

Ramirez, Angelica

Public Comment - Group

#3

From: Anna Carrillo <annacarp@cox.net>
Sent: Sunday, September 12, 2021 5:11 PM
To: sbcob; Nelson, Bob; Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Hart, Gregg
Subject: Agenda Items #3, 4, 5 being heard on 9/14/21



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: Board of Supervisors
 From: Anna Carrillo
 September 12, 2021

I would like to make a few comments on the three cannabis items you will be discussing at the 9/14/21 Board of Supervisors' Meeting.

1. Please give the Planning and Development Dept. funds to be able to properly identify the source of odors. This is especially problematic in the Carpinteria area for those permitted and unpermitted cannabis operations located between Foothill Rd. and Via Real between Nidever and almost to Cravens Lane.

There is 1 fully permitted greenhouse cultivation site at 3561 Foothill Rd. which smells when one is near it, but P&D is unable to verify that that is the one as the source of the odor in the nearby La Mirada EDRN located nearby. When this operation was appealed in 2019, Planning Commissioner Michael Cooney added the following:

MONITORING: P&D compliance staff shall monitor implementation prior to Final Building Clearance and/or commencement of use, whichever occurs first. Permit Compliance staff has the authority to request additional measures necessary for corrective actions, provided at the cost of the Applicant, to verify compliance with the Odor Abatement Plan. Upon installation of the odor control system and quarterly thereafter for one year, Permit Compliance staff shall conduct an inspection of the odor control system to assess its compliance with the requirements of this condition and the approved Odor Abatement Plan. As part of each inspection, the County shall retain a professional engineer or certified industrial hygienist, at the applicant's expense, to certify that the Odor Abatement system, specification, operation and procedures has been installed, operating, and maintained as specified in the approved Odor Abatement Plan.

The required quarterly inspection is included in all the cannabis conditions of approval, but it has not occurred yet, even though this operation at 3561 Foothill Rd. has been operating for the last 2 years. Neighbors have been complaining for at least the last year. When I followed up to see whether the stated quarterly monitoring had been completed, I received the following May 5, 2021: "The compliance staff have visited the site to verify that the equipment is operational. However, we held off on conducting the Professional Engineer/Industrial Hygienist review as the condition placed on the project refers to the ordinance where the standard that 'no odors be experienced in residential zones...'; which would require offsite monitoring for cannabis odor in residential zones. Since there are three other unpermitted cannabis operations adjacent to G&K, the Professional Engineer/Industrial Hygienist has no method to determine where any cannabis odors originated. Holding the only permitted cannabis operation accountable for any cannabis odors that are present in the vicinity would be not supportable since there are other adjacent grows and there is not a method to trace an odor to a precise source. The Department is currently exploring other methods to determine effectiveness of the odor control systems. Full implementation of the condition will be possible when all four projects are permitted." Since that May email, there are now 5 cannabis operations in the neighborhood, some cultivating and some are newly permitted.

2. The 2nd part of the inspection was to occur during the annual business license review and according to my last request, even though the operator turned in his request for his business license renewal Nov. 2020, 8 months later it is still under review. Part of the business license renewal process looks at the odor complaints received.

3. In Carpinteria in this latest quarter there were 495 odor complaints received. That's the most I've heard of in any quarter. Since there are only 2 fully permitted cannabis cultivation sites out of the current 19 unpermitted and fully permitted sites, it's not surprising to state that most were from unpermitted grows. There SHOULD NOT BE ANY ODOR ISSUES FROM A FULLY PERMITTED SITE!

4. The residents in Carpinteria have been told for the last 4 years, once an operation is permitted, then the County can enforce on inadequate odor abatement systems, but now we are being told that WE HAVE TO WAIT UNTIL ALL THE NEIGHBORING OPERATIONS ARE PERMITTED. Please tell me what difference that is going to make as even if all 5 of the cannabis operations located near La Mirada are permitted, how is the County going to be able to tell which operation is causing the problem?

5. There is a problem with notifications of residents within 1000' of a cannabis operation. In the Coastal Zone, if some of the residents of an EDRN are notified, all need to be notified as they are all affected even those residing further away than 1000', especially those living in the hill looking down on the cannabis cultivation greenhouses on the flat area below them. The ocean breezes blow it right up the hill.

6. A resident in La Mirada just wrote me: "I still smell cannabis every time I drive to and from my home. Always on Foothill at 3561 and sometimes at 3615. But I do smell it on lower Paquita too and at my house often between around 5:30 am lately. It comes into my bedroom window and wakes me up. There are other times if I leave my garage open it can linger there. Not sure what time it arrived. Until the county is able to enforce it would be nice to ask for a moratorium on new permits. At one point one of the county people said that "if they stand on the property line and smell it they know where it is coming from. Well stand on the 3561 property line. No need to wait until others around get permits. Stop it there and then see what happens when the next place comes on line." I also just heard from a Padaro Lane resident and a Polo Field resident complaining of odors.

7. I support requiring CUPs for the Santa Rita Hills AVA, but I would also like that to occur in Carpinteria. In our very small valley with greenhouses located on two 4 mile stretches of roadways, we are being inundated with 10 new operations either expanding or being completely new. This is in addition to the current 19 growing with provisionals (2-3 received their CDPs, but have been appealed).

8. I've heard that some of our greenhouse operations in Carpinteria will be incorporating carbon filtration systems in their cultivation sites but the County needs to make this a requirement. The air needs to be scrubbed clean before the vents are opened to disrupt residents' lives. We've heard too long about the health issues for some from inhaling both the cannabis and the Byers vapor phase system. It's not fair for residents to have to buy expensive air purifier systems in order to counteract the cannabis odors or the added vapors put into their homes and Carpinteria air from the odor abatement system used.

9. I support joining the California Cannabis Authority. This is about time. I had been promised a long time ago the county would have access to the Track and Trace system but I see now that that never occurred. It will be good when the county receives information from the state. When I look at the CDFA site, I've seen very sloppy work entered by some operators, using incorrect addresses, wrong zip codes.

10. When an appeal is withdrawn there needs to be some public acknowledgement of why the appeal was withdrawn. This was brought up at a 7/28/21 Planning Commission meeting.

Please protect your residents here in Carpinteria and elsewhere.

Thank you,
Anna Carrillo

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Renee O'Neill <chasingstar2701@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 12, 2021 5:21 PM
To: sbcob; Nelson, Bob; Hartmann, Joan; Hart, Gregg; Lavagnino, Steve; Williams, Das
Cc: Villalobos, David; Larry Ferini; Michael Cooney; John Parke; Laura Bridley; Dan Blough;
Subject: SBCRC; Concerned Carpentarians; Blair Pence; Marc Chytilo; Linda Krop
Attachments: Public Comment for D-3 and D-4
BOS re Agenda items D-3 and D-4 9-14-21.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 one-page letter to submit for public comment on both Agenda Items, D-3 and D-4. I plan to attend and speak on both these agenda items.

Respectfully Submitted,

Renée O'Neill

September 12, 2021

To: The Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
Cc: The Santa Barbara County Planning Commissioners
Re: Agenda Items D-3 and D-4,

Honorable Chair Nelson and Supervisors,

I am writing to support the excellent recommendations that were submitted by the Santa Barbara Coalition for Responsible Cannabis and Linda Krop, re Agenda Items D-3 and D-4. In addition, I wish to support all public comments that encourage the Board to mitigate Significant, Negative Class-I Impacts that were identified in the initial, 2017 PEIR but not accepted or implemented, in the Final PEIR.

When I consider the meetings I've attended, since 2017, the letters/speeches/presentations I've submitted and the work our County Planning and Development Department and Board of Supervisors have done to navigate through this convoluted process, I believe we are making progress in some areas.

1. We have developed a set of ordinances that establish where and how cannabis can be grown.
2. More recently, we have set limits on the number of acres that can be cultivated in our County and number of licenses issued.
3. We continue to identify problems and fine-tune ordinances by making revisions that mitigate some of the ongoing concerns.

They say, "Hindsight is always 20/20." Had we been aware of the disastrous consequences that commercial cannabis would inflict on our beautiful, serene County, we would have voted, "NO, on Prop 64!" We must now strive to resolve and possibly reverse some of the existing ordinances, to remedy flawed regulations.

1. Require CUPs for all outdoor cannabis operations.
2. Reduce the CAP and total number of licenses issued. SBC is growing more pot than our entire state can consume, *legally!* This is evidenced by the number of illegal and/or deceitful growers who continue to develop/operate/profit, without paying cannabis taxes at all or their fair share.
3. I commend our P&D and Enforcement Team for the results they have achieved, knowing full well that they would be much more effective had our BOS granted them the essential resources and staffing they desperately needed, at the outset and are still lacking, today (emphasis added).
4. Prohibit commercial cannabis development in regions where it compromises residents, vineyards, scenic lands and threatens natural resources.
5. Adopt all SIX recommendations submitted by the SBCRC and Linda Krop's sound proposals.

We have been requesting that the Board resolve other problems, as well, by doing the following:

1. Revise the EDRN language to include additional, protective clauses, 'Prohibit commercial cannabis within ... adjacent to and accessed through...'
2. Hire an additional Cannabis Enforcement Team and P&D staff to effectively enforce and oversee all cannabis regulations and permit processes.
3. Increase penalties on non-compliant growers. They are well aware that it is easier to flout the laws and pay minimal fines, than to comply.

In time, we may be able to resolve some of these challenges but not unless the Board makes a commitment to fully support revising ordinances to better protect residents, rural neighborhoods, scenic lands, natural resources, vineyard owners and other businesses that generate genuine revenue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Renée O'Neill

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Theresa Reilly <tree101@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 12, 2021 9:26 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: 9/14/2021 BOS D3 Zoning Ordinance Amendments Public Comment
Attachments: CannabisComments9.14.2021BOS.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.

Attached please find my letter with Public Comment for the 9/14/2021 SB County Board of Supervisors meeting to be entered into the public record regarding consideration of Cannabis Ordinance Amendments. Thank you.

Theresa Reilly

Sent from Outlook

September 12, 2021

Attn: Chairman Bob Nelson & Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors

Re: Items #D3 & D4 September 14, 2021, Cannabis Permitting Ordinance Amendments

Dear Chair Nelson and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

As I draft this letter, I opened the windows of my home in western Buellton hoping to capture the cool evening breeze blowing in from the west. Instead, I am breathing in cannabis odors signaling another harvest season has begun. In May and June of 2021, the city of Buellton and surrounding areas suffered from the stench of skunk along with irritation of the eyes, sinuses, and lungs. I regularly drive north on Highway 101 from Santa Barbara at night, and for the past several weeks have been assaulted by the pungent odors emanating from Nojoqui Farms as I descend from the Nojoqui grade and again when exiting at Santa Rosa Road. The ensuing irritation of my senses is a driving distraction. In October 2020, the odors were horrendous for weeks during the hottest, driest time of the year.

As an environmentally sensitive individual, cannabis produces not just an “odor”, but is a chemical irritant affecting my health and well-being. I speak for friends, neighbors, families, and colleagues who share the same experiences but find it daunting to try to do anything about it. Because we already have so many farms surrounding us and stretching westward to Lompoc, it is exceptionally difficult to pinpoint any particular farm in order to file a county complaint complete with an address and APN#.

The amount of cannabis acreage planned between Buellton and Lompoc is alarming, especially without any odor control requirements in place. I am heartened by the progress made with odor control in Carpinteria, an area with limited acreage contained in greenhouses using carbon scrubbers and terpene monitors. It is unfathomable that the County can consider hundreds of acres of open-air cannabis cultivation along an over-drafted river watershed, renowned AVA growing area, schools, parks, residential areas, and tourist destinations along a major highway. It is ironic that the county can ban plastic straws and single-use plastic bags but allow acres of unsightly plastic-covered hoops. I hope a sustainable alternative can be developed which helps to contain odors, perhaps made of hemp or another natural material which can be used as mulch after its season.

I urge you to amend current AG II ordinances to limit cannabis cultivation acreage; increase buffer zones from cities, schools, parks, homes, and businesses; require CUPs and Odor Abatement Plans; determine groundwater and well water impacts; monitor terpene levels and support research into their effects on plants, animals, and people. Locals need to be able to determine which farms are harvesting and processing cannabis to better monitor and file complaints as needed. It is time to rethink the policies in place so that growers, residents, vintners, and visitors can co-exist comfortably. Current policies are not acceptable – Now is the opportunity to change course.

Sincerely,

Theresa Reilly

Buellton Resident

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Mary Ellen Brooks <mebrooks@sbceo.org>
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 6:48 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public Comment for BOS 9/14 Items #3 and #4
Attachments: CPA Cannabis updates 9-14.docx; 2018 CPA Cannabis Ordinance- BOS.pdf; ATT00001.txt

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 Clerk: Please distribute this letter to the five supervisors. I have attached a letter written in 2018 that is referenced in the current letter. Could you please make sure both items are delivered to the supervisors as part of the same e-mail?



September 13, 2021

To: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors

RE: 9/14/21 Agenda items 3 & 4 re Cannabis Ordinance amendments, and licensing update

Dear Board members:

CPA was established in 1960 as a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization to educate the public in Santa Barbara County on the environmental and planning issues paramount to our communities and neighborhoods, and to encourage both the County and City of Santa Barbara to develop and adopt General Plans, and to protect Santa Barbara County's cherished quality of life.

Consistent with that mission, we strongly urge you to direct staff to initiate the process of Cannabis Ordinance Amendments that will better protect neighborhoods, preserve the unique features of the Santa Rita Hills, and possibly further limit the size and number of cannabis grows and enhance noticing requirements. We respectfully request that the amendment process not be limited only to inland areas. The disparate zoning that offers less protection in coastal neighborhoods than inland must also be corrected.

In 2018, prior to your Board's adoption of the Cannabis Ordinance, Citizens Planning Association submitted a letter [attached] urging the Board to impose reasonable limits on acreage and licenses, CUPs on AG 2, raise the standards for odor abatement, and not allow manufacturing in Ag 1. We made several other recommendations with the goal of balancing "*community interests with reasonable regulation of the cannabis industry*". The past few years have revealed significant environmental and neighborhood impacts of the Cannabis ordinance.

CPA has existed for over 50 years, advocating for good planning on matters of housing, transportation, agriculture and community engagement within all regions of Santa Barbara County. We do so without animosity towards any of those commodities, including commercial cannabis. We are merely advocating for our objectives which include a goal to:

“protect the unmatched natural assets of Santa Barbara County and advocate for appropriate management and stewardship”.

In that spirit we reiterate our request that you direct staff to initiate the process for amendments to the County’s Cannabis Ordinance as contained in the LUDC and Article II.

Sincerely,

Marell Brooks, CPA President

916 Anacapa St.

Santa Barbara, CA 93101



RE: Cannabis Ordinance

February 5, 2018

Dear Chair William and Supervisors:

Citizens Planning Association has promoted a sustainable community and enforcement of existing zoning regulations for more than 50 years. We have reviewed the staff report and viewed the video of the Planning Commission hearing regarding the proposed cannabis ordinance and would like to make the following comments.

CPA supports a sensible cannabis ordinance that balances community interests with reasonable regulation of cannabis production. CPA notices and the EIR recognizes the ordinance will have a number of Class 1 impacts on air quality, transportation, and prime soils in Santa Barbara County.

CPA supports **requiring a CUP (Conditional Use Permit) for all AG II Zoning**. Cultivation of cannabis crops is a more intensive agricultural operation that will require many more employees than now using the roadways. Additional traffic will be required to support the manufacturing, distribution, and delivery licenses. Unfortunately, the lands most suitable for cultivation are close to residential properties, not high up on the hillsides. **More thorough review** is needed in these foothill agricultural areas near residential zoning.

Traffic is just one issue that will affect such neighborhoods. Other negative impacts might include skunky odors, increased noise from trucks and generators and from associated cannabis “tourism”.

CPA would like to see a high standard for application of the county’s **Odor Abatement Control Plan** which will protect the neighborhoods not only adjacent to the AG II fields but further away. Buffers from any cannabis activities should be considered for residential properties adjacent to County agricultural lands. The extra scrutiny of a CUP for cannabis activities located on these AG II parcels will hopefully offer protections for these adjacent neighborhoods.

Of great concern is the allowance in the County’s cannabis ordinance for volatile manufacturing. CPA would like to see a **Prohibition of Volatile Manufacturing** on all AG 1 and Ag II parcels. Volatile manufacturing belongs in industrial areas located in the urban areas, not on fire-prone hillsides. The manufacture of cannabis products is allowed in the County’s manufacturing zone district and this should be the only zone district where it is allowed in Santa Barbara County.

CPA would like to also see a **prohibition provision of volatile manufacturing in residential areas**. In the past, several fires have been started in people's illegal grow set ups.

CPA has concerns that the recommendation before you today has not been thoroughly vetted by the public or by the decision-makers. CPA believes the recommendation that is now before the Board has certain weaknesses:

It is more lax than all the neighboring counties' cannabis regulations, which might result in more cannabis operations and associated adverse impacts in our County.

It allows an unlimited number of commercial cannabis operations within the County. Currently it is being proposed that there be no limit on the number of cannabis businesses that can operate in the County. Other counties/cities have capped the number of cannabis businesses they will allow in their area.

It only requires odors to be reduced if they impact residential zones.

It allows indoor and outdoor cannabis cultivation and cannabis manufacturing in Ag-1 zones, which could be near schools and residential areas.

By allowing outdoor cultivation and manufacturing in Ag-1 zones, the proposed ordinance will legalize operations and allow cannabis businesses to locate in close proximity to schools and residences. CPA believes the County's Odor Abatement requirements must apply in all zones and to all sensitive receptors (schools, day care, places where minors congregate), not just to odors experienced within residential zones.

We agree with the Planning Commission that the setback from schools should be increased to 1000 feet in the Coastal Zone to reduce the identified impacts on schools. Schools and other impacted parties should also be notified before the County issues a new cannabis permit. We also support the suggestions made in the Cate School letter which details the negative impacts to their campus.

Staff has analyzed two alternatives that would result in substantial reductions in the severity of many impacts by: (1) Excluding cannabis activities from the Ag-1 zone district (Alternative 1): and (2) Limiting the number of licenses that the County will issue (Alternative 3). CPA recommends that the County adopt Alternatives 1 and 3 in an effort to mitigate the Class 1 impacts.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Ellen Brooks
Executive Director, Citizens Planning Association, 916 Anacapa St. Santa Barbara 93101

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Sharyne Merritt <sbcountyneighbors@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 9:47 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Sept 14 meeting Cannabis controls

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.

Honorable Supervisors:

All recommended controls for the Santa Rita AVA should apply to all county AVA's.

Sharyne Merritt

Ramirez, Angelica

From: DENNIS PATRICK <dpatrick2100@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 10:08 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: County to re-open cannabis ordinance

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.

Clerk of the County Board of Supervisors

We are residents of the county and own Zaca Creek Ranch in Buellton CA. This ranch is comprised of 1600 acres of grazing land. Despite our low intensive use of the land, we have over the years been subjected to a number of rigorous county restrictions regarding where and how we build on and develop ranch. *We are not complaining.* By in large, those regulations, and the costs they impose on us, are necessary to preserve the beneficent use and enjoyment of the land for all who enjoy the Santa Ynez Valley.

We write today to express my surprise and disappointment that, inexplicably, the Board has been to date so inexcusably lax in its regulation of Cannabis grows in that same valley. The adverse “external effects” of cannabis, from odor to terpenes, is well documented and far exceeds the potential adverse external effects of various types of development the County does regulate.

We would *strongly* urge the Board to adopt the following policies:

Require CUPs for all outdoor grows. A CUP has been shown to be an appropriate and necessary level of permit to give County discretion to properly condition and control future project approvals.

Require Odor Abatement Plans (OAPs) for all outdoor grows. A requirement of OAPs for outdoor grows will drive needed technological improvements in odor control from outdoor grows. We now have the tools to measure odors, which is essential to identify improved odor control technologies and techniques.

Maintain and Enforce the Acreage Cap. The total acreage cap on cultivation must not be expanded. County ordinances should be amended to not allow continued cannabis permit processing after the cap has been met.

Direct Funding to Research and Mitigation. Research into the effect of cannabis terpenes on wine grapes is long overdue. Odor control strategies need to be tested and improved through research and development. The County needs to seek outside funding and provide matching funds to these two research priorities.

Sincerely,

Dennis Patrick and Hayley Firestone

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Brandon Gnekow <gnekow1@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 10:10 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Board of supervisors meeting regarding cannabis auto 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.

Please please require C UPS on all outdoor cannabish groves That is the proper way to monitor and control them

It is imperative that an odor abatement plan be part of every permit

Please enforce and don't expand the acreage cap and allow any new growth

very importantly the Turpin impact impact on the wine grapes must be researched and addressed

Sent from AOL Mobile Mail

Thank you so much

Pam and bill GNEKOW
Get the new AOL app: mail.mobile.aol.com

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Andy Caldwell <andy@colabsbc.org>
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 10:14 AM
To: sbcob
Cc: Lavagnino, Steve; Williams, Das; Nelson, Bob; Hart, Gregg; Williams, Das
Subject: Public Comment Long Range Planning Oil Industry Land Use Regs

Importance: High

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.

SBCOB
Agenda Comment Letter Item D-3
September 14, 2021

Chair Nelson and Members of the Board,

COLAB believes your board has a duty of due diligence to work with the regulated community in much the same manner as you work with environmental activists such as the EDC. As you are well aware, the EDC sent a letter asking the county to change rules and regulations affecting the oil industry and your board forwarded the item for consideration in the Long Range Work Plan without so much as a heads up to the oil industry. Considering such action without bothering to ask the industry what this means to them violates the basic concept of public service in light of your overwrought regard for special interest organizations such as the EDC. It is also a recipe for bad policy by way of the associated echo chamber of so-called "deliberation".

For instance, the EDC letter recommends that:

Oil Drilling and Production Plans must have a termination date. Chapter 35.53 of the County's Land Use & Development Code governs the filing requirements and procedures for the discretionary review of Oil Drilling and Production Plans. The intent of the requirements in Chapter 35.53 "is to ensure that impacts on natural resources from oil and gas drilling and production activities shall be minimized to the maximum extent feasible." Consistent with the purpose and intent of the Chapter, the County must include a provision for a termination date in Oil Drilling and Production Plans.

This policy proposal completely ignores the fact that the production rates of oil operations, to some degree, are determined by market prices, along with other variables, over time. In view of the fact that the county has an ongoing opportunity and responsibility to oversee operations, there is no need to terminate plans and start over. Let's be honest here. The EDC knows full well that the process for approval is a death knell to the oil industry (and any other business for that matter) and they want this provision enacted for this nefarious purpose. This provision applies to virtually no other industry via county regulations and violates the concept of equal protection and double indemnity!

A second request of the EDC has to do with "The definition for 'high risk operation' under Section 25-4 of the Petroleum Code must be strengthened given the serious threats that these operations pose to the environment and public safety". Would that include the County of Santa Barbara as it pertains to Toro Canyon? Seriously! The industry has been operating in this county for over 120 years and should be treated as such. It is not a high-risk business in most circumstances.

Finally, the EDC requests that "We urge the Board to direct staff to include these actions in the Work Program and encourage staff to consider additional activities undertaken in other jurisdictions, like the counties of Ventura and Los Angeles. Recently, the Ventura County Board of Supervisors voted to adopt new policies in its 2040 General Plan that may be a template for Santa Barbara County. For example, the County now requires new oil drilling to be located at least 1,500-feet from residences and 2,500-feet from schools." Would it not be helpful and reasonable for the county to first determine how many wells fall into this category, instead of shoot first and ask questions later?

Now, with regard to the big picture, our economy and society are still completely dependent upon fossil fuels. Yet, policy considerations such as these seek to sever production from consumption with nary a word about the consequences of the same. For instance, if you continue to shut down local production, what impact will that have on the economy and the environment? The push here is to go all electric and have that electricity generated by alternative sources such as wind and solar. But, that is a pipedream in the near future. Hence, the county's real mission statement should read "One County, One Future and Numerous Diesel Generators"!!!

Until you completely replace any and all gasoline and diesel vehicles, equipment, and fossil fuel uses such as asphalt, your board is simply engaging in meaningless virtue-signaling in an echo chamber. Moreover, please consider the following inconvenient facts about the reality of our situation:

Fossil fuels created electricity. There, I said it. It is an indisputable inconvenient truth, true to this day. The majority of electricity in the world was and still is produced by fossil fuels. That is because electricity is a secondary power source. It has to be produced because it does not naturally occur in nature, lest we learn how to capture lightning!

What about wind turbines and solar panels, you ask? You can't mine the raw materials you need to make them, and neither can you produce the final products without the use of fossil fuel. Moreover, you can't have on-demand electricity, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, without fossil fuels. The wind doesn't blow nor does the sun shine throughout the day and year. Nor, can you make batteries without fossil fuels by which to store these weather dependent intermittent supplemental energy sources.

There was, and will be, no industrial revolution without oil. Sans the ongoing industrial revolution, we would still be living in huts and caves, lest we denude the environment of any and all materials to use as our energy and heat source. Let us not forget that before we learned to develop fossil fuels, the world was burning whale oil and trees, among other fuels, as a primary fuel source.

You can't make plastic without oil. Plastic is the most widely used product in the world and it has no replacement. For instance, you can't produce an electric car, or any other car for that matter, without oil. According to Resource Innovation "Currently, there are about 30,000 parts in a vehicle, out of which 1/3 are made of plastic. That would include the body, the upholstery, the fuel system, the instrument panel, and the lighting to just name a few. In total, about 39 different types of basic plastics and polymers are used to make an automobile."

You can't pave a road without oil, nor the tires that run on them.

You can't ship products around the world without oil because you can't build or fuel ships without oil.

You can't make the infrastructure for buildings, dams, bridges, planes, trains and automobiles without steel, and you can't make steel without fossil fuels.

You can't produce enough food, via commercial agriculture, to feed this country or the world without fossil fuels as they are required ingredients in fertilizers, pesticides, insecticides, and herbicides. And, lest you think we could depend on back yard or community gardens to sustain ourselves, too many people live in that concrete and asphalt jungle to make that a realistic proposition.

Aspirin, one of the most common medications used to treat pain, inflammation and fevers, consists of benzene, a hydrocarbon typically derived from petroleum. Moreover, chewing gum, lipstick, cd's and dvd's, rubbing alcohol, cortisone, hand lotion, heart valves, telephones, synthetic rubber, laptops, Styrofoam, dish soap, televisions, contact lenses, artificial limbs, linoleum, along with polyester which is the raw material in 60% of the world's clothing, not to mention toothpaste and 6,000 other products, are all produced with derivatives of fossil fuels.

Fossil fuels are nature's gift to our quality of life and the most important raw materials known to man. We have nothing to replace it. As decision makers, it is high time you appreciate that which you rely on each and every day.

Andy Caldwell
COLAB

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Villalobos, David
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 11:46 AM
To: sbcob
Cc: Klemann, Daniel; Dargel, Joseph
Subject: FW: 091421 BOS Meeting - Items D3&4 regarding updates to existing Cannabis Ordinance in AGII SRH
Attachments: BOS091421 - SRH Ordinance Amendments.docx; ATT00001.htm

FYI. For tomorrow's hearing.

From: Dianne Pence <diannedpence@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 11:01 AM
To: Villalobos, David <dvillalo@countyofsb.org>; Nelson, Bob <bnelson@countyofsb.org>; Hartmann, Joan <jHartmann@countyofsb.org>; Lavagnino, Steve <steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org>; Williams, Das <DWilliams@countyofsb.org>; Hart, Gregg <gHart@countyofsb.org>
Subject: 091421 BOS Meeting - Items D3&4 regarding updates to existing Cannabis Ordinance in AGII SRH

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.

David,

Hope you are staying well! Can you please add my request below to comments on tomorrow's meeting . Thank you .

Dianne

Regarding updates to existing Cannabis Ordinance in AGII SRH

Chairman Nelson and our Board Members:

We applaud Supervisor Hartmann for stepping up to support the commercial POT acreage cap of 20 acres within the long established SRH AVA. Thank you.

Our community has been speaking out to the BOS since 2016, when the stench from the first 60 acre cannabis grow at the SRH Gateway (1807 West Highway 246, now "Dorado Farms") overwhelmed our rural neighborhoods – the stench and the impact on the community residents and businesses has only intensified since that time. Many Buellton residents, teachers from local schools and community businesses have written to voice their concerns for the health and livelihood of the community. Many are suffering from respiratory ailments and associated conditions not experienced prior to these grows.

Since that time, the BOS has received ***thousands of letters from impacted homeowners, businesses, local communities and schools. It's time to put a lid on this!***

The currently approved pot operations underway are not compliant with their LUP "conditions" - we are seeing continuous-stacked growing cycles with an almost-continuous dead skunk stench, the promised "Howard Bracken" gateways and elaborate entrances/"cover-ups" exist only on useless powerpoint presentations, the numbers of containers onsite, numerous trucks moving product constantly, and "employees" is significantly greater than defined in the "LUP" conditions- effectively ***creating intolerable conditions for the surrounding community and businesses.***

Let's start thinking about the people who live and work in this community; have taught our children and retired here - like poor suffering Mrs Reilly, and our businesses, like Hitching Post and all the wineries and tasting rooms whose customers can smell the football field of dead skunks all the way past Albertsons; ***what about all the good decent people who have built their homes and live in this community?***

You have allowed a debacle to be created in a world renown AVA, possibly minimizing its reputation and desirability as a wine experience destination forever. Visitors can just go to Paso where the air is clean and their ***county BOS support good clean businesses that provide valuable-long term jobs in the wine and Hospitality industries.***

As the SBCVA recommended, we strongly request that the BOS put in place reasonable amendments to the existing ordinance:

- A preferred 20 acre parcel cap on all projects with expanded buffer zones around schools, EDRNs, and hospitality businesses (restaurants, tasting room, wineries, etc.)
- Require Conditional Use Permits on all projects - these projects are not a rubber stamp like growing celery or carrots
- Stricter odor abatement plans or closed greenhouse requirements - mirroring what has been accomplished in Carp
- Better enforcement throughout the Valley - Locals need to be able to determine which farms are harvesting and processing cannabis to better monitor and file complaints as needed.

The question is - whom are you here to represent and protect? ***It's time to take care of our community and your constituents!***

Respectfully,
Dianne Pence

Ramirez, Angelica

From: PAUL EKSTROM <paulekstrom@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 12:34 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Cannabis expansion in the North County.

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, Staff and Planners,

1. We must learn from past mistakes and require CUP's on cannabis grows.
2. Odor Abatement Plans must be enforced after the grows start and be continuously updated with requiring better technology throughout the life of the "farm".
3. Currently, there is a glut of both medical and recreational cannabis here in California and in nearly all other states where cannabis is legally grown. Also, Canada is reporting a glut on their market. Our county is growing way too much.
4. Our county's wine grapes should not be shut out of the market by cannabis interference. California is famous for high quality wine and you should be doing more to protect this market.

Thank you,

Paul and Linda Ekstrom

1489 Manzanita St. Carpinteria, CA 93013 805-886-6712

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Pam Mays <pammays@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 1:29 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Clerk of the Board: Cannabis Ordinance Updates

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 Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors,

You're hearing from me today as a concerned resident from the Santa Rita Hills Appalachian area of our County. Please review the following list of suggested revisions to the County's Cannabis Ordinance as it stands today...

1. **Require CUPs for all outdoor grows.** A CUP has been shown to be an appropriate and necessary level of permit to give County discretion to properly condition and control future project approvals.
2. **Require Odor Abatement Plans (OAPs) for all outdoor grows.** A requirement of OAPs for outdoor grows will drive needed technological improvements in odor control from outdoor grows. We now have the tools to measure odors, which is essential to identify improved odor control technologies and techniques.
3. **Maintain and Enforce the Acreage Cap.** The total acreage cap on cultivation must not be expanded. County ordinances should be amended to not allow continued cannabis permit processing after the cap has been met.
4. **Direct Funding to Research and Mitigation.** Research into the effect of cannabis terpenes on wine grapes is long overdue. Odor control strategies need to be tested and improved through research and development. The County needs to seek outside funding and provide matching funds to these two research priorities.

Thank you in advance for considering all of these modifications to the County's current Cannabis Ordinance.

Most Sincerely, Pam Mays

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Jennifer Fullerton <goletaspring@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 1:51 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Sept 14 BOS meeting- Items D3 & D4- Cannabis permitting ordinance ammendments

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.

Chair Nelson and members of the Board of Supervisors:

I understand that you are considering some changes to the cannabis ordinances, specifically in regards to solving some of the issues related to outdoor grows.

While the focus of discussion appears to be related to the Santa Rita Hills area, all areas with outdoor grows suffer the same issues, and I am asking that you consider changes across the board, not just for this one area.

Specifically, I am requesting that you enact the below restrictions to provide an adequate quality of life for everyone who is affected by these grows- that includes county residents, existing farmers, and wineries- so many people are affected by the negative impacts of these projects. All we are asking for is for a chance to mitigate the risks and disruption to our lives, we are not asking for every project to be denied.

1. **Require CUPs for all outdoor grows.** A CUP has been shown to be an appropriate and necessary level of permit to give County discretion to properly condition and control future project approvals.
2. **Require Odor Abatement Plans (OAPs) for all outdoor grows.** A requirement of OAPs for outdoor grows will drive needed technological improvements in odor control from outdoor grows. We now have the tools to measure odors, which is essential to identify improved odor control technologies and techniques.
3. **Maintain and Enforce the Acreage Cap.** The total acreage cap on cultivation must not be expanded. County ordinances should be amended to not allow continued cannabis permit processing after the cap has been met.

In the past, the County Planning Commission has supported these simple, common sense measures, but their recommendations were disregarded. Now is the chance to fix this once and for all.

Could adding a CUP requirement slow down the process and add additional costs to the applicant? Yes, that could be the case. But these applicants stand to make millions of dollars, and the ordinance changes are needed to ensure that their profits are not at the expense of everyone around them. And the extra requirements at the front of the process could save many years of appeals and legal actions for the County.

Thank you for your consideration.
Jennifer Fullerton

Ramirez, Angelica

From: rick grimmsbluff <rick@grimmsbluff.com>
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 2:18 PM
To: sbcob
Cc: rick grimmsbluff; aurora grimmsbluff
Subject: County to re-open cannabis ordinance
Attachments: BOS 2021-9-13 Ltr RE Cannabis Ordinance Amendments.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.

To: The Clerk of the Board,

Can you please distribute the attached letter relating to Departmental Item #3 on tomorrow's Board agenda.

Kind regards,

Rick & Aurora Grimm

Grimm Estates
5400 Kentucky Road
Santa Ynez, CA 93460

VIA EMAIL

September 13, 2021

Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
105 E. Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, California 93101
By email to sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

**RE: Cannabis Zoning Ordinance Amendments
Departmental Agenda Item #3**

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

We live on Kentucky Road in Happy Canyon and purchased the property in 2010. We are writing again regarding the proposed amendments to the Cannabis Ordinance and our continued concerns regarding the inadequacy of the current ordinance to address the compatibility of cannabis cultivation with existing agriculture and residential uses in AG-II zones. We live on an AG-II parcel, and a cannabis cultivation project was approved just last month. We have appealed the permit issuance because, among the many issues, the project is sited near our home with any Odor Abatement Plan. We have serious concerns about the impact of the odors on our quality of life, and have no enforceable process to seek recourse or assistance from the County when the inevitable impacts arise.

We have followed the ongoing review, approval, and appeals of cannabis permit applications and appreciate the Board's opening up the Cannabis Ordinance to additional amendments. We support the Board immediately requiring **Conditional Use Permits (CUPs)** and **Odor Abatement Plans (OAPs)** for all cannabis cultivation in agricultural zones.

Each proposed cultivation site is entirely unique and we are all are still learning about the scope and extent of impacts cannabis has on existing agriculture and nearby residences. It has become clear that beyond the project size (e.g. total acres or percent of parcel), specific meteorological conditions, cannabis strains, the topography of the proposed location, and the siting of outdoor cultivation all greatly affect the range and significance of a project's impacts. As such, the CUP is clearly the necessary and appropriate permit path for cannabis cultivation projects.

A CUP will increase the County's legal authority to condition cannabis permits with odor control, limits on overconcentration of grows in certain areas, and address incompatibility issues. Further, most cannabis permits are being appealed by concerned neighbors, so requiring a CUP will not necessarily require additional County resources.

We urge the Board to adopt these two simple and crucial amendments immediately, and make them retroactive to all permits in the pipeline and to those without final approval.

Sincerely,
Rick and Aurora Grimm

Ramirez, Angelica

From: kathi@wghames.com
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 3:15 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Board of Supervisors Meeting Sept 14th Regarding Cannabis Ordinance Updates
Attachments: This pending Land use Permit is Egregious on all levels.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.

Please see attached to be added to the comments regarding the impacts of Cannabis Ordinance changes to be addressed at the Sept 14th meeting
Kathryn & William Hames

My Husband & I (William & Kathryn Daly Hames) are life-long County Residents, having both being born & raised in Montecito/Santa Barbara since the 50's.

My family operates the second oldest business in Santa Barbara County, dating back to 1915. Jordano's Food Service & Pacific Beverage have been a source of integrity, pride & service for 106 years, and continue to do to this day.

William's family goes back to the California Spanish Families from the Santa Barbara/Santa Ynez Valley area. They have been hard working producers for decades.

We moved to the Santa Ynez Valley in 1988 to raise our children as we were raised, with the rural life a priority for us.

We moved to Mail Rd, Santa Rita Hills, west of Buellton, in 2003 to recapture the rural way of life after enduring the Crime of the Chumash Casino in Santa Ynez.

It seems now, the Crime & ODOR will have us moving again in the coming years unless this relentless assault changes.

As we speak, a security Gate that will cost us about \$30,000, is going in to protect our property from a proposed Outdoor Cannabis Grow Directly behind us (705 Mail Rd. Lompoc) of which we are also downwind of. To say the pending STENCH will affect our daily life is an Understatement. We will Not be able to open windows, doors, or entertain outside to name a few. We are literally surrounded by outdoor & Greenhouse grows both on our road and Highway 246 leading to our home.

We have had to invest considerably more money in security lights, security fencing etc., due to the element that the MULTIPLE grows & potential grows attract that threatens our security & belongings. There is no way to mitigate the odor we will have & have had to endure.

All that is lacking out here is a sign that designates West Highway 246 as the "Cannabis Highway". All the landscaping in the world doesn't mitigate the odor or said element.

What is happening to our area (Santa Rita Hills), Hwy 246 west of Buellton, Los Alamos, Carpinteria etc., is a sad state of affairs, to put it mildly.

4/5ths of our "Representatives" have sold out to Greed, mostly from out of town/state investors on all levels.

Supervisors have shirked their responsibilities & put them on overworked planners trying to follow the letter of the "Law". Essentially tying their hands.

In doing so, lifelong residents are having to swallow lack of Representation to the people that vote them in.

It is stated in the Notice of Pending Land Use Permit Approval for Case # 19UP-00000-00126 that we as neighbors can appeal, which we have, and will be coming before the Planning Commission on October 13, 2021.

We have followed closely other "Appeals" & see that they are a complete waste of time & money, of which, we Don't Have but we also feel that Not appealing shows approval of this invasion or Our property rights.

We are trying to run a business in the area and have been for 33 years and don't have the time or money to chase a losing battle.

We have kept apprised of all Appeals & their outcome. Legitimate Reasons for denials/appeals of permits fall on deaf ears. We have personally talked to one of the Planning Commission members and it was stated that the Board of Supervisors have Tied their hands.

Buellton's "representative" should recuse herself from all Buellton Cannabis operations voting as it is our understanding she conveniently lives in an ERDN neighborhood & isn't directly affected by these approvals as so many of us that are not so lucky, are.

We have extensive email chains with Alia Vosburg & Petra Leyva, Planners on the project, regarding our complete aversion to the approval of the permit at 705 Mail rd.

It has been offered to us to meet with the property owner to negotiate an agreeable outcome to the impacts of this "Boutique Winery & Cannabis Grow"

We have witnessed in the 3-4 years that this property has been purchased by a Louisiana resident, the goings on & have no faith in the owner caring about impacts once

The pending permit is approved. Meeting with him to placate us until it is, is a waste of our time.

We invite all of you "Representatives" to take a drive out Hwy 246 between Buellton & Lompoc to see what you have "Approved" for the area.

We did just that with former Supervisor Adam & current Supervisor Nelson & invited them to our property for a firsthand look at the impact.

They were not very encouraging as having our voices heard with the other "Representatives".

We understood from then Supervisor Adam, that he recommended an approved CUP vs LUP for these projects but that was voted down by the BOS.

In closing, in this difficult time that we are living in, it would be surprising, but greatly appreciated, if you all did the right thing for the residents, not just those wealthy individuals who will prosper from the approvals going forward & the County and the projected taxes collected.

Sincerely,

William G. & Kathryn Daly Hames

875 Mail Rd

Lompoc/Buellton, CA