

de la Guerra, Sheila

Public Comment Group 2 #3

From: Lee Pearson <lee.e.pearson@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 4:34 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Re: Comment Letter for 2/15 Hearing: Dept. Agenda No. 3 (Chapter 50 Cannabis Amendments)



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 Honorable Supervisors:

Good afternoon, my name is Lee Pearson and my project is SBC Farms in Cuyama

I support the proposed amendments to Chapter 50 to allow transferability of cannabis business licenses.

These amendments will:

1. Most importantly, allow the investment that is necessary for the survival of cannabis businesses during this period of pricing drops and cost increases
2. Allow, through investment, the risk of these pricing and cost changes to be diversified beyond the family of the operator, which could be devastating to individual finances
3. Allow for the business to be passed on to family or other close parties involved in supporting the operation..

Please vote to support the efficient transfer of licenses in this legal industry that is already under so much pressure from regulations, taxes and unfettered illegal competition.

Sincerely,

Lee E Pearson

--

Lee Pearson
CEO, ElectriGarden Ventures, LLC

Phone 310/729-7119
Email lee.e.pearson@gmail.com
www.linkedin.com/in/leepearson1/

=====

The above terms may reflect a potential business arrangement, are provided solely as a basis for further discussion, and are not intended to be and do not constitute a legally binding obligation. No legally binding obligations will be created, implied, or inferred until an agreement in final form is executed in writing by all parties involved. This message may contain "forward-looking statements" within the meaning of the United States Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. All statements, other than statements of historical fact, that address activities, events or developments that the Company believes, expects or anticipates will, may, could or might occur in the future are Forward-Looking Statements. The words "expect," "anticipate," "estimate," "may," "could," "might," "will," "would," "should," "intend," "believe," "target," "budget," "plan," "strategy," "goals," "objectives," "projection" or the negative of any of these words and similar expressions are intended to identify Forward-Looking Statements, although these words may not be present in all Forward-Looking Statements.

Forward-Looking Statements are subject to a number of risks and uncertainties that may cause the actual events or results to differ materially from those discussed in the Forward-Looking Statements, and even if events or results discussed in the Forward-Looking Statements are realized or substantially realized, there can be no assurance that they will have the expected consequences to, or effects on, the Company.

The Company undertakes no obligation to update its Forward-Looking Statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this presentation or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events other than as required by law. Accordingly, readers should not place undue reliance on Forward-Looking Statements. The information contained in this email message is intended only for the PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL use of the designated recipient (s) named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message and/or any attachments hereto is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by reply email, and delete the message immediately. Thank You.



de la Guerra, Sheila

From: S G <sasha477m@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 4:56 PM
To: Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Cc: Patty
Subject: Community Input re. Cannabis Acreage Cap and Related from Carpinteria Taxpayers

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,

We understand that the County is considering exempting cannabis processing from the 186 acre cannabis cap. Please DO NOT EXEMPT CANNABIS PROCESSING from existing or future limits and DO NOT INCREASE THE CANNABIS CAP in general.

It is widely believed throughout our community that the regulation of cannabis growing and processing has been mismanaged by the Santa Barbara County supervisors from Day One. Whether a result of innocent "unintended consequences" or through malfeasance, the fact remains: the County, and especially the Carpinteria Valley, CONTINUES TO BE NEGATIVELY IMPACTED BY CANNABIS ODOR.

We live adjacent to several cannabis growing and processing operations in Carpinteria and have lived in our home for 23 years. We continue to experience the negative impacts of obnoxious cannabis odor infiltrating our property, often forcing us to keep our windows shut, even during heat waves. Cannabis odor permeates our property on a regular basis.

While we applaud efforts by some growers to seek alternative mitigating solutions, the fact is that solving this complex problem, especially in the Carpinteria Valley, as a whole, is a long way's off and by no means assured. The emissions from cannabis growing and processing continue in the Carpinteria and many residents are concerned about the potential for long term health impacts and impacts to quality of life. One only has to drive a short distance along Highway 192/Foothill Road to experience ongoing cannabis odor. Depending on a home's location, wind direction and atmospheric conditions, cannabis odors continue to waft in and out on a regular basis.

We therefore strongly urge the following:

- 1) Ensure that cannabis processing, which clearly adds to cannabis emissions, is NOT EXEMPTED from the cap.
- 2) Improve the level of CANNABIS ODOR MONITORING and provide the funding necessary to step up REAL ENFORCEMENT of regulations.
- 3) Conduct a COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW of the impacts of cannabis production to the community, in particular the Carpinteria Valley, due to high density of cannabis growing and processing operations. Let the results of the environmental review help drive cannabis policy decision making and further regulatory measures.
- 4) CEASE FURTHER PERMITTING OF CANNABIS GROWING AND PROCESSING until the above have been resolved.
- 5) Lastly and critically, the Board of Supervisors should recognize the CRISIS OF PUBLIC CONFIDENCE in their leadership on cannabis (reference the 2020 Grand Jury Report on Cannabis in Santa Barbara County for examples of why this is occurring). The Board members should adopt a BASIC STANDARD OF ETHICS and ABSTAIN from voting on cannabis related measures where they have accepted money as political donations from the cannabis producers. Given the tremendous impacts of cannabis on residents, taxpayers, children and other businesses, the Board should be especially sensitive to conflicts of interest relating to cannabis (this includes the appearance of a conflict, whether or not a supervisor believes one in fact exists). The Board should abide by this as a MINIMUM of good governance.

Respectfully,

Alexander and Patricia Globa

Carpinteria, CA

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: robyn geddes <robyn_geddes@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 5:02 PM
To: sbcob; Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Nelson, Bob
Subject: Carpinteria Acreage Cap

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 Sirs:

Please hold the cannabis growing & processing acreage in Carpinteria as is. An increase in acreage, without putting the proposed Carbon Scrubbers through testing in actual large settings, especially in the Processing Phase, is premature.

Sincerely,
Robyn Geddes
Carpinteria

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Kent Englert <Kent@englertassociates.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 5:13 PM
To: sbcob; Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Nelson, Bob
Subject: Carpinteria 186 acre cap

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.

Exempting processing from the 186 acre cap is an end run to expand cannabis production in the Carpinteria Valley. We do not need any

Enough is enough. 186 total acres is enough for cannabis in the Carpinteria Valley.

Kent and Jill Englert

////