

LATE
DIST

#6

Alexander, Jacquelyne **Group 2**

From: susan belloni <susanbelloni@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 8, 2019 4:38 PM
To: Lavagnino, Steve; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Das Williams; Hart, Gregg
Cc: sbcob
Subject: Hoop Structure Concerns for the April 9 Hearing

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 Chair Lavagnino and Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to stand up for local control and the SYV Community Plan. Recently, I wrote this letter to the editor below. It was in the Santa Maria Times, the SYV News and The Independent. It points out that the people who live here wanted local control and used the County’s Community Plan and Overlay processes to achieve it.

Letter to the editor:

“Recently, hundreds of people from Santa Barbara, Goleta and beyond signed a petition arguing that unregulated agricultural hoop structures 20’ or less, usually used for berry crops but now used for cannabis, should be allowed in the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan’s Design Overlay along our main scenic highways. Farmers have lived in the Design Overlay for years, but suddenly people from out of town and hoop farmers are clamoring to undo its protections?

What people probably don’t know is cannabis farmers are not protected by the Right to Farm Ordinance and that SB County is the ONLY County in the State that allows unlimited acreage for cannabis. If the petition signers worry about having enough cannabis, there is already more produced in California than we can consume. Cannabis does not need to be commercially grown everywhere in the County and the County can lawfully limit where and how it is grown.

If you haven’t read the County’s SYV Community Plan, one of its primary goals is to preserve the valley’s rural character. One of the ways to achieve that goal is to have a Design Overlay along our scenic highways.

As a renowned tourist destination, it would be foolish to add synthetic, bright white plastic 20’ high hoop structures along our scenic highways. Tourism is an important source of income for many businesses. Residents and visitors come to enjoy our rural, not our industrial, character.

Within the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan are 2/3rds of the County’s Ag 1 five and ten acre parcels. It wasn’t designed for industrial scale hoop farming. To have so many people outside of the area demanding it here makes me think they don’t know about the policy and goals in the SYVCP and the Design Overlay or that it was created by the people who live in the valley and it has been County policy for a decade.”

#####

We have not asked for a ban on hoops, we are willing to compromise. We ask you to **please respect our Overlay because we see it as local control**. It’s puzzling that there are those who would agree with local control as a philosophy and at the same time disagree with Community Plans and Overlays developed by the people who live there. Every area has different topography, business, residential needs and desires that need to be respected by other areas.

Lastly, we are trying to keep our beautiful country landscape intact for the residents and for the tourist industry that provides a lot of jobs here.

Here are some tourism statistics:

- The Chumash said they had about 3.75 million tourists at the casino in 2017 .
- Solvang has for years said they get about 1.5 million mostly day visitors that don't overlap with the casino.
- The Santa Barbara Vintners said they estimate they bring in about 2 million visits to the County.
- Adding in up, it's 7.25 million visitors! (minus unknown winery visits outside SYV and an unknown overlap).
- For comparison, Hawaii had a banner year in 2015 with 8.6 million tourists. My sources are in the footnotes.

Our tourist industry depends heavily on our beautiful rural character and our natural views. **Please respect them.** Thank you!

Sincerely,

Susan Belloni

Solvang

Footnotes:

1. In a 1.24.2018 Santa Maria Times article the Chumash said: "...total visitation rose from 2.8 million patrons to a projected 3.75 million last year."

https://santamariatimes.com/news/local/govt-and-politics/economic-impacts-of-chumash-casino-expansion-detailed/article_449c877e-24a9-51a0-984d-67faa6341500.html

2.The SB Vintners said in a Jan. 12, 2016 article; "Tourism was estimated at 860,000 visitors who made a total of 2 million visits to county wineries and wine events."

https://santamariatimes.com/news/local/report-wine-industry-worth-b-to-santa-barbara-county/article_cafcdda1-9bda-55ff-bf2a-ed73e5308f1f.html

3. Solvang says they get 1.5 million mostly day visitors per year and little overlap with the casino.

http://solvang.s3.amazonaws.com/digital_files/514/2011-2012-solvang-visitor-survey-summary.pdf

CA international visitor spending comes in at \$25.2 Billion and agriculture is \$20.69 Billion.<https://indd.adobe.com/view/c6d6dfd8-4b53-412d-a973-a30f7852b642>

4. For comparison, Hawaii had a banner year in 2015 with 8.6 million tourists and a 1.4 million population.

[http://www.hawaii tourism authority.org/default/assets/File/research/monthly-visitors/December%202015%20\(FINAL2\).pdf](http://www.hawaii tourism authority.org/default/assets/File/research/monthly-visitors/December%202015%20(FINAL2).pdf)

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: sbcob
Subject: FW: Public Comment
Attachments: Letter to BOS re Hoops, Lic. 4.9.19.docx

From: Renee ONeill <chasingstar2701@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 8, 2019 5:14 PM
To: sbcob <sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>
Subject: Fw: Public Comment

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 County of Santa Barbara,

Attached, please find my Public Comment for BOS Cannabis/Hoop Hearing, April 9, 2019. Please do not include other communications... just the letter I attached. Thank You.

Warmest Regards,

Renée O'Neill

To: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
Cc: Santa Barbara County Planning Commissioners

April 9, 2019

Dear Supervisors,

Tepusquet Community supports the findings and recommendations of Attorneys, CRC and countywide residents that are opposed to current, ineffectual protections and biased cannabis ordinances. We support BOS or PC members who approve amending ordinances that remedy the many problematic issues, re our county's, 'escalating-cannabis-crisis.'

Short of reopening and adopting Staff's strict regulations, endorsed in 2017 PEIR, the following changes or amendments to current, 'prejudiced' ordinances should be revisited and include:

- Limit total number of Provisional/State Permits/Licenses, issued to entire SB County to 1,000 or less
- CAPS Limit of 3 Provisional/Permits/State Licenses, per parcel/site, (*not, per grower/LLC/etc.*)
- Limit Cultivation to 1-acre per parcel/site, regardless of zoning ordinances or size of parcel
- Limit Permit/License to ONE per grower/parcel/site - cultivation/manufacturing/dispensary/etc.
- Limit total number of hoops (3) and sq. footage (1,000), for a total of 3,000 sq. ft., on each site, regardless of parcel size

*****Amend Hoop Structure Ordinances** to clarify the significant differences between Cannabis Cultivation (Class I Impacts, identified in EIR) and Traditional AG Cultivation (No Class I impacts).

*****Clarify/Amend Ordinances** to stipulate that Cannabis does not qualify for *any* Exemptions that apply to traditional, Agricultural 'Crops.' The Cannabis EIR (1700000-0000-3) and Hoop EIR (17EIR-00000-0000-4) do not match and are inconsistent as to impacts and mitigation analysis.

Reverse/Amend decisions (*and support of cannabis industry*), by amending hoop ordinances:

-Prohibit Cannabis Cultivation in Hoop Structures. Period! (We requested this from the outset)

-Prohibit Hoop Structures in EDRN zones. There are only *Four* permits out of *76*, countywide

This mitigation is feasible, because it reflects less than 3% of county's total grow permits.

If you *will not/cannot* make these changes, then amend Hoop Structure Ordinances to restrict:

-Mitigate Class I Visual Impacts to maximize CEQA Requirements.

-Reduce slopes to 10% (traditional Ag); do not undermine PC's 20%, with BOS' unconscionable, increase to 30%

downgrading permit requirements from an LUP to a Zoning Clearance, and from a Development Plan to an LUP. These changes weaken or eliminate public noticing and the ability of decision makers to exercise needed discretion.

- Hoop structures, regardless of size, height, square footage, slope, etc., must require a Land Use Permit/Development Plan and/or CUP (depending on zoning), for all cannabis-related activities. This is 'Cannabis,' not Traditional Agriculture.

The Planning Commissioners' CEQA Findings are not supported by substantial evidence. They do not reflect the current crisis - an explosion of unabated, unregulated, unenforced, illicit cannabis industry. This may not have been anticipated by you but SB County residents, who are subjected, daily, to the devastating impacts of unabated, unenforced cannabis industry, are outraged!

John Dorwin's letter, re Tepusquet Canyon, was especially informative. We need you to review his findings and carefully consider his suggestions and/or recommendations. I will support his and other attorney's efforts to protect not only Tepusquet Community (and all EDRN's) but our entire county (strong emphasis added). If that means reopening/redoing the entire EIR and you insist that Staff, citizens, 'taxpayers' and you, go through to that grueling process again, then maybe, *this time*, you'll adopt Staff's comprehensive, well-thought-out, sensible, impartial recommendations they have continually brought before you... (*only to be rejected*), from the outset. Strong words but true.

Respectfully Submitted,

Renée O'Neill

Tepusquet Canyon Crisis Committee

Advocate with Fortitude... and/or *Attitude*, as needed

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Susan Ashbrook <sjashbrook@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 8, 2019 8:30 PM
To: sbcob; Adam, Peter; Nelson, Bob
Cc: Miyasato, Mona
Subject: Public Comment 4-9-2019

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,

Residents from Cebada Canyon have joined the fight against commercial cannabis grows on AG1 5 acres, AG1 10 acres, AG1 20 acres and EDRN's. Our canyon residents share a deep concern about commercial cannabis cultivation that we have felt and observed for over two years. While enforcement has shut down several growers, cannabis operators change names and LLC's and refile for permits.

Cebada Canyon will have at least 6 commercial cannabis grows applying for a CUP (Conditional Use Permit). We need YOUR help or the quiet lifestyle we love about our canyon will be changed forever.

You are aware of the ill effects of odor, fumes and respiratory problems, traffic safety on our rural roads, crime, increased fire hazard, environmental hazard caused by illegal grading. Two commercial grows in our canyon have been raided by law enforcement for lack of permits and lying on applications, yet they are already back in business. But there are a few more reasons why we are against commercial cannabis in Cebada Canyon:

- The County has no restrictions on the number of acres that can be cultivated per parcel. In other words, a neighbor can have hoop houses on their entire property.
- Use of generators 24 hours a day for security, drying, processing and lighting on grow sites is in front of the planning commission. With controlled lighting, growers are getting 4-6 crops a year. Noise, traffic and the "skunk" smell will be constant.
- Health and safety of residents and our environment is at stake as more data surfaces about the cannabis industry.
- Santa Barbara realtors are saying that properties near cannabis operations are falling out of escrow.

Please vote against commercial cannabis grows on AG1 5 acres, AG1 10 acres, AG1 20 acres and EDRN's before it's too late.

Susan Ashbrook and Derek McLeish