

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis <coalition4responsiblecannabis@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 1, 2019 1:31 PM
To: Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve
Cc: sbcob; Miyasato, Mona
Subject: Item D 5, 11/5/19 BOS hug: CANNABIS RETAIL OPERATIONS
Attachments: CRC Letter to BOS re RETAIL SELECTION.pdf

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

Please see attached letter, copied below.

RE: Item D 5, BOS hearing of November 5, CANNABIS RETAIL OPERATIONS

Dear Board,

We appreciate your direction to staff to amend the process for cannabis retail operations. We wish to offer our comments and preferences.

While the Board letter states that the reasoning for the change is "*to identify the high-quality cannabis storefront retail operators*", the concern that **we** hear among community members is to ensure neighborhood compatibility and consistency with community plan policies.

We have read the Board letter several times and it is confusing to defibrinate and identify numbered "options" vs numbered "issue areas". We urge the Board to seek clarity in your deliberations and directions so that the community is clear about the direction you provide. We will do our best to navigate the Board letter to identify preferences in this written public comment.

ISSUE AREA # 1: Review, Ranking and Selection:

We support **Option 1**, as it allows for most transparency and public involvement in the process. *We do not believe "random selection" has any place* in determining neighborhood compatibility, for ANY matter let alone the introduction of retail sales of marijuana in neighborhoods.

ISSUE AREA #2: Roles in Criteria-based Selection Process:

We support a hybrid of Option #2 and Option #4. A County Selection Committee, comprised of staff [including *staff from Planning and Development, a public safety department, and Public Health or Behavioral Wellness, and Auditor*] should review and score applications, post all documents related to the review, and hold a public hearing for input prior to selection or recommendation.

We do not believe a "third party consultant" is necessary or appropriate, as the expertise on the issues of most importance lies with our County Departments. In order to insure familiarity with all of the individual community plans, it is essential that a *County Planner* with expertise in the content and analysis of the various community plan areas be part of whichever option you choose.

We believe a final hearing at the Board of Supervisors, or Planning Commission, is appropriate for final selection.

ISSUE AREA #3: Criteria and Scoring options:

While we are somewhat confused about the distinctions, we believe a combination of Options 1 and 2 are appropriate. A thorough business plan and application, combined with community engagement, are both essential elements to an informed selection process. While not mentioned in the bullet points, we presume a criminal record check will be part of any selection process [and may already be embedded in the County's Cannabis Licensing Ordinance].

ISSUE AREA #4: Application Format and Submittal Guidelines:

We believe Options 1, 2 and 3 are appropriate and allow for the most transparency, thoroughness of information, and public noticing.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues. As you are aware the impact of the County's Cannabis Ordinance on local communities continues to be tremendous and to the extent the Board incorporates transparency and public involvement in these processes, we are appreciative.

Sincerely,
Coalition for Responsible Cannabis



**SANTA BARBARA
COUNTY COALITION**
FOR RESPONSIBLE CANNABIS

November 1, 2019
Board of Supervisors

RE: Item D 5, BOS hearing of November 5, CANNABIS RETAIL OPERATIONS

Dear Board,

We appreciate your direction to staff to amend the process for cannabis retail operations. We wish to offer our comments and preferences.

While the Board letter states that the reasoning for the change is “*to identify the high-quality cannabis storefront retail operators*”, the concern that *we* hear among community members is to ensure neighborhood compatibility and consistency with community plan policies.

We have read the Board letter several times and it is confusing to differentiate and identify numbered “options” vs numbered “issue areas”. We urge the Board to seek clarity in your deliberations and directions so that the community is clear about the direction you provide. We will do our best to navigate the Board letter to identify preferences in this written public comment.

ISSUE AREA # 1: Review, Ranking and Selection:

We support Option 1, as it allows for most transparency and public involvement in the process. We do not believe “random selection” has any place in determining neighborhood compatibility, for ANY matter let alone the introduction of retail sales of marijuana in neighborhoods.

ISSUE AREA #2: Roles in Criteria-based Selection Process:

We support a hybrid of Option #2 and Option #4. A County Selection Committee, comprised of staff [including staff from Planning and Development, a public safety department, and Public Health or Behavioral Wellness, and Auditor] should review and score applications, post all documents related to the review, and hold a public hearing for input prior to selection or recommendation.



**SANTA BARBARA
COUNTY COALITION
FOR RESPONSIBLE CANNABIS**

We do not believe a “third party consultant” is necessary or appropriate, as the expertise on the issues of most importance lies with our County Departments. In order to insure familiarity with all of the individual community plans, it is essential that a County Planner with expertise in the content and analysis of the various community plan areas be part of whichever option you choose.

We believe a final hearing at the Board of Supervisors, or Planning Commission, is appropriate for final selection.

ISSUE AREA #3: Criteria and Scoring options:

While we are somewhat confused about the distinctions, we believe a combination of Options 1 and 2 are appropriate. A thorough business plan and application, combined with community engagement, are both essential elements to an informed selection process. While not mentioned in the bullet points, we presume a criminal record check will be part of any selection process [and may already be embedded in the County’s Cannabis Licensing Ordinance].

ISSUE AREA #4: Application Format and Submittal Guidelines:

We believe Options 1, 2 and 3 are appropriate and allow for the most transparency, thoroughness of information, and public noticing.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues. As you are aware the impact of the County’s Cannabis Ordinance on local communities continues to be tremendous and to the extent the Board incorporates transparency and public involvement in these processes, we are appreciative.

Sincerely,
Coalition for Responsible Cannabis