



June 24, 2026

Bao M. Vu
1 Montgomery Street, Suite 3230
San Francisco, CA 94104
D. 415.500.6572
bao.vu@stoel.com

VIA EMAIL

Terence Dressler, Chair
Aeron Arlin Genet, Clerk
Lorena Saldana, Deputy Clerk
Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District Hearing Board
260 North San Antonio Rd., Suite A
Santa Barbara, CA 93110
Emails:

Variance@sbcapcd.org
ArlingenetA@sbcapcd.org
SaldanaL@sbcapcd.org

**Re: Case No. 2026-07-N – (90-Day Variance)
Response to the Center for Biological Diversity’s Objection to Variance Petition**

Dear Chair Dressler:

Petitioner Sable Offshore Corp. (“Petitioner”) responds to the Center for Biological Diversity’s (“CBD”) objection and purported request for continuance (the “CBD Objection”), which Petitioner received on Monday, June 22, 2026.¹ The CBD Objection concerns the public hearing set for Thursday, June 25, 2026. The purpose of that hearing is to consider Petitioner’s petition for a 90-Day Variance (Case No. 2026-07-N), following the Interim Variance (Case No. 2026-06-I), from District Rule 206 / Part 70 Permit to Operate 9102-R7, Conditions 9.C.3(a), 9.C.3(b)(i), and 9.C.18.

Petitioner disputes the CBD Objection on procedural, factual, and legal grounds. Given the timing and length of the CBD Objection, Petitioner submits this preliminary response and expressly reserves all rights, arguments, and challenges, including its right to supplement this response and to challenge the positions presented in the CBD Objection. Meanwhile, with respect to the hearing tomorrow, June 25, 2026, Petitioner responds as follows:

¹ The CBD Objection states that it was submitted via email at some point on Thursday, June 18, 2026. Petitioner did not receive a copy of it, and it was not filed until Monday, June 22, 2026.

First, CBD is not a party to these variance proceedings. These variance proceedings contemplate the Petitioner, the holder of the permit or variance (if different from the Petitioner), and the Control Officer as the persons entitled to service and to file an answer.² CBD is a member of the public and CBD was duly notified of this matter through the District's published notice on June 12, 2026. CBD's participation here is in that capacity. It effectively concedes the point, stating only that it "wishes to participate as a party" and to be afforded the rights "conferred upon parties." District Regulation V contains no mechanism by which a member of the public may intervene or be joined as a party to a variance proceeding. As such, CBD enjoys a limited right to participate only and does not have the rights reserved to parties.³

Second, the CBD Objection establishes no basis to deny the variance requested by Petitioner. CBD relies heavily on collateral permitting matters that are not before the Board in this proceeding and have no bearing on the discrete findings governing a variance. Elsewhere, the CBD Objection presumes what evidence will be presented at the hearing and what findings the Board will make, and it misreads the applicable law to suggest that a time-limited variance under Health & Safety Code §§ 42350, *et seq.* is equivalent to a significant modification of a Title V permit. Those arguments are misplaced, and the Board need not credit any of them.

Third, the variance Petition is complete and should be granted. It is submitted on the District's prescribed Petition for Variance form and addresses each of the criteria set out in District Rule 504, supplying the information necessary for the findings required under Health & Safety Code §42352. CBD suggests the Petition is deficient for purportedly failing to address why compliance is unreasonable (District Rule 504.B) and the advantages and disadvantages to District residents (District Rule 504.F). That is incorrect. Both are addressed on the face of the Petition, and Rule 504 requires only that these matters be stated "briefly."

² See District Rule 502 ("[s]ervice of a copy of the petition shall be made to the Control Officer and to the holder of the permit or variance, if any involved[]"); District Rule 509 (permitting response to petition only via "answer within 10 days after service" and to be "served in the same manner as petitions under Rule 502"); District Rule 516 (a continuance of 15 days or less "shall" be granted when "concurred in by petitioner, the Control Officer and every person who has filed an answer in the action").

³ Compare Health & Safety Code § 40828(a) ("A hearing board shall allow interested members of the public a reasonable opportunity to testify with regard to the matter under consideration, and shall consider that testimony in making its decision."), with Health & Safety Code § 40823(a) (requiring notice of a hearing to be served on "air pollution control officer, and upon the applicant or permittee affected, not less than 10 days prior to such hearing"); *id* at § 42351 (referring to "any person who has submitted an application for a variance"); *id* at § 42352 (referring to "petitioner for a variance" and "applicant for the variance"); District Rule 513 (conferring various rights to "each party").

Terry Dressler
Aeron Arlin Genet
Lorena Saldana
June 24, 2026
Page 3

Accordingly, Petitioner respectfully requests that the Board duly proceed to consider the Petition and grant the 90-Day Variance. Petitioner appreciates the Board's consideration and remains available to address any questions.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Bao M. Vu', is written over the closing text.

Bao M. Vu