



CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR
Ventura County Harbor Department

Mark Sandoval
Director

3900 Pelican Way • Oxnard, CA 93035-4367 • (805) 973-5950 • Fax (805) 382-3015

June 22, 2020

Rene Aiu
Lauraine Effress

Ms. Aiu and Ms. Effress:

I am writing in reference to letters you wrote to the Board of Supervisors regarding the recommended extension of the Exclusive Rights to Negotiate (ERNs) with Channel Islands Harbor Properties (CIHP) and the recommended authorization for a consulting contract with Sargent Town Planning to facilitate the Harbor visioning process.

First, I am surprised that you would object with the Sargent Town Planning recommendation in that it is directly in line with the recently adopted Harbor Planning and Development Process, a process which Ms. Effress helped draft and most residents support. If your only concern is that it is not an update of the Harbor Public Works Plan (PWP), my expectation is that this process will ultimately result in a plan which could readily carry forward to a PWP update, but that would be a much lengthier process.

With regards to the CIHP ERNs, as you rightfully state, there were a number of deliverables which were due by March 31, 2020. CIHP delivered all of the deliverables by the due date. The issue is that neither the Parcel X-3 nor the Parcels F/F-1 concepts were acceptable to me because they included a significant number of apartments with an insufficient amount of visitor and public serving amenities. I communicated my views to CIHP, and subsequently discussed the development of these parcels with CIHP principals. It is true that these proposals could have been taken to the Board of Supervisors for five-year Lease Option Agreements, as specified in the ERNs, but that action would have made little sense as it would have been for projects I could not support, as I knew we would end up in the same situation as Fisherman's Wharf in the absence of a visioning process.

As a result, and in conformity with the new Harbor Planning and Development Process, the most prudent course of action is to recommend moving forward with the Harbor visioning before making a determination as to the appropriate development on those two parcels, and to recommend extension of the CIHP ERNs to enable us to finish the visioning before we proceed with CIHP on these parcels. Your recommendation to issue a Request For Proposals (RFP) at this point doesn't fit with our new process. Until we complete the visioning, we do not know what should be included in the RFP as allowable projects. To allow expiration of the CIHP ERNs because we delayed action on these parcels while we concentrated on Fisherman's Wharf, and before we complete the visioning process to determine what is preferred on these parcels, is in my opinion very unfair to CIHP.

Sincerely,

Mark Sandoval
.MS

CC: Board of Supervisors
CEO Michael Powers