to build a road, not according to the MOA which with the permission of the County violates some public road standards, but that would meet County public road standards, for the express purpose of thereafter condemning the road in hope of negating the other MOA requirements.

In a letter written by Chris Marks in 2002 and circulated to the Lakeview owners, he actually outlined how creating a CSD, and using it to condemn a road over Cargasacchi Ranch, would allow the Lakeview owners to avoid their obligations under the MOA such as gates, and use/burdening restrictions.

Mr. Petersen and Mr. Marks have over the years been joined in that effort by many of the same people the CSD has called to speak before the Commission in support of these applications with the blatantly false claim that their appearance is necessary because **"This approval is necessary before any additional building permits can be issued, or road improvements made, within the District."**

The CSD's communication to its constituents, urging them to appear in support of the applications, when virtually none of the ever even appeared at the CSD meetings where these applications were hastily adopted, is imply untrue. Road improvements can readily be made without this approval. Building permits can be issued without this Commission

approving these applications. All that is required is for the Lakeview owners to build the moa road!

That avoiding the MOA obligations was the purpose in the original effort to create the CSD is borne out by the indisputable fact that none of the services the CSD was formed to provide have ever been provided to the CSD constituents. The plan by Marks and Petersen failed because this Commission was persuaded to restrict the CSD's right to condemn the Cargasacchi Ranch when there was already a perfectly viable option for access, as unpalatable as it might be.

Thus, the persons who planned so carefully the CSD formation, including gathering the Marks clan to register to vote on one remote 3/4 acre island within the 1,590 acres of Lakeview Estates, were left with an entity that was supposed to maintain and improve the internal roads and utilities only, something it has completely and totally failed to do, despite having spent hundreds of thousand of dollars squeezed from the owners of the parcels within its boundaries.

With the exception of a recent dumping of some road based on a short stretch of one road, no roads have been maintained, much less improved in any way, and important stretches of roads used to access parcels are often impassable, and this has continued for years while this CSD was engaged in activities it was legally restricted from doing.

Yet, the MOA has, over he years, consistently been identified by the County and the Courts as the sole operative basis for building any access road into what only recently became the CSD boundaries.

The Executive Officer's report completely ignores these facts.

By letter or memoranda in 1993, 2004, 2006 and as recently as 2007, the County of Santa Barbara has made it clear that the MOA is the only proper access road into Lakeview, and the County has no public right of way as asserted in this application. These opposing parties are certain that no one from the County of Santa Barbara will ever advise this Commission that there exists a viable County right of way over Cargasacchi Ranch, yet the Executive Officer recommends that this Commission accept such a right of way in approving the applications.

In a 2010 Superior Court case involving one of the Lakeview lots, the Court expressly found that the MOA was a valid and binding instrument, and that that lot, owned by Ariel and Angela Lavie, must comply with all of its terms. Again, this important fact was conveniently left out of the applications and the Executive Officer's report to this Commission.

The Executive Officer is unfairly favoring the applicants, and is openly biased against the opponents, as evidenced by his report's failure to bring to the Commission's attention these critical issues and findings.

**The "Application to Modify" is a Procedurally Improper and Incomplete Application for Reorganization, as a Matter of Law and Fact**

The Executive Officer's report would have this Commission believe that these applications are in order, They are not.

In the first instance, neither properly, much less adequately, addresses the application of CEQA to this project, which by the emphasized portions of the applications is to condemn a single portion of land, in order to build a specific road. The applications are for a "project," not a "funding mechanism," and as such, they are subject to CEQA.

No proper CEQA evaluation was made part of the applications, and in order to honestly represent the issues to this Commission, it should have been informed that this is not like the formation application, where the determination that the prior SOI did not invoke CEQA was noted in the records of SBLAFCO to be specifically because the SOI was "coterminus with the District boundary." Now, the application is to expand the SOI beyond the CSD boundary, thus negating this conclusion, and invoking CEQA compliance.

Additionally, the first of the two applications is for "Authorization for the Santa Rita Hills Community Services District to Provide Additional Special District Services." "Services" is plural, not singular, in your own description. It is in fact an application for reorganization under the law.

Page 2 of the Executive Officer's report specifically notes that the CSD seeks permission to conduct the specific governmental activity of condemning the land of another (a "service" within the meaning of that term in LAFCO Act Section 56074), and the right to construct (and, also, to maintain) an access road (a second "service" within the meaning of LAFCO Act Section 56074.)

The requested change in SOI is designed to allow the CSD to create new boundaries in one of three places as shown on the map. Not only would this not meet the requisite specificity for a boundary and/or sphere change, it would be in essence a boundary change once the eminent domain power is exercised.

Thus, under the definitions in Government Code Sections 56021 and 56073, the requested "Authorization for the Santa Rita Hills Community Services District to Provide Additional Special District Services" action is a "re-organization," whether disguised as an application to "modify conditions" or otherwise.

"The conditions" being modified are to change limits of boundaries, and increase and expand more than one service, now being made in a single application process given the recent combination of these into a single agenda item. The application is to change two or more conditions, as well as boundaries.

Applications for reorganization have specific requirements not met by this applicant. No proper application for re-organization was filed (maps, etc.), only a two page request document. The "application" lacks numerous components required for a complete application for re-organization.

Of course, both applications, and the Executive Officer's report, ignore the fact that this CSD cannot even afford to do the job it was formed to do, maintain and improve roads within the district boundaries.

Where is this CSD going to get the money to pay for the land it intends to condemn, paying full value for all of the rights associated therewith, much less to build a road to modern, public road standards, a cost which the County of Santa Barbara estimated at over \$2,000,000 almost twenty years ago? This crucial issue is not addressed in the applications, much less has it been disclosed to or discussed with the CSD's constituents.

### **Plans Already Exist to Build the MOA Road and the MOA Obliges The Lakeview Owners To Build It**

One of the most critical facts ignored by both the applicant and the Executive Officer is that there are already in existence fully developed plans which, with some very minor modifications, can be used by the Lakeview owners to build the MOA road.

Those plans were developed by Chris Marks because the County required him to have an access road to the "chateau" he built inside Lakeview (in blatant violation of numerous land use restrictions). As he had in the past, the late Mr. Marks refused to design exactly the MOA road, holding out for a road he could later have condemned, or the plans for which could be transferred to the CSD for condemnation.

Unfortunately for Mr. Marks, in 2004 and 2006 the County noted the discrepancies, and confirmed that Mr. Marks needed approval from Cargasacchi Ranch if he wanted to deviate from the MOA. Marks refused to seek that cooperation, and the project languished.

In 2010, Mr. Marks was sued for fraud by Hank Blanco related to loans Marks obtained for the road and house. In settlement of those claims, Mr. Blanco was given the property and the plans.

Mr. Blanco approached the Cargasacchis about their outstanding objections. He told them that Marks had assured him that it was the Cargasacchis' intransigence that had caused the road not to be built. Mr. Blanco quickly learned otherwise. The Cargasacchi family was more than willing to compromise to see the road built, offering to remove the restriction on the time for building the road (between crops), limiting gating if the owners cooperated in getting the road built, allowing drainage to pass over part of Cargasacchi Ranch so long as the road promptly was built, and agreeing to sit down with the Lakeview

owners once the road was completed to discuss orderly implementation in the future of the use and burdening restrictions.

Unfortunately, those negotiations derailed when Blanco asked the Cargasacchis to consider allowing him to market the Marks building for "winery" use before the road was constructed. When the Cargasacchis repeated that issues of uses and burdening would not be addressed until the road was completed, Blanco was incensed and abruptly cut off all discussions, refusing to move forward with building the road.

However, the plans exist; they are essentially approved, and John Karamitsos has indicated that even though the permit has expired, if the Cargasacchis agree to revised plans, the permit readily can be revived and will likely receive full approval for building the already negotiated MOA road.

The ball is in Mr. Blanco's court, but he is understood to be integrally involved in this condemnation process, so he can have the road and the winery, without being burdened by the agreement to which he is otherwise bound. Documents obtained from LAFCO indicated that as much as a year before these application ever were submitted, Blanco and Mr. Braitman, this Commission's Executive Officer, were discussing the applications and how the CSD might get the right to build its own access road, again all without public disclosure and in violation of its sphere of influence and certificate.

No discussions or negotiations have been held with the CSD because its manager and legal counsel have for more than a year refused to answer simple questions, asked long before these applications suddenly appeared, about what role the CSD saw itself playing with respect to the MOA, and why it was spending tax dollars on projects outside its sphere of influence and regarding the access road it was prohibited from being involved with.

## **Conclusion**

Despite the very limited time the opponents have had to bring matters to this Commission's attention, it should be clear from the information provided herein, all of which is well documented, that these applications are without merit, contrary to public policy and the policies of this Commission, and unless denied outright as they should be, require further *independent* investigation and consideration, with all pertinent materials and verified facts before the Commission before it rules.

Finally, this Commission must consider the letter written by the Code Enforcement, North County Division of Santa Barbara County's Planning and Development Department on June 27, 2007, wherein it was noted:

"County Counsel determined that all Lakeview owners have an enforceable agreement with [Cargasacchi Ranch] that they will not use the existing road for any use not already in existence and they will build he new road per the agreement. Unless a Lakeview owner gets your permission, the cannot obtain a permit in

Lakeview. Also, no permit issuance that requires access can be issued without consideration of the Special Problems Area."

These applications have nothing to do with changed circumstances, or necessity. They have everything to do with a group of individuals misusing the political process and public money to avoid meeting their otherwise binding personal contractual obligations.

Very truly yours,

**LAW OFFICES OF E. PATRICK MORRIS**

E. Patrick Morris, Esq.

Cc: Clients; Santa Rita Hills Community Services District