

Lenzi, Chelsea

Group 2

LATE  
DIST

A-13

**From:** anna bradley <annaberit@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 9, 2019 9:41 AM  
**To:** Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob  
**Subject:** [DO NOT CLICK, Likely malicious content, contact your Departmental IT] I second the letter from SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis

**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,

Please help us to stop fighting in our community over the continuing problem of cannabis production and side affects. Some days it is just so hard to be optimistic . I am trying to work with the growers in the neighborhood, accepting that production will continue and speaking with them when I have problems. Regarding safety problems what will only increase when our bridge reopens: This past week I was nearly hit by a card at shift change on Foothill in Carpinteria. I called the business owner of the property who said that it was another company's employees. We no longer know who runs what business and who to contact regarding problems. Further, we are continually met with the odor that doesn't seem to quit. Is lighting ok for hoop growing in night hours that blare into our houses above?

I am writing to you in my capacity as a private citizen and as a concerned Carpinterian. I wanted to express my strong support for the letter sent to you from the Santa Barbara Coalition for Responsible Cannabis (excerpted below).

Anna Bradley

LETTER FROM SB COALITION FOR RESPONSIBLE CANNABIS EXCERPTED BELOW:

Dear Supervisors,

Thank you for the opportunity last week to convey to you our Coalition's grave concerns about the impact of the County's Cannabis Ordinances (both land use and

licensing) on the quality of life for County residents. We appreciate your response to our request to combine the two agenda items on April 2, 2019 concerning cannabis.

We appreciate that the majority of you, in particular Supervisor Adam, seem to acknowledge the unrelenting impacts that the "legal" non-conforming and unregulated cannabis cultivation sites continue to inflict upon residents and communities ranging from Tepesquet to Carpinteria.

Unfortunately, the proposed amendments to the Cannabis Ordinance, A-13, do not address the crux of the issue, which is the continued acceptance on the part of the county of these nonconforming and in most cases expanded uses. ***We request that you revise and further amend the ordinance so it does not imply the nonconforming uses can continue.***

Here are pertinent excerpts, enumerated and excerpted from the letter we sent to you last week [attached]. We continue to request that you amend the ordinance to include these important actions:

- 2. The Board should direct staff to review and investigate unlawful expansions and changes to those grows determined to be Legal Nonconforming Uses, and terminate them.***
- 3. The Board should clarify that only those legitimately designated and continuing nonconforming uses which have an application called complete for processing under the Land Use and Development Code (LUDC) and Article II by P&D prior to 2016 should be processed.***
- 4. For all applications which have not been called complete by P&D, the Board should direct staff to order termination of nonconforming uses as of the dates described in the ordinance.***

We also urge you and your staff to be cognizant of the fact that both Article II and the LUDC provide:

“Upon recommendation of the Planning Commission, or upon petition by a person or persons affected by a nonconforming use of buildings or land or both, or on its own initiative, the Board of Supervisors may set a date for, and call a public hearing to determine whether or not a nonconforming use of land or buildings or both, or an unpermitted expansion of or change in such use should not be ordered terminated.”

***We continue to request that the Board acknowledge that this specific rule applies to cannabis grows under the Nonconforming Use provisions of Section 1003*** (which was not certified by the Coastal Commission to apply in the coastal zone in the first place, because it is outside of the LCP). Any unpermitted expansion or change in a nonconforming use, both within and outside of the coastal zone must be terminated.

Finally, we would like to draw your attention to the fact that as of close of business on Sunday, April 7, the State of California had issued **651 Provisional Licenses** statewide since late February--411 Adult Use Provisional Licenses, and 240 Medicinal Provisional licenses, all valid for another year. Of those, **244 Adult Use provisional licenses and 26 "Medicinal Provisional" licenses were issued to Santa Barbara County growers, the majority in Carpinteria. This comprises approximately 60% of the total** issued Statewide. We have attached the public list, available at the CDFA website, for your reference.

We are puzzled about how the County could have authorized the issuance by the State of these Provisional licenses when none of the sites have actually gone through the County permitting and licensing process-- in fact, most have incomplete applications, according to the County Planning website. Some of these locations and business names do not even exist in the County planning public website. We ask that you direct staff to review the completeness of land use applications and CEQA review **prior** to informing the State that a grower is eligible for a Provisional license.

Supervisors, we implore you to take the actions necessary to insure that your **stated** intent to mitigate the impacts of unpermitted cannabis operations is addressed **immediately**. Please incorporate the language we provided you last week, enumerated above!

Thank you.  
SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis

**Lenzi, Chelsea**

---

**From:** Elena Demeyer <eomdr@verizon.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 9, 2019 9:44 AM  
**To:** concernedcarpinterians@gmail.com; Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob  
**Subject:** I second the letter from SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis

**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.**

**TO:** dwilliams@countyofsb.org, ghart@countyofsb.org, jhartmann@countyofsb.org, peter.adam@countyofsb.org, steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org, sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us  
**CC:** concernedcarpinterians@gmail.com

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to you in my capacity as a private citizen and as a concerned Carpenterian. I wanted to express my strong support for the letter sent to you from the Santa Barbara Coalition for Responsible Cannabis (excerpted below), as well as talk a bit about what I'm seeing here locally.

I spoke with your County representative (when attempting to make an odor nuisance complaint). I was informed that they can't really enforce any odor on the violating property because they were under a temporary license, that I would have to wait until the temporary expired and they were applying for their annual license to make any complaint they could investigate. Now, the holders of temporary licenses are going to get Provisional Licenses? So they can continue violating my home and neighborhood's air quality and drag their feet and rake as much money as they can before they realize that they never truly could comply with the proper equipment to run an odorless system? That's ridiculous. Imagine if a builder could operate that way, or a restaurant with a temporary license meanwhile selling to customers without fully being compliant? Or a doctor performing operations before he's fully licensed -- would you give him a temporary license? I see residential building projects grounded for long periods of time, because towners just can't come up with the way to satisfy the strict building codes and permits yet. If Cannabis companies want to do business, they need to plan ahead and come up with the required infrastructure before they can be open for business (which includes growing, not simply selling). Carpinteria residents are trying to be patient, but this is not being handled as a business should, one that operates while also protecting those at risk of harm.

By the way, some growers are rumored as bragging that they are going to get as much as they can get before they get shut down. By then, they would have grown enough and gotten enough money to move on to another business. They really don't care if they end up with a fully compliant annual license. I realize that this is only a small portion of the growers, but these growers are also the offending ones (the same ones that can't be enforced).

It's not that complicated. Think of attorneys, , if you don't pass the State Bar, you can't practice law. You don't get to practice a bit until you are prepared to take the test. We need straight rules and hard expiry dates. Otherwise, you just need to put your business on hold until you are in compliance. In the very least, businesses need to show compliance to get Provisional Licenses. I actually voted to legalize cannabis, expecting that it would be fully regulated from start to finish. What's going on here in the Carpinteria valley is truly disappointing. Out of towners who love and visit Carp annually are laughing at the whole system. It is shameful. Please, please, let's get things moving forward, toward a system of rules and enforcement that is fair to our community.

Sincerely,

Elena De Meyer  
Concerned Carpinterian

---

LETTER FROM SB COALITION FOR RESPONSIBLE CANNABIS EXCERPTED  
BELOW:

Dear Supervisors,

Thank you for the opportunity last week to convey to you our Coalition's grave concerns about the impact of the County's Cannabis Ordinances (both land use and licensing) on the quality of life for County residents. We appreciate your response to our request to combine the two agenda items on April 2, 2019 concerning cannabis.

We appreciate that the majority of you, in particular Supervisor Adam, seem to acknowledge the unrelenting impacts that the "legal" non-conforming and unregulated cannabis cultivation sites continue to inflict upon residents and communities ranging from Tepesquet to Carpinteria.

Unfortunately, the proposed amendments to the Cannabis Ordinance, A-13, do not address the crux of the issue, which is the continued acceptance on the part of the county of these nonconforming and in most cases expanded uses. ***We request that***

***you revise and further amend the ordinance so it does not imply the nonconforming uses can continue.***

Here are pertinent excerpts, enumerated and excerpted from the letter we sent to you last week [attached]. We continue to request that you amend the ordinance to include these important actions:

- 2. The Board should direct staff to review and investigate unlawful expansions and changes to those grows determined to be Legal Nonconforming Uses, and terminate them.***
- 3. The Board should clarify that only those legitimately designated and continuing nonconforming uses which have an application called complete for processing under the Land Use and Development Code (LUDC) and Article II by P&D prior to 2016 should be processed.***
- 4. For all applications which have not been called complete by P&D, the Board should direct staff to order termination of nonconforming uses as of the dates described in the ordinance.***

We also urge you and your staff to be cognizant of the fact that both Article II and the LUDC provide:

“Upon recommendation of the Planning Commission, or upon petition by a person or persons affected by a nonconforming use of buildings or land or both, or on its own initiative, the Board of Supervisors may set a date for, and call a public hearing to determine whether or not a nonconforming use of land or buildings or both, or an unpermitted expansion of or change in such use should not be ordered terminated.”

***We continue to request that the Board acknowledge that this specific rule applies to cannabis grows under the Nonconforming Use provisions of Section 1003*** (which was not certified by the Coastal Commission to apply in the coastal zone in the first place, because it is outside of the LCP). Any unpermitted expansion or change in a nonconforming use, both within and outside of the coastal zone must be terminated.

Finally, we would like to draw your attention to the fact that as of close of business on Sunday, April 7, the State of California had issued **651 Provisional Licenses** statewide since late February--411 Adult Use Provisional Licenses, and 240 Medicinal Provisional licenses, all valid for another year. Of those, **244 Adult Use provisional licenses and 26 "Medicinal Provisional" licenses were issued to Santa Barbara County growers, the majority in Carpinteria. This comprises approximately 60% of the total** issued Statewide. We have attached the public list, available at the CDFA website, for your reference.

We are puzzled about how the County could have authorized the issuance by the State of these Provisional licenses when none of the sites have actually gone through the

County permitting and licensing process-- in fact, most have incomplete applications, according to the County Planning website. Some of these locations and business names do not even exist in the County planning public website. We ask that you direct staff to review the completeness of land use applications and CEQA review **prior** to informing the State that a grower is eligible for a Provisional license.

Supervisors, we implore you to take the actions necessary to insure that your **stated** intent to mitigate the impacts of unpermitted cannabis operations is addressed **immediately**. Please incorporate the language we provided you last week, enumerated above!

Thank you.  
SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis

**Lenzi, Chelsea**

---

**From:** Judy Dean <judycathryndean@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 9, 2019 9:56 AM  
**To:** Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob  
**Subject:** cannabis grower abuses

**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,

I am writing to implore your leadership in dealing with the worsening cannabis crisis in Santa Barbara County in general, and Carpinteria, (where I live) particularly.

Traffic and jay-walking on Cravens Lane are increasing, and will sooner or later lead to an accident or death. Noxious odors continue. I see more and more people coming into my neighborhood who appear to be either wandering or surveying the cannabis grows. Fences, barriers, cameras, and other visual blight continue to appear on about a weekly basis.

You were given an excellent road map for stopping most if not all of this by the SB Coalition for responsible cannabis. Please adopt its provisions immediately. You are not protecting our citizens or our quality of life by sitting back and letting things unfold as they are. The number of State provisional licenses issued recently for our County is unconscionable. How can you let this happen?.

Judy Dean MD



Lenzi, Chelsea

---

**From:** Kenneth L. Kraus <KKraus@loeb.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 9, 2019 11:19 AM  
**To:** Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob  
**Cc:** concernedcarpinterians@gmail.com  
**Subject:** I second the letter from SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis

**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.**

I am a longtime resident of Carpinteria and am greatly concerned about all the cannabis growing taking place in our wonderful town. Needless to say, this is not what I had in mind when my wife and I chose Carpinteria, over many other places we considered in California, as where we wanted to live out the rest of our years. Accordingly, my wife and I are looking to you, our elected officials, not to let the pot industry destroy all the things that make Carpinteria so special, and we are paying close attention to what you now do. Please don't let us down.

Ken Kraus and Perry Gibson

LETTER FROM SB COALITION FOR RESPONSIBLE CANNABIS EXCERPTED BELOW:

Dear Supervisors,

Thank you for the opportunity last week to convey to you our Coalition's grave concerns about the impact of the County's Cannabis Ordinances (both land use and licensing) on the quality of life for County residents. We appreciate your response to our request to combine the two agenda items on April 2, 2019 concerning cannabis.

We appreciate that the majority of you, in particular Supervisor Adam, seem to acknowledge the unrelenting impacts that the "legal" non-conforming and unregulated cannabis cultivation sites continue to inflict upon residents and communities ranging from Tepesquet to Carpinteria.

Unfortunately, the proposed amendments to the Cannabis Ordinance, A-13, do not address the crux of the issue, which is the continued acceptance on the part of the county of these nonconforming and in most cases expanded uses. ***We request that***

***you revise and further amend the ordinance so it does not imply the nonconforming uses can continue.***

Here are pertinent excerpts, enumerated and excerpted from the letter we sent to you last week [attached]. We continue to request that you amend the ordinance to include these important actions:

***2. The Board should direct staff to review and investigate unlawful expansions and changes to those grows determined to be Legal Nonconforming Uses, and terminate them.***

***3. The Board should clarify that only those legitimately designated and continuing nonconforming uses which have an application called complete for processing under the Land Use and Development Code (LUDC) and Article II by P&D prior to 2016 should be processed.***

***4. For all applications which have not been called complete by P&D, the Board should direct staff to order termination of nonconforming uses as of the dates described in the ordinance.***

We also urge you and your staff to be cognizant of the fact that both Article II and the LUDC provide:

“Upon recommendation of the Planning Commission, or upon petition by a person or persons affected by a nonconforming use of buildings or land or both, or on its own initiative, the Board of Supervisors may set a date for, and call a public hearing to determine whether or not a nonconforming use of land or buildings or both, or an unpermitted expansion of or change in such use should not be ordered terminated.”

***We continue to request that the Board acknowledge that this specific rule applies to cannabis grows under the Nonconforming Use provisions of Section 1003*** (which was not certified by the Coastal Commission to apply in the coastal zone in the first place, because it is outside of the LCP). Any unpermitted expansion or change in a nonconforming use, both within and outside of the coastal zone must be terminated.

Finally, we would like to draw your attention to the fact that as of close of business on Sunday, April 7, the State of California had issued **651 Provisional Licenses** statewide since late February--411 Adult Use Provisional Licenses, and 240 Medicinal Provisional licenses, all valid for another year. Of those, **244 Adult Use provisional licenses and 26 "Medicinal Provisional" licenses were issued to Santa Barbara County growers, the majority in Carpinteria. This comprises approximately 60% of the total** issued Statewide. We have attached the public list, available at the CDFA website, for your reference.

We are puzzled about how the County could have authorized the issuance by the State of these Provisional licenses when none of the sites have actually gone through the

County permitting and licensing process-- in fact, most have incomplete applications, according to the County Planning website. Some of these locations and business names do not even exist in the County planning public website. We ask that you direct staff to review the completeness of land use applications and CEQA review **prior** to informing the State that a grower is eligible for a Provisional license.

Supervisors, we implore you to take the actions necessary to insure that your **stated** intent to mitigate the impacts of unpermitted cannabis operations is addressed **immediately**. Please incorporate the language we provided you last week, enumerated above!

Thank you.  
SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis

---

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail transmission, and any documents, files or previous e-mail messages attached to it may contain confidential information that is legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of any of the information contained in or attached to this transmission is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify the sender. Please destroy the original transmission and its attachments without reading or saving in any manner. Thank you, Loeb & Loeb LLP.

---

**Lenzi, Chelsea**

---

**From:** Gail Herson <devesi@me.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 9, 2019 12:34 PM  
**To:** Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob  
**Subject:** My personal Support for letter from SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis

**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,

Thank you so much for your constant efforts to support and take care of us, your constituents. It was so evident at the last meeting I attended that you put your hearts and minds and resources into doing your very best to help.

I live in Carpinteria, and am still so very concerned and worried about the Cannabis situation here. Despite your tireless efforts, things are not yet getting better. My life's savings are tied up in my tiny avocado ranch, I retired here for fresh air and a good investment and despite all my hard work at this advanced age on my farm, I am at risk for losing both. Truly, the quality of my older years are in your hands.

Would you please read the letter I copied onto this email? It is from the Santa Barbara Coalition for Responsible Cannabis. Their letter strongly reflects my concerns and what I know you can do to save us from this growing disaster.

I'd also like to alert you to my concerns about the unintended consequences that are arising from the odor masking technology you have encouraged. Not only is it not working-just drive down Casitas Pass and smell the stench, but also we have no research on the long term effects of spraying the masking solution into the air on people, animals, plants, nature. And people hate the smell of the masking agent. Carpinteria used to smell so wonderful. Now, people who are physically sensitive to the terpenes in the masking agent, like I am, are subject to headaches and face autoimmune responses. While there may be not be acute immediate reactions documented to these, you have no idea the cumulative effect of breathing this, night and day, every day on the nervous system over time. How shortsighted to mask instead of scrub. The emulsifier used in the solution is documented to create health effects.

Please bring back our little Eden!

Thank you so much, I am so grateful for your efforts,  
Gail Herson

LETTER FROM SB COALITION FOR RESPONSIBLE CANNABIS EXCERPTED BELOW:

Dear Supervisors,

Thank you for the opportunity last week to convey to you our Coalition's grave concerns about the impact of the County's Cannabis Ordinances (both land use and licensing) on the quality of life for County residents. We appreciate your response to our request to combine the two agenda items on April 2, 2019 concerning cannabis.

We appreciate that the majority of you, in particular Supervisor Adam, seem to acknowledge the unrelenting impacts that the "legal" non-conforming and unregulated cannabis cultivation sites continue to inflict upon residents and communities ranging from Tepesquet to Carpinteria.

Unfortunately, the proposed amendments to the Cannabis Ordinance, A-13, do not address the crux of the issue, which is the continued acceptance on the part of the county of these nonconforming and in most cases expanded uses. *We request that you revise and further amend the ordinance so it does not imply the nonconforming uses can continue.*

Here are pertinent excerpts, enumerated and excerpted from the letter we sent to you last week [attached]. We continue to request that you amend the ordinance to include these important actions:

- 2. The Board should direct staff to review and investigate unlawful expansions and changes to those grows determined to be Legal Nonconforming Uses, and terminate them.*
- 3. The Board should clarify that only those legitimately designated and continuing nonconforming uses which have an application called complete for processing under the Land Use and Development Code (LUDC) and Article II by P&D prior to 2016 should be processed.*
- 4. For all applications which have not been called complete by P&D, the Board should direct staff to order termination of nonconforming uses as of the dates described in the ordinance.*

**We also urge you and your staff to be cognizant of the fact that both Article II and the LUDC provide:** "Upon recommendation of the Planning Commission, or upon petition by a person or persons affected by a nonconforming use of buildings or land or both, or on its own initiative, the Board of Supervisors may set a date for, and call a public hearing to determine whether or not a nonconforming use of land or buildings or both, or an unpermitted expansion of or change in such use should not be ordered terminated."

*We continue to request that the Board acknowledge that this specific rule applies to cannabis grows under the Nonconforming Use provisions of Section 1003 (which was not certified by the Coastal Commission to apply in the coastal zone in the first place, because it is outside of the LCP). Any unpermitted expansion or change in a nonconforming use, both within and outside of the coastal zone must be terminated.*

Finally, we would like to draw your attention to the fact that as of close of business on Sunday, April 7, the State of California had issued **651 Provisional Licenses** statewide since late February--411 Adult Use Provisional Licenses, and 240 Medicinal Provisional licenses, all valid for another year. Of those, **244 Adult Use provisional licenses and 26 "Medicinal Provisional" licenses were issued to Santa Barbara County growers, the majority in Carpinteria. This comprises approximately 60% of the total issued Statewide.** We have attached the public list, available at the CDFA website, for your reference.

We are puzzled about how the County could have authorized the issuance by the State of these Provisional licenses when none of the sites have actually gone through the County permitting and licensing process-- in

fact, most have incomplete applications, according to the County Planning website. Some of these locations and business names do not even exist in the County planning public website. We ask that you direct staff to review the completeness of land use applications and CEQA review *prior* to informing the State that a grower is eligible for a Provisional license.

Supervisors, we implore you to take the actions necessary to insure that your *stated* intent to mitigate the impacts of unpermitted cannabis operations is addressed **immediately**. Please incorporate the language we provided you last week, enumerated above!

Thank you.

SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis