

Ramirez, Angelica

Public Comment Group 3

A-4

**From:** Sarah Trigueiro <sarah.trigueiro@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 27, 2022 2:09 PM  
**To:** sbcob; Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Nelson, Bob; Hart, Gregg  
**Subject:** Comments on Item A-4



**Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.**

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing with regard to Item A-4 on Tuesday's agenda, the second reading of the proposed Chapter 50 amendments that would effectively gut the cannabis acreage cap by exempting processing. Processing is the most odiferous phase in cannabis operations, and there is already an incredibly high density of it in Carpinteria Valley, with processing permits currently granted to 20 operators, 10 of which are already in operation and causing a horrific nuisance. Making the proposed Chapter 50 changes would have the effect of allowing more cultivation and processing in the already-besieged Carpinteria Valley.

Respectfully, I urge you - to borrow some of the past words of former Supervisor Adam - to "stop digging a hole".

Kind regards and with hopes of a better future for our County,  
Sarah Trigueiro

**Ramirez, Angelica**

---

**From:** Leigh Johnson <rlj.leigh@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 28, 2022 4:16 AM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Subject:** 50  
**Attachments:** chapter 50 2-27-22.pdf

**Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.**

Hello,  
Can you attach to 3-1-22 hearing for the chapter 50 discussion.

Thank you

2-27-22

Honorable Supervisors:

I've written this email 10 times in my head and numerous times in word. I think it's best that I echo some of the previous sent letters on file. I will say that I don't necessarily see this as a finger pointing situation directed at the Board and nor the Planning Commission.

Stakeholders is phraseology gone bad. I don't think the county is aware of the hostility this has reignited.

Shell companies are a way for those that want to be hidden or for those that like to play hide the taxable income. I've seen a shell company jigsaw puzzle on an applicant that LLC'd in Nevada and had so many shells it was almost necessary to tape pictures to the wall and connect the strings. The license name change game is going to be a mess.

Nothing is minor when it comes to the changing of the ordinance, the chapters, the LUDC, the XYZ...If it was a simple change then the CUP requirement would be up and going instead of saved for the dormant future. If it was minor Supervisor Hartman would of pursued the cap in Santa Rita, but she was convinced like we all were, that the caps were going to be done by the end of 2021. If it was minor than it wouldn't have been advised at a hearing that nothing is as easy as a sentence change and the log jam created would be disastrous for productivity.

If anyone had a clue that back door planning was going to happen in the 11<sup>th</sup> hour and the stakeholders would put on the sale job of the century...then Netflix would have a new series about how Santa Barbara County reinvented itself and it went horribly wrong. American Riviera...good! American Amsterdam...bad!

The constant extensions for the feet dragging legal non-conforming applicants is an insult to injury. How does it go from the end of 2020, to the end of 2021, to June 30, 2022, to December 31, 2022 to fall 2023? The Manhattan project took less time and atoms had to be split and fission achieved. Even Dennis Bozanich told the growers to get it together before he split town.

I'm attaching this link from CPA and associates, it is extremely well written and hits all the points of an aggrieved population within the county.

and finally I'll echo the majority of thoughts from letters on file that ask.."when will it end?" Keep the cap for North County (new districts 3 and 4) and Carpinteria...we have done our share for the county machine.

Thank you for your time and consideration,  
Leigh Johnson

<https://santabarbara.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=10526712&GUID=75AF7983-D6C2-456C-B42C-C3B884EDA400>

## Ramirez, Angelica

---

**From:** Villalobos, David  
**Sent:** Monday, February 28, 2022 8:28 AM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Subject:** FW: NO to Cannabis Coup of SB on Tuesday

**From:** A.L.Bardach <albardach@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 27, 2022 12:37 PM  
**To:** Frapwell, Jeff <jFrapwell@countyofsb.org>  
**Cc:** Williams, Das <DWilliams@countyofsb.org>; Hartmann, Joan <jHartmann@countyofsb.org>; ateve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org; Nelson, Bob <bnelson@countyofsb.org>; Hart, Gregg <gHart@countyofsb.org>; Nick Bobroff <nickb@ci.carpinteria.ca.us>; AlClark@ci.carpinteria.ca.us; WadeNomura@ci.carpinteria.ca.us; D, Dave <daved@ci.carpinteria.ca.us>; Villalobos, David <dvillalo@countyofsb.org>  
**Subject:** Re: NO to Cannabis Coup of SB on Tuesday

**Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.**

Hey guys,

Do the right thing for once ! No one expects any altruism but consider that the stink of your Cannabis Coup will follow you for some time...And not just El Das.  
Thank you Joan Hartmann for what you do to help...Please do more.

As you all know, you can end The Weed Wars of SB tomorrow simply by amending your widely-reviled Cannabis Ordinance:  
by limiting and downsizing Caps, imposing MANDATORY ODOR CONTROL enforced by the County, ending open grows near the \$3 billion wine vineyards, banning clear cutting of Carpinteria's avocado orchards. And HALT all Processing near residents and schools, **esp Carpinteria High, which could now qualify as an EPA Superfund Toxic Site.**

You're backing a losing business down to \$3 million last year- pennies in a county budget -while threatening our lucrative wine and avocados industries and fomenting misery across the county.

You've had thousands of letters urging NO, hundreds of odor complaints, if not thousands. Condemnation from the cities of Carpinteria and Goleta et al....

All met with a resounding yawn from **The Cannabis Cowboys. The BOS was once respected; Sadly, not now.**

SO

- **NO to Gutting THE Cannabis CAP :** Item A-4 is the County's second reading of its plan to exempt processing (the smelliest part of the cannabis process) from the cannabis cultivation acreage cap. It would have the effect of allowing further proliferation of both processing and cultivation in Carpinteria Valley in excess of the 186 acre cap. In Carpinteria there are currently already 20 (!) different sites with processing permits (10 of which aren't even yet in operation but soon will be). The existing processing is

already causing a huge nuisance. Removing processing from the cap of 186 acres should not be considered for Carpinteria, as WE are already suffering from incredibly dense cannabis activities here.

• **NO to APPEAL of Huge Processing Facility Near Beach:** Item 5 is Sarah Trigueiro's (local resident) appeal hearing of G&K's (Farrar's) proposed new 25,000 sq. foot warehouse located adjacent to Arroyo Paredon Creek at 3480 Via Real, in addition to his existing 8.17 acre cannabis project at 3561 Foothill Rd. County records show that Farrar's two Carpinteria properties are first and second for the most cannabis odor complaints filed by residents since 2015, with 285 and 252 complaints each. Last year, **100 members of Concerned Carpinterians signed a petition against this processing project.**

- Carpinteria does not need more density of cannabis and processing activities, particularly when the grower has a poor track record. There are already 20 cannabis projects permitted or in the pipeline in the Nidever Rectangle area alone (between Nidever and Cravens, Foothill and Via Real).
- The County has been unable to enforce even its own meager controls that were supposed to protect residents. Case in point – there have not been the required quarterly industrial hygienist inspections for the existing greenhouses on the site to ensure the odor control system is effective in preventing noxious fumes in residential zones. Planning officials cannot identify the source of odors when there are so many projects next to each other – and as a result, there has been no effective enforcement.
- Additionally, the fumes from this location have been a significant nuisance in La Mirada, the Polo Condos and Santa Claus/Padaro areas – even at the beach. There are significant Coastal Act considerations here, given that this project affects an ESH (environmentally sensitive habitat), the Arroyo Paredon coastal feeding creek and impacts residents' and visitors' ability to enjoy the coastal zone.

A.L. Bardach  
Resident  
[BardachReports.com](http://BardachReports.com)  
805.684.7675 off  
805.895.6919 cell

## Ramirez, Angelica

---

**From:** sbcob  
**To:** Alexander, Jacquelyne  
**Subject:** RE: THANK YOU!

---

**From:** Jeff Giordano <[jeffg@ir-holdings.com](mailto:jeffg@ir-holdings.com)>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 27, 2022 2:59 PM  
**To:** Hartmann, Joan <[jHartmann@countyofsb.org](mailto:jHartmann@countyofsb.org)>  
**Subject:** THANK YOU!

**Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.**

Dear Ms. Hartmann:

I generally don't write directly to individual Supervisor's re: Cannabis (apathy is an awful thing) but I did want to let you know that I appreciated your recent votes re: the 24 acre North County project (yes, issues relating to water, Ground Level Ozone, and PM-10 are real) and the Ordinance modification which would carve-out 9 acres (5% increase) for processing in our already much too dense 186 acre Carp Valley. THANK YOU.

Should you ever need to publically or privately justify your vote you might consider the following:

- It's never healthy when the City most affected by an ordinance modification (not interpretation!)—Carpinteria—voices a vehement objection and even considers Censuring the County. Individual district-Supervisors aside, the Carpinteria City Counsel knows what's best for Carpinteria. My only lament is that some of the change would also affect the unincorporated areas, some of the most pristine in Carpinteria with one such processing facility very close to Lions public park and the Cate School.
- As you are probably aware, our FPPA Form 700 (Statement of Economic Interest) requirements are some of the narrowest in the state. So, yes, when Growers who have already been given a mile now ask for an inch, one wonders whether staff members who cheer for the change are doing so honestly? Until the County expands the Form 700 filing requirements, it's an unfortunate but obvious question.
- The PEIR didn't envision processing so it never examined it's unique impacts (power grid, natural gas, battery power) or the cumulative effect of these facilities re: odor (Class I) or the 24/7 65-decibel level of noise these facilities usually cause re: fans/odor abatement. Remember, one of the PEIR's original alternatives for the Carp Valley was NO Cannabis given our relative residential density.
- As it relates to Odor—an article in Rolling Stone compared the lesser level of cultivation vs. 5,000 SF processing plants (here, they will be 5X larger). Anyway, the smell from processing was described as: **“the magnum olfactory opus”**. Even if Carbon Scrubbers (lowest form of Carbon Filtration) are 80% effective (Grower statistic) that means they are 20% ineffective. Push this across scores of grows and processing facilities and your left with the textbook definition of a Public Nuisance.
- Oh yeah, you might want to remind the Board of the MJ extraction lab/processing center that exploded killing two people in Canoga Park just last year (five defendants were charged with murder). As I understand it, we have 7 people for our entire county re: enforcement so I doubt we are going to be overseeing much of anything as it relates to these facilities, in my humble opinion.

Finally, let's be honest, these Growers brand themselves "good neighbors" but after securing the most lenient ordinance in the state they still push for "MORE" (talk about gluttony)—not very neighborly. Santa Barbara County comprises 1.8% of CA, yet growers hold licenses for 35% of all the state's cannabis acreage—do we really need to add nine acres to the already existing three square miles of County Cannabis?

I happen to reside in the First but take my word that folks in the newly drawn Third have taken notice—thank you.

Regards,

Jeff Giordano

## Ramirez, Angelica

---

**From:** Gail Herson <devesi@me.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 28, 2022 9:57 AM  
**To:** sbcob; Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Nelson, Bob; Hart, Gregg  
**Subject:** 3-1 Board of Supervisors meeting items A4 and 5

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

And so it happened that in the glorious County of Santa Barbara, the cannabis growers came to the rulers and said "We want more acreage! Exempt cannabis processing from the caps!"

And the rulers looked around and they saw people suffering. They wept to see that children couldn't learn because their schools were surrounded by malodorous cannabis plants. They saw people sickened, headaches, wheezing and eyes tearing, as the odors filled their homes and cars. They saw countless violations and no enforcement. They saw the purveyors of the fruit of the vine closing their tasting rooms, the industry laid to waste. Precious avocado groves, the prized fruit of the kingdom, being torn down to make room for behemoth processing plants. The rulers saw that despite the increasing bags of gold of the growers, the county tax coffers were not full. And the old grandmothers could not smell their roses above the skunky odor and wept that their paradise was laid to ruin.

And the rulers looked at each other, their hearts melting in compassion, and they proclaimed "Enough!! Our people are suffering and we have the power to make it better! We will not exempt the noxious processing from the caps! Today we will draft a new cannabis ordinance that is enforceable and fair to all and from this moment we will enforce the violations!"

And the people praised their benevolent and compassionate rulers and rejoiced! The town criers proclaimed the rulers' benevolent legacy with word of the rewritten ordinance and bards sung of their bravery and goodness! And enforcement reigned across the land!

The children danced in joy and opened their textbooks; the sickened could breathe freely; the County tax coffers overflowed with fair and accountable taxation; the wine poured fragrant! The old grandmothers smelled their roses and showered the benevolent rulers with flower petals.

With an open heart,  
Gail Herson  
An old grandmother of Carpinteria



**Ramirez, Angelica**

---

**From:** Renee ONeill <chasingstar2701@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 28, 2022 10:20 AM  
**To:** sbcob; Hartmann, Joan; Nelson, Bob; Hart, Gregg; Lavagnino, Steve; Williams, Das  
**Cc:** Villalobos, David  
**Subject:** Public Comment re Item A-4  
**Attachments:** BOS re BOL amenments, 02-28-2022.docx

**Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.**

Dear Supervisors,

Attached, please find my short letter to be submitted for public comment - item A-4.

*Best Regards,*

*Renée O'Neill*

February 27, 2022

To: Santa Barbara County Supervisors  
From: Renée O'Neill  
Re: Business License Ordinance, Agenda Item A-4

Honorable Chair Hartmann and Supervisors,

I respectfully request that you postpone this hearing, until both staff and residents have had time to further review and evaluate the language that seems to conflict with earlier promises.

I want to express my appreciation to Supervisor Hartmann, who appears to be the only voice of reason by voting "NO" to the county's attempts to amend the BLO and increase the number of acres to the Cap. We were led to believe that the Cap was absolutely FOOLPROOF! However, some county legislators seem to be under the mistaken impression that they might lose revenue if they don't add more processing facilities and acreage to the already excessive Cap.

Contrary to what the CEO's office asserts, "there are very few existing or proposed processing facilities in the county," CA State Records confirm that Santa Barbara County growers hold 29 active processing licenses, the third highest number in the State!

I commend ALL residents and communities that have fought so long and so hard to advocate for 'responsible cannabis legislation.' It is disturbing to me that we are compelled to insist that our county legislators uphold and enforce their own regulations. Odor has plagued many communities from the outset but the county has failed to gain control of the odor crisis. If the BOS changes the rules, they will subject residents to even more stench because processing is the smelliest part of cannabis operations.

In closing, I continue to believe that the cannabis industry costs our county more to oversee, monitor, regulate, enforce and process multiple appeals and/or lawsuits, than is financially beneficial to SBC.

Respectfully Submitted,

Renée O'Neill

## Ramirez, Angelica

---

**From:** Judy Dean <judycathryndean@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 28, 2022 12:11 PM  
**To:** sbcob; Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; ateve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org; Nelson, Bob; Hart, Gregg  
**Subject:** Item 4A: Lifting the cap on cannabis in Carpinteria Valley

**Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.**

My husband and I live in Carpinteria and are thus subject to the emitted cannabis odors and other pollution from cannabis activities on a daily basis. For over 5 years we have been assured by our Supervisor that development of a cannabis industry in Carpinteria Valley would not be allowed to become a nuisance. Instead it has been an ongoing nuisance and is all but ignored by County officials.

Odor rules are unimplemented largely because they hinge on the nose of a single individual: the Director of Planning, who has stated the source of cannabis odors cannot be reliably determined. Clearly existing cannabis odor rules are not working, so adding more cannabis activities is not the solution.

One of the only protections residents of Carpinteria have is the acreage cap created by the County. That is now under threat with the consideration of a new rule to discount cannabis processing activities from the acreage limit

Processing cannabis is arguably the most odor-producing phase of the cannabis industry. The cannabis odors and air pollution from vapor phase are already a clear nuisance for the surrounding pre-existing neighborhoods. They can cause and exacerbate asthma. They routinely cause watering eyes, cough, sneezing, and sometimes headache. Now the County proposes making a bad situation even worse by exempting cannabis processing from consideration in the cannabis cap.

Carpinteria Valley is a unique mix of beach and agricultural elements, and is home to over 20,000 people. The local topography results in frequent periods of overcast skies with formation of inversion layers that trap local pollution. The County government has already permitted an unacceptable level of air pollution with the existing cap on cannabis activities. It is unconscionable to propose expanding that cap before odor control has been achieved on what is already being allowed.

I urge you to vote against any exemptions for cannabis processing from the acreage cap.

Judy Dean MD

**Ramirez, Angelica**

---

**From:** Anna Carrillo <annacarp@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 28, 2022 12:55 PM  
**To:** sbcob; Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; Nelson, Bob; Hart, Gregg; Lavagnino, Steve  
**Subject:** A-4 Changes to Chapter 50 Business License Processing  
**Attachments:** A-4 Changes to Chapter 50 Business License Processing

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Anna Carrillo annacarp@cox.net  
Subject: A-4 Changes to business license regarding processing  
Date: February 28, 2022 at 12:50 PM

To: sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us, Williams, Das dswilliams@countyofsb.org, Hartmann, Joan jhartmann@countyofsb.org, ghart@countyofsb.org, bob.nelson@countyofsb.org, steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org



To: Board of Supervisors  
From: Anna Carrillo  
February 28, 2022

I would like to urge you to exempt processing in the Carpinteria Valley, the Coastal Zone, from any changes to the 186 acreage cultivation limit currently in place

I sent a letter two weeks ago when this item was first being discussed and I mentioned at that time I thought there were 15 projects already approved in the Carpinteria Valley. I had arrived at that number by only counting up those with state provisional processing licenses, the 2 stand alone warehouses and the 2 requests to build new buildings. Since that letter was written, it has come to my attention there are even more projects in the Carpinteria Valley with processing than the 15 mentioned in the initial letter. There has been a lack of transparency. I had to write to ask how the original 6 acres that was presented to the Board previously on Feb. 14, 2022. After asking for the list of addresses, the 6 acre number is now almost 7 1/2 acres.

There are currently at least 21 different operators who have already received their CDPs that include processing in their approved permits. Most of them have been doing processing under their state temporary and then state provisional licenses issued initially in 2019, continually renewed and have continued to get approved for processing in their newly approved CDPs. There have already been 10 new CDPs issued that include processing in their brand new operations which aren't even operating yet. There are 2 new projects that have been approved that will only do processing with no cultivation associated with old former warehouses now being converted for processing. There are also CDPs already issued for 2 projects that plan to build brand new buildings for processing.

There are 4 more projects waiting for their CDP approvals which have been doing processing under state provisional licenses so I assume processing will be included in their CDPs when issued. **So including the 4 still to be approved, that would be a total of 25 different processing locations throughout the Carpinteria Valley.** For these 4 projects awaiting CDP approvals, I don't know what their added acreage will be.

As Carpinteria Valley already has plenty of processing (almost every different operation has their own approved processing) our situation here is very different than in the inland area where there is only a total of 3 acres with processing. Currently Carpinteria already has almost 7 1/2 acres with approved CDPs approving processing already but this is a huge percentage of the 186 acre cap compared to the 3 acres of the 1566 acres approved in the inland area.

In the Carpinteria Valley, cannabis cultivation including processing is situated along basically two 4 mile stretches of roadways and interspersed with many EDRNs, the city of Carpinteria, Carpinteria High School, 2 day care facilities and a couple of private schools.

Carpinteria should be excluded from this part of the business license change as Carpinteria was not included when the Board of Supervisors voted to not allow cannabis cultivation on small Ag-1 parcels of 5, 10, and 20 acres in the inland area whereas there was no consideration given to Carpinteria Valley in that approval.

**The processing part of cannabis is the smallest part of cannabis and still there has been no enforcement of any odor concerns.**

Thank you for your consideration,

Anna Carrillo

## Ramirez, Angelica

---

**From:** Nick Bobroff <nickb@ci.carpinteria.ca.us>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 28, 2022 3:58 PM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Cc:** D, Dave; Steve Goggia  
**Subject:** 3/1/22 BOS Agenda Item A-4: Amendments to Ch. 50 of County Code- Licensing of Cannabis Operations

**Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.**

Good afternoon Chair Hartmann and Supervisors,

The City of Carpinteria continues to be strongly opposed to the contemplated change to Chapter 50, Licensing of Cannabis Operations, that would remove cannabis processing activities from counting toward the 186-acre cap on cannabis cultivation in the Carpinteria Valley. We urge the Board to vote down this prospective amendment as it is currently proposed.

Despite what the cannabis industry may suggest, with approximately 20 provisionally licensed and/or permitted processing facilities in the Carpinteria Valley alone, it would appear there is no shortage of cannabis processing capacity in Carpinteria to serve our local ~180 acres of cultivation area. If the inland portions of the County have a lack of sufficient processing capacity (where County staff estimated there are only ~3 acres of processing to serve ~1500+ acres of cultivation), then the Board should focus on the means to correct that specific problem in those specific areas.

The County Board has demonstrated repeatedly that regulating commercial cannabis activities for the entire County need not be based on a "one-size fits all" approach. Given the unique setting and land uses of the Carpinteria Valley as compared to the inland parts of the County, a singular county-wide approach to calculating the respective cultivation caps then is also not necessary nor prudent.

For the sake of consistency amongst the regulations applied to commercial cannabis cultivation in the Carpinteria Valley, it makes the most sense to stick with the current practice of utilizing a consistent definition of cultivation for all permitting and licensing actions, including calculating the 186-acre cultivation cap.

Excluding processing activities from the cultivation cap feels like it's moving the goal posts after-the-fact to accommodate yet more cannabis cultivation and processing activities that would, in the end, cumulatively exceed the 186-acre cap that was previously agreed upon and established by the Board for the Carpinteria Valley. We respectfully ask the Board to honor the cap as it presently is defined.

We appreciate your consideration of this matter.

Respectfully,

Nick Bobroff, Principal Planner

Community Development Department

(805) 755- 4407