

Ramirez, Angelica

Public Comment - Group

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

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: sjashbrook@gmail.com
Sent: Sunday, September 12, 2021 6:46 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Cannabis Regulations in Review September 14 2021
Attachments: BOS September 14 2021.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.

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

It is time to look closely at the County of Santa Barbara's cannabis regulations. As a long-time resident of Cebada Canyon, I frequently drive Hwy 246 to Buellton and can smell "green skunk" most of the time. Regardless of the number of harvests and the claims from cannabis growers that smell is only associated with harvests, the stink lingers. Just ask the residents of Carpinteria. The New York Post told readers that Carpinteria known as a coastal "jewel" City famous for its beaches and wine "smells like weed".

- It is time to require a CUP for all outdoor cannabis grows. Neighbors of these grows should have an opportunity to voice their concerns – no matter the size of the parcel.
- The most advanced odor abatement plans should be required for all outdoor grows and updated appropriately to protect residents. A CUP should hold a grower responsible if a number of complaints surface and are verified.
- I find it hard to believe our BOS would consider expanding the current acreage cap. One grower bragged to media their grow will sell enough cannabis for the entire state. Santa Barbara County is growing more cannabis than the entire state can legally consume. Enough. Just say no!
- During many of the meetings I attended, both sides argued about the effect of cannabis odors on health and welfare and terpenes on grape wines. Use cannabis taxes to properly research and test theories from an independent source so we know the results.

As a resident living in an EDRN, I am asking Supervisors to revise the current language to prohibit commercial cannabis "adjacent to and accessed through" our EDRN roads and communities. Most of our roads are narrow, winding, with blind corners which are not appropriate for cannabis "factories".

The County of Santa Barbara has the opportunity NOW to stand up and do the right thing for residents.

Thank you in advance,

Susan Ashbrook

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

It is time to look closely at the County of Santa Barbara's cannabis regulations. As a long-time resident of Cebada Canyon, I frequently drive Hwy 246 to Buellton and can smell "green skunk" most of the time. Regardless of the number of harvests and the claims from cannabis growers that smell is only associated with harvests, the stink lingers. Just ask the residents of Carpinteria. The New York Post told readers that Carpinteria known as a coastal "jewel" city famous for its beaches and wine "smells like weed".

- It is time to require a CUP for all outdoor cannabis grows. Neighbors of these grows should have an opportunity to voice their concerns – no matter the size of the parcel.
- The most advanced odor abatement plans should be required for all outdoor grows and updated appropriately to protect residents. A CUP should hold a grower responsible if a number of complaints surface and are verified.
- I find it hard to believe our BOS would consider expanding the current acreage cap. One grower bragged to media their grow will sell enough cannabis for the entire state. Santa Barbara County is growing more cannabis than the entire state can legally consume. Enough. Just say no!
- During many of the meetings I attended, both sides argued about the effect of cannabis odors on health and welfare and terpenes on grape wines. Use cannabis taxes to properly research and test theories from an independent source so we know the results.

As a resident living in an EDRN, I am asking Supervisors to revise the current language to prohibit commercial cannabis "adjacent to and accessed through" our EDRN roads and communities. Most of our roads are narrow, winding, with blind corners which are not appropriate for cannabis "factories".

The County of Santa Barbara has the opportunity NOW to stand up and do the right thing for residents.

Thank you in advance,

Susan Ashbrook

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



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

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, EDNRs, 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: 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: craig Shell <crgshell@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 2:05 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Regarding Agenda item File# 21-00810 September 14, 2021
Attachments: Letter BOS-SB-sept-14.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.

Clerk of Santa Barbara County board of supervisors
Regarding Agenda item File# 21-00810
September 14, 2021

Items I'd like to address
Taxation
Permitting process
Cultivation cap

Your tax revenues are down in Q4 2021.

Your report sites overproduction of cannabis as the cause.

This is a far too simple analysis.

More to the point, the truth is your tax revenues are down in Q4 2021 because you've approved the wrong type of cannabis projects to maximize your ROI (taxation).

Please let me explain.

When you approve a 200-acre outdoor cannabis cultivation undoubtedly you're approving auto-flower cultivation.

There is a glut of this product on the market in California.

Why? Because this is the cheapest easiest way to enter the market.

Currently, auto-flower has a wholesale price of approximately \$40 a pound and falling.

Conversely, the highest quality forms of cannabis are still holding at \$1200 to \$1500 a pound.

This type of cannabis can only be grown indoors or in state-of-the-art new greenhouses specifically designed for cannabis production.

This type of cannabis cannot be grown in hoop houses or the old dilapidated greenhouses in Carpinteria. Even with extensive retrofitting.

From a tax perspective approving a new state-of-the-art greenhouse project with a six-times-of-year harvest schedule.

Revenue per square foot.

You're looking at over 100 X return on ROI (tax returns) per square foot on this type of project versus outdoor cannabis.

If you would like I can arrange a tour for you of this type of project in Lemoore California.

The California Cannabis Company there has a 100,000 ft.² of state of the art greenhouse. They have no problem selling their product at a premium price. In fact, they are constructing another hundred-thousand square feet of greenhouse space for a total of 200,000 ft.².

They wouldn't be doing this unless they were certain the high-end market has stabilized.

Other ancillary benefits of approving state of the art greenhouse production over other types of cultivation.

Improved odor control

Negligible water consumption

Significantly reduced footprint

Permitting process.

Santa Barbara Counties' permitting process is probably the most onerous, expensive, and lengthy permitting process in the state.

Coupled with a lack of Visibility due to the pending cap.

Santa Barbara County has lost most of the high-quality greenhouse projects to inland counties. Where a permit is much easier to attain.

In a new consolidating market first-mover advantage is paramount.

If you want to develop an industry that has sustainability in Santa Barbara County. You need to simplify and streamline the permitting process for these type of projects.

Otherwise, you'll see long-term tax revenues continue to decrease.

Cultivation cap

1. There are over 3000 acres currently in the permitting process. These applicants have spent well over \$1 million to get to this point. I would suggest that all applicants currently in the permitting process should be grandfathered in and granted a permit if they can meet the county permitting requirements.

2. Inland projects outside the coastal zone on Ag-2 property should be exempt from the cap.

3. New state-of-the-art Green House projects should receive favorable consideration over other types of cultivation projects.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Craig Shell

3700 Highway 33 Ventucopa California

Clerk of Santa Barbara County board of supervisors
Regarding Agenda item File# 21-00810
September 14, 2021

Items I'd like to address

Taxation

Permitting process

Cultivation cap

Your tax revenues are down in Q4 2021.

Your report sites over production of cannabis as the cause.

This is a far too simple analysis.

More to the point, the truth is your tax revenues are down in Q4 2021 because you've approved the wrong type of cannabis projects to maximize your ROI (taxation).

Please let me explain.

When you approve a 200 acre outdoor cannabis cultivation undoubtedly you're approving auto-flower cultivation.

There is a glut of this product on the market in California.

Why? Because this is the cheapest easiest way to enter the market.

Currently auto-flower has a wholesale price of approximately \$40 a pound and falling.

Conversely the highest quality forms of cannabis are still holding at \$1200 to \$1500 a pound.

This type of cannabis can only be grown indoors or in state of the art new greenhouses specifically designed for cannabis production.

This type of cannabis cannot be grown in hoop houses or the old dilapidated green houses in Carpinteria. Even with extensive retrofitting.

From a tax perspective approving a new state of the art greenhouse project with a six times of year harvest schedule.

Revenue per square foot.

You're looking at over 100 X return on ROI (tax returns) per square foot on this type of project versus outdoor cannabis.

If you would like I can arrange a tour for you of this type of project in Lemoore California.

The California Cannabis Company there has 100,000 ft.² of state of the art greenhouse. They have no problem selling their product at a premium price. In fact they are constructing another hundred-thousand square feet of greenhouse space for a total of 200,000 ft.².

They wouldn't be doing this unless they were certain the high-end market has stabilized.

Other ancillary benefits of approving state of the art greenhouse production over other types of cultivation.

1. Improved odor control
2. Negligible water consumption
3. Significantly reduced footprint

Permitting process.

Santa Barbara Counties permitting process is probably the most onerous, expensive and lengthy permitting process in the state.

Coupled with lack of Visibility due to the pending cap.

Santa Barbara County has lost most of the high-quality greenhouse project to inland counties. Where a permit is much easier to attain.

In a new consolidating market first mover advantage is paramount.

If you want to develop an industry that has sustainability in Santa Barbara County. You need to simplify and streamline the permitting process for these type of projects.

Otherwise you'll see long-term tax revenues continue to decrease.

Cultivation cap

1. There are over 3000 acres currently in the permitting process. These applicants have spent well over \$1 million to get to this point. I would suggest that all applicants currently in the permitting process should be grandfathered in and granted a permit if they can meet the county permitting requirements.
2. Inland projects outside the coastal zone on Ag-2 property should be exempt from the cap.
3. New state of the art Green House projects should receive favorable consideration over other types of cultivation projects.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Craig Shell

3700 Highway 33 Ventucopa California