

Relis, Mia

Public Comment - Group 3 #2



From: ben@protacsecurity.com
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 10:25 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Support for Cannabis Cultivation and Farming
Attachments: Letter to SBCO BOS 7-5-19.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 the attached letter in Support for Cannabis Cultivation and Farming

Ben Parliament
Director of Operations
ProTac Security
Office: 805.938.9100



PROTAC
PRIVATE SECURITY

"An Innovative Approach to Safety and Security"

July 5, 2019

To: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
From: Benjamin Parliament, Director of Operations
Bruce Thompson, Owner
Subject: Support for Cannabis Cultivation and Farming

Protac, INC. provides high-risk protection and estate security throughout the Central Coast.

Over the past several years, we have developed a collaborative relationship with major cannabis farmers as well as many auxiliary businesses in Santa Barbara County.

We feel very fortunate that this emerging industry has become a consistent and reliable customer. The industry is contributing to our progressive growth and economic bottomline.

Throughout the years, our company has always remained steadfast that economic prosperity is a two way street - where everyone benefits.

We are very confident that cannabis cultivation and farming in the County has been a viable economic engine that our business, employees and their families have benefited from. This impact reaches not only the employees supporting the cannabis cultivation projects but to our entire workforce.

We all win when businesses work together to be successful and have a commitment to economic growth.

Respectfully,

Benjamin D Parliament
Director of Operations

Relis, Mia

From: Lion Eye <lioneyemanagement@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 10:26 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: July 9th BOS Public Comment-Cannabis

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

Hello,

My name is Joseph Nunez, I am 22 years old. I was born in Aiken, South Carolina and have been living in Lompoc, CA for over 15 years. I have been working at Lion Eye Management for over a year now and my occupation is to grow and take care of each plant we have here. I really love working at Lion Eye Management because everyone has a passion for what they do here. I've learned lots of beneficial things working here and I am extremely grateful for that.

Joseph Nunez
Employee-Lion Eye Management

Relis, Mia

From: Lion Eye Farms <lioneeyefarms@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 10:31 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public Comment July 9th BOS Cannabis Hearing

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

My name is Amanda Haines. I am a native to Santa Barbara County and currently live in the City of Santa Barbara. Currently I am the manager at Lion Eye Farms and have had this wonderful opportunity since April of 2018. I run our processing department and help supervise our nursery. I can't say enough about the positive impacts of being a part of the Lion Eye family. It has elevated my life and has benefited me in so many ways. Our work there contributes to the well being of the community, from providing sustainable jobs to local individuals, local revenues and community health and unification. I feel lucky and appreciative to be a part of this growing community. My hope is that future regulations will help strengthen the compliant farmers and help to push out illegitimate farming. In addition, our focus would be better spent on flushing out illegal farms that still exist in our local forests.

Amanda Haines
Manager/Weighmaster - Lion Eye Farms

Relis, Mia

From: Mark Ferrer <markyoungferrer@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 10:37 AM
To: Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Subject: Carpinteria cannabis issue

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.

My wife and I are writing as Carpinterians and avocado growers. The environment and agricultural realities in the Carpinteria Valley are being greatly damaged by the county's indulgent and neglectful allowance of the harmful practices which characterize the burgeoning Cannabis industry that has been swept into this community. The air pollution is stunning, revolting. The present truculent threat of huge law suits (2-20 million an acre) by cannabis owners against all other valley farmers who spray their crops threatens to cripple our production in order simply to increase theirs. Fear of litigation has forced many growers to abandon the critical protection of their acreages. If the cannabis growers are not required to protect their crops at their expense and to eliminate the sickening odors they release, this community and the family growers who have lived and worked here for generations will be devastated and a small but rich and clearly influential group of publicly harmful profiteers with egregious reach will be improperly benefitted.

We join the majority of those living in the Carpinteria Valley in asking the BOS to make this right.

1. We ask that the county amend its regulatory and enforcement policies and practices such that they require the cannabis industry to operate with complete pollution control. By requiring the cannabis growers to use carbon filtration and grow within sealed, industrial greenhouses, both the odor and spray issues will be resolved for the greater good.

2. The cannabis pollution is of such obvious magnitude that it affects public health, property value, tourism, and local business. That it was allowed to grow unchecked so quickly to such proportions should require investigation. As has been stated in the **Concerned Carpinterians** call for action:

Das Williams and Steve Lavagnino should voluntarily recuse themselves from voting on cannabis-related items given the revelations in the recent LA Times article re coziness with the cannabis lobby. Recusal is imperative to restore public trust. The Board of Supervisors should request an independent subpoena-powered investigation into how the current regulatory framework came to be.

3. That the county has allowed for the dense penetration of cannabis cultivation into such a populous community is at best ill-advised, ill-considered and at worst scandalous. Caps must be set, zoning restrictions and land use regulations must be reconsidered; the public good must be put first. That good has been adversely affected not just by the stench their product emanates but also by the crime it attracts.

This is a mess affecting thousands of Carpinterians each day. It has been allowed to get completely out of hand. We need you to set it straight, to act in the public interest and to do so immediately.

Mark and Connie Ferrer

Relis, Mia

From: Lion Eye Farms <lioneeyefarms@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 10:37 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: July 9th BOS Cannabis Public Comment

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

My name is Chuck Holt, I live in Los Alamos, CA. I moved here from Denver, Colorado and have an extensive background in botanical horticulture. I have seen the tremendous amount of help the taxes from sustainable cannabis have had on this state. I feel strongly that this is a very good opportunity for the county to enable the first responder programs. I have been working here for more than 1 year, and I know that this farm uses the latest technical advances for the most pure product. The opportunity for a well paying job is part of the reason why I am glad to see Santa Barbara County is at the forefront of advancing the cannabis industry, and commend you for giving the opportunity for state of the art farming to progress!

Chuck Holt
Employee/Spray Program - Lion Eye Farms

Relis, Mia

From: Mary Ellen Brooks <mebrooks@sbceo.org>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 10:41 AM
To: Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Subject: CPA comment letter on cannabis ordinance amendments
Attachments: CPA cannabis ord.doc

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 Staff: Please forward the attached comment letter to members of the Board of Supervisors. Thank you. Marell Brooks, co-President, CPA



July 5, 2019

TO: Board of Supervisors

Citizens Planning Association asks the BOS to accept the Planning Commission recommended ordinances amending the County Land Use and Development Code, the Coastal Zoning Ordinance (Article II), to: (1) provide additional noticing requirements for certain commercial cannabis activities within the unincorporated inland areas and Coastal Zone of Santa Barbara County; and (2) further regulate commercial cannabis activities in the Agriculture I (AG-I) zone in the unincorporated inland areas of Santa Barbara County.

CPA asks that the Board consider a commercial cannabis ban on AG-1-20 acre or under parcels in the Coastal Zone or, at minimum, require CUPs for any commercial cannabis grows in the Coastal Zone. We feel that this would be more in line with the Gaviota Community Plan. Having stronger controls for inland Ag parcels vs coastal Ag parcels would create differential zoning treatment.

CPA also would like to see a reconsideration of allowing commercial cannabis in EDRNs and other parcels in AG-1-20, especially in the Santa Ynez Valley. CPA members participated in the SY Community Plan and also followed the winery ordinance process. During those hearings, many ranchette owners requested that their properties be considered 'residential' in nature. We are also concerned about the proliferation of pot farms on larger agricultural parcels along Santa Rosa Road and Highway 246. We suggest a reasonable cap in the number of pot farms in these areas.

CPA also agrees that CEQA review should be reopened since the County's EIR did not address the impact of cannabis terpenes/VOCs on ozone and smog air pollution. Air pollution (ozone/smog) was not covered by the County's EIR and is an environmental impact that needs to be evaluated.

Lastly, the County and APCD should note that under applicable laws, cannabis is not considered a "crop" under the Right to Farm Act. Manufacturing is not an "Agricultural Operation". The County and APCD need to evaluate the significant air pollution issues caused by commercial cannabis grows.

CPA supports the letters submitted by the cities of Carpinteria and Goleta. We commend the BOS for listening to county residents who are being negatively impacted by a hastily developed ordinance.

Marell Brooks

Co-President, Citizens Planning Association

citizensplanningsb@gmail.com

Relis, Mia

From: Laurie Huarte <lauriehuarte1@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 10:44 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Cannabis Land Use Ordinance Amendment

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.

Sent from my iPhone

Good Morning,

My husband & I live on 25 acres on Roblar Avenue in Santa Ynez.

We are one of 4 families in our HOA. Each family is on approximately 25 acres.

Our concern involves 2 out of 4 families are not in agreement as to whether Cannabis should be farmed in our neighborhood.

We have one Annex road leading to each home.

Increased traffic & potential criminal activity will inhibit future home values & desirability of this beautiful area.

Our requests include:

*Excluding Cannabis cultivation from AG-1-20 and smaller parcels for the inland area to protect residential areas as is the stated intent of The Cannabis Ordinance.

*Require a CUP for all AG-1-40 for the same reason and in keeping with the Planning Commission recommendation.

*Leverage the ordinance

Section 35.42.075(A.3)

so that any ordinance modification passed by the Board of Supervisors on 7/9/19 apply to all current pending land use applications as well as future

*Institute a Countywide acreage cap similar to one in place for the First District.

Thank You,

Greg & Laurie Huarte

Relis, Mia

From: S. Van Der Kar <ranch.public@cox.net>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 10:47 AM
To: Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Subject: Public Comment for BOSI 7-9-19 Meeting

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

Dear Board of Supervisors:

In your consideration of the cannabis items on your July 9, 2019 agenda, I submit the following comments.

Allowing cannabis to be grown in re-purposed greenhouses is not compatible with existing agriculture in the Carpinteria area. This new "crop" is unique and must be recognized and regulated as such. The drug/medicinal uses of cannabis require that it be tested for minute contaminant residue levels. This jeopardizes the ability of conventional farm operations, organic and non-organic, to protect their crops using standard, allowable industry practices. As a farm manager in Carpinteria and state-licensed pest control advisor, I urge the Board to step back and bring in all responsible public agencies and experts to evaluate and address the negative impacts of the cannabis industry in Carpinteria prior to the hasty issuance of permits. With no buffers between cannabis and other agricultural commodities, the problems should not need to be solved by growers, but addressed by proper agencies prior to issuing permits to grow cannabis.

The Board of Supervisors Agenda Letter for the July 9, 2019 meeting states:

The County may further amend its ordinances that regulate cannabis activities. Property owners do not "vest" to existing zoning or anticipated zoning. After receiving a permit and performing substantial work and incurring substantial liabilities in good faith reliance on the permit, though, property owners may acquire a vested right. The County's land use codes also provide "nonconforming use" regulations for the continuation of established land uses that were lawful before later amendments prohibited or further restricted those land uses.

If the problems are not addressed prior to the issuance of permits, it seems that future constructive amendments to the Cannabis Ordinance may not be enforceable on those grows with previously issued permits. This and the issuance of more permits without proper restrictions will only worsen the significant adverse effects that we are experiencing, exacerbating known and yet unforeseen problems.

Cannabis cultivation is not a conventional crop. The history, regulations and residue testing requirements confirm that it is unusual and has inherent risks and impacts, unlike other agricultural products. Farmers and ranchers operating in proximity to cannabis grows are being forced to significantly restrict their established customary practices that should otherwise be protected by the Santa Barbara County Right to Farm Ordinance. This directly places these growers at an economic disadvantage and threatens their ability to compete in the marketing of their products.

Please adopt any amendments to the Cannabis Ordinance that will protect non-cannabis agriculture in Santa Barbara County. A variety of crops in an area is a healthy way to avoid over-reliance on any one crop and a hedge against the market fluctuations of a single crop.

Respectfully,

Scott Van Der Kar

Van Der Kar Family Farm

7017 Shepard Mesa Rd

Carpinteria, CA 93013

Relis, Mia

From: aunteeq@aol.com
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 10:50 AM
To: sbcob
Cc: aunteeq@gmail.com
Subject: 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.

Dear Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors:

I am an 18-year resident of Solvang. My home address is 1854 Ringsted Drive, which is only a few hundred yards from the property located at 988 Fredensborg Canyon Road. I am strongly opposed to the current Cannabis Ordinance which may allow the owner of the Fredensborg property to conduct commercial production of cannabis right in the middle of our quiet residential neighborhood. As many, if not all, of you have probably experienced first hand by now, the cultivation of cannabis brings with it many negative aspects, including a strong odor permeating the surrounding area, as well as a large increase in out-of-the-area visitors. As my home is directly down-wind from 988 Fredensborg, I am particularly distraught about the potential for an unpleasant smell in and around my home (it is often very windy in this neighborhood, especially in the late afternoons) and a significant decrease in my property value.

I am respectfully requesting the Board of Supervisors implement immediate changes to the current Cannabis Ordinance.

Ordinance Amendments:

- Exclude cannabis cultivation from AG-1-20 and smaller parcels for the Inland Area to protect residential areas as is the stated intent of the cannabis ordinance.
- Require a CUP for all AG-1-40 for the same reason and in keeping with the Planning Commission recommendation.
- Leverage the ordinance section 35.42.075 (A.3.) so that any ordinance modifications passed by the Board of Supervisors on 7/9 should apply to all current pending land use applications as well as future.
- Institute a County wide acreage cap similar to the one in place for the First District.

Your consideration of this issue is greatly appreciated.

Kindest regards,
Susan Noble
1854 Ringsted Drive
Solvang, CA 93463

Relis, Mia

From: Dennis Strong <strongbox9@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 10:54 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public comment re: Cannabis Land Use Ordinance
Attachments: Cannabis article.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.

Dear Supervisors:

I have written before and am writing again to urge you to uphold your earlier decision to prevent cannabis growing operations on AG-1 properties of 20 acres or less and requiring strict guidelines for Conditional Use Permits on AG properties within the county. These grows are totally incompatible with any nearby residential areas and should be allowed on large parcels in areas solely used for commercial farming. Even then, the size of grows should be controlled so that nearby crops of other growers are not compromised as well as the health and safety of employees of other farming operations.

I work in the agricultural industry and one of the operations I work with is a 100 acre vineyard located in Los Alamos. In the center of the vineyard is a 10 acre cannabis growing operation enclosed in greenhouses that were previously used to grow orchids. The complex is surrounded by a security fence with 24 hour guards at the entrance. The odor from the operation is very strong and the employees of the vineyard are required to work in an atmosphere that constantly smells like skunks. It is also possible to smell the same odor along Highway 101. This operation was once shut down by our County Cannabis Task Force, but somehow continues to operate.

I am attaching a letter written by a grower in Carpinteria explaining some of the impacts he has felt from cannabis operations. This is a large, growing industry that must be closely regulated for the protection of the citizens of our County. I urge you all to take steps to put a tight rein on this new threat to our county environment.

Thanks for your consideration,

Dennis Strong, Solvang

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

GUEST COMMENTARY

Cannabis a threat to other crops

I grow 13 acres of certified organic avocados in Carpinteria. Our farm is our primary source of income.

For the past 15 years a local agriculture company

SHAYNE MERRITT

has been spraying my avocados for persea mites

and avocado thrips with Entrust, a certified organic product. Persea mites cause defoliation and low yields. Avocado thrips cause scars that cut wholesale price by half.

But this year they won't spray Entrust or any conventional pesticides for that matter because of fear of lawsuits from cannabis growers. They are one of only three licensed, insured applicators that serve Carpinteria. The second also will no longer spray in Carpinteria for the same reason. The third is checking with their lawyers to see if they could spray in Carpinteria.

If a fly, ant or a bit of

dust with a speck of Entrust or conventional pesticide enters a greenhouse, cannabis growers are threatening to sue for the entire value of the crop. The number quoted to me was \$7 million per acre.

Greenhouses in Carpinteria are plastic structures with large roof vents that are opened much of the day to cool off the inside. They are not fully enclosed, so insects and dust particles can easily get in.

I contacted 1st District Santa Barbara County Supervisor Das Williams for help and he had the addresses of cannabis growers near my farm sent to me so I could coordinate with these growers. But there is nothing to coordinate if there isn't a licensed and insured applicator willing to do the spraying.

As a side note, all three applicators offered to spray Veritran, which is permitted on cannabis. Unfortunately, it is minimally effective on persea mites,

and not at all effective on thrips.

A friend who is a cannabis grower offered to spray for me, but I was advised to not take him up on his kind offer because of licensing and state legal issues.

So, marijuana growers will make millions and I will lose half the value of my crop. Doesn't seem fair to me.

This isn't only about avocados. Olives, walnuts, grapes and vegetables all have pests that farmers treat, even organic farmers. And this is not a Carpinteria issue, it's all of Santa Barbara County.

This county has 49 percent of all state, adult-use provisional cultivation licenses, with 1 percent of the state population and 2 percent of the square miles. Anywhere you go, there's likely to be a grower within a couple of miles. Santa Barbara County is also the only coastal county with no limits on size of grows. It has sev-

eral 80-acre grows in wine country. That's 62 football fields apiece.

And it isn't just a farming issue. Winemakers have had to close tasting rooms because the wind is blowing because you can't taste the wine in the presence of marijuana terpenes. Residential neighbors have to live with the smell of skunk. And no one is talking about potential health problems from the VOC's emitted.

I am not anti-cannabis. I voted for Proposition 64 — but I did not vote for this. I did not vote to be put out of business.

If you care about locally-grown food, local wines or small farms going out of business, or what your kids are breathing, or your property values, start talking about this. If enough people talk about it, maybe politicians will hear and do something about it.

Sharyne Merritt is an avocado grower in Carpinteria.

Relis, Mia

From: Foothill Cannabis Group <foothillcannabis@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 10:55 AM
To: sbcob; Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve
Subject: [DO NOT CLICK, Likely malicious content, contact your Departmental IT] Agenda Item D3 for July 9 BOS Meeting (AG-2 Cannabis Zoning and Restrictions)
Attachments: July BOS Letter Foothill Cannabis Group.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.

Below and attached, please find out letter.

July 5, 2019

To: Members of the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors

From: Foothill Cannabis Group

Regarding: Agenda Item D3 for July 9 BOS Meeting (AG-2 Cannabis Zoning and Restrictions)

We represent 150 homeowners along Old North San Marcos Road, Via Regina, Via Parva, Via Campobello, and are very concerned about how the SB County Board of Supervisors has handled the cannabis issue and the severe consequences that are now being felt from Carpinteria to Tepesquet. The current zoning regulations do not adequately safeguard neighborhoods like ours that directly abut AG-2 parcels. We are concerned about our health, safety, and property values. We believe the Board of Supervisors must act quickly and make significant changes to the cannabis ordinance standards for AG-2 parcels to protect urban/residential neighborhoods like ours from the impacts of cannabis cultivation and other activities. Please rectify the decisions pushed through when our community was still recovering from the Thomas Fire and mourning the tragedy of the mudslides as the current ordinance is wholly deficient at this time.

As residents living near AG-2 lands that are very vulnerable to cannabis cultivation, we are requesting swift action on the items listed below:

1. With applications pending for outdoor cultivation on south coast foothills near our neighborhoods we urge you to expedite review as soon as possible revised standards for AG-2 parcels as noted below.
2. The BOS must prohibit cannabis cultivation on parcels directly abutting residential neighborhoods.
3. The BOS must set a firm boundary of at least 2 miles between neighborhoods and any outdoor cannabis cultivation and must require odor abatement plan/equipment for cannabis on AG-2 lands that are within 2 miles of urban areas, neighborhoods, and schools.
4. The BOS must require a CUP for all AG-2 parcels within 2 miles of a residential area. Many of the concerns being raised during the appeals process, including odor, potential for crime, and overall neighborhood compatibility would be considered during the CUP process, moving the burden away from the neighborhoods, and putting it back on the applicants, where it belongs.

5. The BOS must acknowledge and act to protect residents and businesses to preserve the economic vitality of our area as well as the scenic value of our local land.
6. The BOS must pause any new permits being issued, in order to consider both the unforeseen effects of the current ordinances and to consider the new issues that have come up recently regarding existing farms.
7. The BOS must place a cap on the number of permits and the number of acres that can be grown on each parcel. Most other counties in the state have enacted these types of restrictions, so this would bring us more in line with other areas.
8. The BOS must acknowledge that cannabis nurseries are a form of cultivation and should be held to the same standards (not exempt) since they can have large quantities of adult and flowering plants onsite. They should also adhere to other ordinances around lighting, etc.
9. The BOS must take urgent action to investigate and address all of the unpermitted grows throughout SB County.
10. The BOS must acknowledge and address the concerns of residents living in the urban/residential areas and the language of the ordinance already gives them the power to make changes (including limitations, stipulations, and even banning) so there is no reason/excuse to not do so.

Thank you for listening to the concerns of your residents/voters. We are hopeful that you will provide the leadership needed because **the American Riviera should not become a place of stench and crime!**

Sincerely,

Foothill Cannabis Group (Email: FoothillCannabis@yahoo.com)

Lauren & Kevin Gleason, Chris Sneathen, Britt Andreatta, Anna & Jan Roestel, Karen & Nathan Field, Melinda Rogers, Arthur Voros, Ted Hoelter, Robert Muhr, David & Bonnie Cummings, Judy & Chris Donner, Gordon & Melba Sprague, Danny & Linda McCue

FOOTHILL CANNABIS GROUP

Representing many neighborhoods along the foothills in SB County

July 5, 2019

To: Members of the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors

From: Foothill Cannabis Group

Regarding: Agenda Item D3 for July 9 BOS Meeting (AG-2 Cannabis Zoning and Restrictions)

We represent 150 homeowners along Old North San Marcos Road, Via Regina, Via Parva, Via Campobello, and are very concerned about how the SB County Board of Supervisors has handled the cannabis issue and the severe consequences that are now being felt from Carpinteria to Tepesquet. The current zoning regulations do not adequately safeguard neighborhoods like ours that directly abut AG-2 parcels. We are concerned about our health, safety, and property values. We believe the Board of Supervisors must act quickly and make significant changes to the cannabis ordinance standards for AG-2 parcels to protect urban/residential neighborhoods like ours from the impacts of cannabis cultivation and other activities. Please rectify the decisions pushed through when our community was still recovering from the Thomas Fire and mourning the tragedy of the mudslides as the current ordinance is wholly deficient at this time.

As residents living near AG-2 lands that are very vulnerable to cannabis cultivation, we are requesting swift action on the items listed below:

1. With applications pending for outdoor cultivation on south coast foothills near our neighborhoods we urge you to expedite review as soon as possible revised standards for AG-2 parcels as noted below.
2. The BOS must prohibit cannabis cultivation on parcels directly abutting residential neighborhoods.
3. The BOS must set a firm boundary of at least 2 miles between neighborhoods and any outdoor cannabis cultivation and must require odor abatement plan/equipment for cannabis on AG-2 lands that are within 2 miles of urban areas, neighborhoods, and schools.
4. The BOS must require a CUP for all AG-2 parcels within 2 miles of a residential area. Many of the concerns being raised during the appeals process, including odor, potential for crime, and overall neighborhood compatibility would be considered during the CUP process, moving the burden away from the neighborhoods, and putting it back on the applicants, where it belongs.
5. The BOS must acknowledge and act to protect residents and businesses to preserve the economic vitality of our area as well as the scenic value of our local land.
6. The BOS must pause any new permits being issued, in order to consider both the unforeseen effects of the current ordinances and to consider the new issues that have come up recently regarding existing farms.
7. The BOS must place a cap on the number of permits and the number of acres that can be grown on each parcel. Most other counties in the state have enacted these types of restrictions, so this would bring us more in line with other areas.
8. The BOS must acknowledge that cannabis nurseries are a form of cultivation and should be held to the same standards (not exempt) since they can have large quantities of adult and flowering plants onsite. They should also adhere to other ordinances around lighting, etc.
9. The BOS must take urgent action to investigate and address all of the unpermitted grows throughout SB County.
10. The BOS must acknowledge and address the concerns of residents living in the urban/residential areas and the language of the ordinance already gives them the power to make changes (including limitations, stipulations, and even banning) so there is no reason/excuse to not do so.

Thank you for listening to the concerns of your residents/voters. We are hopeful that you will provide the leadership needed because **the American Riviera should not become a place of stench and crime!**

Sincerely,

Foothill Cannabis Group (Email: FoothillCannabis@yahoo.com)

Lauren & Kevin Gleason, Chris Sneathen, Britt Andreatta, Anna & Jan Roestel, Karen & Nathan Field, Melinda Rogers, Arthur Voros, Ted Hoelter, Robert Muhr, David & Bonnie Cummings, Judy & Chris Donner, Gordon & Melba Sprague, Danny & Linda McCue

Relis, Mia

From: Blair Pence <blair@pencevineyards.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 10:57 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Ltr RE Cannabis Ordinance Amendments letter for july 9 BoS.pdf
Attachments: Ltr RE Cannabis Ordinance Amendments letter for july 9 BoS.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.

The attached letter is submitted for the Supervisors' consideration in anticipation of the July 9th BOS meeting:

Blair Pence
Pence Vineyards and Winery
1909 West Hwy 246
Santa Rita Hills, CA 93427
Office: 805-735-7000
Cell: 213-910-1971
blair@pencevineyards.com

PENCE RANCH, LLC
1909 West Highway 246
Santa Rita Hills, CA 93427

VIA EMAIL

sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us.

July 3, 2019

Clerk of the Board
County Santa Barbara, Board of Supervisors
105 East Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

RE: Proposed Amendments to Cannabis Regulations For AG-II Parcels

Dear Supervisors:

I am writing regarding the proposed additional amendments to the Cannabis Regulations currently outlined in Section 35.42.075 of the Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code.

Since 2006, I have lived at 1909 West Highway 246, just west of the Buellton city limits. I moved there from Los Olivos to start a vineyard and realize my life's dream of growing the highest quality wine grapes possible. Towards this end, I have invested an eight-figure sum and employ close to 50 people. Our ranch and vineyard are frequently cited as one of the most beautiful spots in the county, with photos published in national magazines such as Wine Spectator. Pence wines are served in some of the best restaurants in the country and our wine club satisfies over 1,200 aficionados. We take great pride in having created this and are devasted to ponder that all the work that went into this could be for naught.

Our 200-acre ranch is also home to my wife, as well as several employees and their families (including two young children). My comments and suggestions are uniquely valuable to your debate as they are based on actual experience with pot growers operating in close proximity to our ranch. There is no reliance upon theoretical studies, surveys or projections with no basis in reality. As virtual Guinee pigs, we have been subjected to unpredicted real-life hardships that have come hand in hand with the invasion of the marijuana industry directly across the street and right next door.

Our first experience was with the marijuana grower at 2000 West Highway 246, directly south of us. A once beautiful horse farm with friendly neighbors was covertly converted into an unsightly drug manufacturing facility with odd hours and strange people flowing in and out. The smell was overpowering and for several people (including my wife), caused debilitating headaches. Dianne's headaches were so bad that we converted a rental home in Montecito to our own use so we could limit our exposure to the VOC's being released. That cost me \$10,000 per month in rent or \$120,000 annually. Thankfully, the sheriffs finally busted the illegal grow.

But this is only the start. In 2018, our new next-door neighbor to the east began producing marijuana in the northern area of his ranch, directly adjacent to the property line. When I approached him about this, he said he had leased the land to "some guys from LA" and that he had nothing to do with it. He also said he was fully in his rights to do this and, frankly, I did not know this to be untrue. His falsified affidavit proves otherwise. Ten acres grew to 30 and finally to 60 acres. The VOC emissions from this much marijuana was overpowering. Armed guards and cameras protected the illegal grow, intimidating all of us to the point that nobody felt safe riding or hiking in the north 100 acres of our ranch. In effect, it was what our attorney calls a "taking" of our property.

The loss of rents in Montecito pale in comparison to the subsequent costs associated with this intrusion. Given our residents' and staff's fear and intimidation, I was forced to retrofit our main gates with electronic access controls, costing me over \$20,000 and forever changing the culture of our ranch. With the stench permeating everywhere and the inability to ride in the 100 acres adjacent to the illegal grow, our equestrian clients left in droves. Our trainers could no longer make ends meet and I was forced to waive their rent in order for them to survive. That cost me another \$8,000-\$10,000 per month or another \$100,000+ annually.

When fields of white plastic hoops were installed, the flooding began. Since there is no requirement to contain the run-off from these illegal structures, these "farmers" felt no need to contain the river they had created. Accordingly, it ran right through our ranch, devastating vineyards and landscaping, and costing thousands of dollars to repair. We are physically unable to redirect this flow; therefore, we anticipate this has become another annual operating cost we will bear to support the hoops next door.

Then there is the ugliness. To alleviate the eyesore, I spent over \$70,000 installing a full height fence and hedge along the property line. My neighbor grudgingly committed \$20,000 as his share, which he delivered in a paper bag full of small bills (I wonder how your County taxation people track revenues for an illegal cash business like that). The hedge does little to hide acres of plastic, and parts of it are being continually washed away by the flooding. It is a no-win situation.

What amazes me is that the same County that encourages this sort of disaster has required me to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars over a four-year period to get a permit for a small winery and imposed requirements from every agency imaginable to dissuade me from doing so. How does a well-designed, 18,000 square foot winery (half of which is underground and cannot even be seen) have more effect upon the neighborhood than a sixty-acre pot production facility? Why do I have to create on-site drainage retention facilities for a 9,000 square foot roof while over half the ranch next door is covered with impermeable plastic that triggers no such requirements whatsoever? Why are unsightly, bright white hoops imposed with no restrictions while wineries must go through endless architectural reviews, salamander studies, cultural artifacts searches, etc? I need a winery facility in order to process my wine grapes. Why is that any different from hoops and why am I limited to only 20,000 square feet on over 200 acres of land when hoops can go from property line to property line?

Then there is the question of vineyard impacts. What are all these VOCs doing to our wine grapes? Will we suffer the same fate as Sonoma County growers whose crops were subjected to smoke taint? Will we be able to spray to control powdery mildew without risk of being sued by the pot growers down the street? The avocado growers have already learned this lesson and are at risk of extinction here – are we the next victims?

Beyond all the aforementioned economic costs, the personal toll to us has been devastating. The people afflicted with headaches has steadily increased, with multiple employees forced to limit their amount of time spent here. Our general manager is forced to work from home much of the time, drastically reducing his efficiency. We have two small children living on the ranch and I fear for their health and specifically the possibility of brain damage from exposure to such massive amounts of VOC emissions. My wife and I spend less and less time here as her headaches make sleep impossible and I am now remodeling the house in Montecito (at further cost) so that it can become our full-time residence. In effect, we are being evicted from our home, or as our lawyer opined, we have suffered yet another taking of our property.

As you may be aware, two weeks ago the next-door neighbor was also busted. Twenty tons of pot growing on sixty acres and worth millions. That made a big splash, but what hasn't been reported is the fact that the operation was legally sanctioned by the county, its products had been sold into the black market for over a year, and a once beautiful ranch had been bulldozed (killing countless irreplaceable oaks) in the process. Somehow, the affidavit had been signed by a "Luis Cisneros" rather than the real owner, "Juan Cisneros", so the threat of a perjury prosecution is negated. So much for Dennis Bozanich's claim that "all the bad guys will be punished".

The owner has applied for permanent licensing and my guess is that your Planning Department will forgive and forget since everyone deserves a second chance.

At this point, our planned additional \$5-6 million investment to build the winery on our property is on hold. If the Santa Rita Hills are to be converted from a mecca for wine aficionados and other tourists to an industrial zone for drug manufacturing, then it is clear that further investment here is foolish. Napa County forbids pot growing and Paso Robles has strict restrictions. I am thus contemplating a move to a more stable long-term location for our winery operation, leaving this vineyard as a much lower valued parcel that simply produces wine grapes which we can truck elsewhere for processing. The value add will be done where we are appreciated for the economic value we bring to the table and guests trying to enjoy wine will not be assaulted with the stench of skunks and the headaches it causes.

So, with that rather long prologue, here are my suggestions for saving this area from irreversible disaster. Specifically, I wish to address the inadequacy of the current regulations to address the compatibility of marijuana cultivation with existing neighboring uses in AG-II zones. For whatever reason, AG-II parcels are being treated in a completely different manner than their AG-I brethren.

There are several simple measures the Board can take to address the foregoing.

- 1. Conditional Use Permits in AG-II Zones**

The Planning Commission recommendation includes a conditional use permit for all commercial cannabis activities on all AG-I lots and in the Coastal Zone. While we appreciate this recommendation for cannabis cultivation on AG-I parcels, it overlooks the fact that people also live on AG-II lots and other crops are preexisting that are being negatively impacted by marijuana production.

The EIR for the Cannabis Regulations acknowledges that “*land use compatibility review would be part of the CUP process to address any public concern regarding the compatibility of commercial cannabis cultivation proximate to mixed residential, residential ranchette, and agricultural uses that occur...*” The public process is completely circumvented in AG-II zones because the Land Use Permit approval is ministerial without a public hearing.

- 2. Odor and VOC Emission Abatement in AG-II Zones**

The effects of VOC emissions upon us and others has more than proved the point that they must be controlled. No one has the right to put others at such risk and therefore all odors and emissions should be required to be non-detectable at the property line.

The Board’s rationale for excluding odor and emissions abatement on AG-II zoned parcels has been that the parcels are larger, and thus it has been implied and assumed that the cultivation does not have significant impacts on neighboring uses. This has been proven untrue. The Board further assumed that the cultivation and its attendant impacts are farther from neighboring uses, and thus less likely to emit odors detectable on neighboring parcels. Again, this has been proven untrue.

The emissions from marijuana are most readily detected by their odor. As drafted, there is no complaint process for issues related to odor in AG-II parcels. As such, without specific conditions to address emissions for specific projects, neighbors have no recourse through the County Planning Department’s enforcement process. Section 35.42.075(6)(h) of the ordinance states that the Department must receive three verified complaints regarding odor events in any 365-day period prior to requiring corrective action to comply with the odor abatement requirements. The odor abatement requirements apply only to AG-I zones, so it can be inferred that the County has no authority for odor complaints in AG-II zones as there is no corrective action that County can require without “odor

abatement requirements” to serve as a baseline. If the odor is a nuisance, County staff must have a pathway to corrective actions for complaints concerning AG-II parcels.

The EIR specifically states that Cannabis Regulations “*would not permit cannabis activities within residential areas, due to potential conflicts between commercial operations and residential living such as from odors, traffic, noise, and employee trips.*” The EIR itself acknowledges the issue of odor generally when cultivation is near “residential areas”, yet odor abatement is not required on AG-II parcels despite projects being located adjacent to residential uses. If the same residential uses were in a designated EDRN, or AG-I zones, odor abatement would be required under the ordinance.

Again, odors are only a byproduct of emissions. Odors are not responsible for headaches nor the deleterious effects scientists are discovering with respect to the exposure of these emissions to children and adolescents. Emissions must be controlled through carbon filtering or other processes that eliminate the risk rather than mask it with other compounds. The obvious corollary to this is that marijuana cannot be grown in hoop houses. It must be produced in a controlled environment.

All counties that have authorized cannabis cultivation have odor/emissions abatement requirements for any outdoor cultivation, without reference to parcel size, zoning, or any other factors. In keeping with best practices established by other California counties, the Board must impose odor/emissions abatement requirements on any parcel applying to cultivate cannabis.

3. Visual and Safety Buffers

The Board needs to consider and adopt an agricultural buffer of at least 1,500 feet from existing residences and existing developed agriculture (i.e. vineyards and orchards) located on an adjacent lot to be consistent with AG-I requirements. This buffer zone requirement also acknowledges that residential development is not always classified as an Existing Developed Rural Neighborhood (EDRN) (and thus triggering a CUP) or on an Urban-Rural Boundary (which also requires a CUP). Any neighborhoods not formally designed as EDRN or near an Urban-Rural Boundary have no forum to voice concerns through the LUP ministerial approval process, as a CUP is not currently required under any circumstances.

Policy I.F. of the County’s adopted Agricultural Element further supports this requirement. It states: *“The quality and availability of water, air, and soil resources shall be protected through provisions including but not limited to, the stability of Urban/Rural Boundary Lines, maintenance of buffer areas around agricultural areas, and the promotion of conservation practices.”*

4. Parcel and County Maximum Acreage Caps

The ordinance does not set maximum acres for cultivation indoor or outdoor, and does not cap the number of cannabis cultivation permits that can be issued. All neighboring counties have implemented acreage caps that range from 10,000 square feet to 2 acres, per parcel regardless of parcel size. With no set maximum acreage in the current ordinance, there are currently 1,415 acres of cultivation pending permitting. Further, with no regulations in the ordinance or mandated review through a CUP process for siting of the larger grows, there are discrete areas that are on track to bear the burden of the majority of the outdoor cannabis cultivation, with cultivation is not subject to required setbacks, emissions abatement, or protections for neighbors.

The foregoing suggestions are only a start as we still do not know the long-term effects upon Santa Barbara County businesses and residents. How will the invasion of marijuana affect tourism? Besides avocado and grape growers, what other agricultural industries will be sacrificed? How much will crime increase? What will be the effects upon public health and children in particular? We truly have no idea.

In summary, the County's policies on marijuana have resulted in an absolute disaster, both economically and in personal injuries to its residents. My situation is just an example of the damages caused by such an ill-advised ordinance. To recap, we urge the Board to:

1. Eliminate LUPs for cultivation and require CUPs for all cultivation, including on AG-II zones
2. Require odor and emissions abatement analysis and mitigation for any cultivation, regardless of zoning
3. Require buffers of at least 1,500 feet from existing residences and developed agriculture
4. Cap individual parcel and overall cannabis cultivation in our County at a level that is consistent with the EIR

Sincerely,

PENCE RANCH, LLC

Relis, Mia

From: Fellows Family <fellowsfam@cox.net>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 10:58 AM
To: Foothill Cannabis Group
Cc: sbcob; Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve
Subject: Re: Agenda Item D3 for July 9 BOS Meeting (AG-2 Cannabis Zoning and Restrictions)

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.

Hi, if it is not too late please include me as a signer of the letter...Denice Fellows.

Sent from my iPad

On Jul 5, 2019, at 10:54 AM, Foothill Cannabis Group <foothillcannabis@yahoo.com> wrote:

Below and attached, please find out letter.

July 5, 2019

To: Members of the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors

From: Foothill Cannabis Group

Regarding: Agenda Item D3 for July 9 BOS Meeting (AG-2 Cannabis Zoning and Restrictions)

We represent 150 homeowners along Old North San Marcos Road, Via Regina, Via Parva, Via Campobello, and are very concerned about how the SB County Board of Supervisors has handled the cannabis issue and the severe consequences that are now being felt from Carpinteria to Tepesquet. The current zoning regulations do not adequately safeguard neighborhoods like ours that directly abut AG-2 parcels. We are concerned about our health, safety, and property values. We believe the Board of Supervisors must act quickly and make significant changes to the cannabis ordinance standards for AG-2 parcels to protect urban/residential neighborhoods like ours from the impacts of cannabis cultivation and other activities. Please rectify the decisions pushed through when our community was still recovering from the Thomas Fire and mourning the tragedy of the mudslides as the current ordinance is wholly deficient at this time.

As residents living near AG-2 lands that are very vulnerable to cannabis cultivation, we are requesting swift action on the items listed below:

1. With applications pending for outdoor cultivation on south coast foothills near our neighborhoods we urge you to agendize review as soon as possible revised standards for AG-2 parcels as noted below.
2. The BOS must prohibit cannabis cultivation on parcels directly abutting residential neighborhoods.

3. The BOS must set a firm boundary of at least 2 miles between neighborhoods and any outdoor cannabis cultivation and must require odor abatement plan/equipment for cannabis on AG-2 lands that are within 2 miles of urban areas, neighborhoods, and schools.
4. The BOS must require a CUP for all AG-2 parcels within 2 miles of a residential area. Many of the concerns being raised during the appeals process, including odor, potential for crime, and overall neighborhood compatibility would be considered during the CUP process, moving the burden away from the neighborhoods, and putting it back on the applicants, where it belongs.
5. The BOS must acknowledge and act to protect residents and businesses to preserve the economic vitality of our area as well as the scenic value of our local land.
6. The BOS must pause any new permits being issued, in order to consider both the unforeseen effects of the current ordinances and to consider the new issues that have come up recently regarding existing farms.
7. The BOS must place a cap on the number of permits and the number of acres that can be grown on each parcel. Most other counties in the state have enacted these types of restrictions, so this would bring us more in line with other areas.
8. The BOS must acknowledge that cannabis nurseries are a form of cultivation and should be held to the same standards (not exempt) since they can have large quantities of adult and flowering plants onsite. They should also adhere to other ordinances around lighting, etc.
9. The BOS must take urgent action to investigate and address all of the unpermitted grows throughout SB County.
10. The BOS must acknowledge and address the concerns of residents living in the urban/residential areas and the language of the ordinance already gives them the power to make changes (including limitations, stipulations, and even banning) so there is no reason/excuse to not do so.

Thank you for listening to the concerns of your residents/voters. We are hopeful that you will provide the leadership needed because **the American Riviera should not become a place of stench and crime!**

Sincerely,

Foothill Cannabis Group (Email: FoothillCannabis@yahoo.com)

Lauren & Kevin Gleason, Chris Sneathen, Britt Andreatta, Anna & Jan Roestel, Karen & Nathan Field, Melinda Rogers, Arthur Voros, Ted Hoelter, Robert Muhr, David & Bonnie Cummings, Judy & Chris Donner, Gordon & Melba Sprague, Danny & Linda McCue

FOOTHILL CANNABIS GROUP

Representing many neighborhoods along the foothills in SB County

<July BOS Letter Foothill Cannabis Group.pdf>

Relis, Mia

From: Stacey Wooten <stacey@calcoastcompliance.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:08 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public comment support letter for July 9th Board of Supervisors meeting
Attachments: July 9th BOS Comment.pdf; ATT00001.htm; CCC-LOGO-sig.png; ATT00002.htm

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 include the attached letter in public comments for July 9th.

CALCOAST COMPLIANCE

TO: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors

RE: Support for Cannabis Cultivation and Farming

Cal Coast Compliance is a full service compliance service that provides comprehensive systems for businesses, specifically in the cannabis industry, to comply with all local, state and federal regulations and guidelines.

Over the past several years, we have developed a collaborative relationship with major cannabis farmers and auxiliary businesses in Santa Barbara County.

We feel very fortunate that this emerging industry has become a consistent and reliable customer. The industry is contributing to our progressive growth and economic bottomline.

Our company has always remained steadfast that economic prosperity is a two way street - where everyone benefits.

We are very confident that cannabis cultivation and farming in the North County has been a viable economic engine that our business, employees and their families have benefited.

We all win when businesses work together to be successful and have a commitment to economic growth.

Thank you for allowing businesses like ours to create and maintain compliant operators in Santa Barbara County!

Relis, Mia

From: Jim Neuman <jbn@silcom.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:08 AM
To: sbcob
Cc: Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; ihartman@countyofsb.org; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve
Subject: 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.

Members of the Board of Supervisors, after listening to all the arguments in favor of amending the County's current Cannabis Ordinance, I've concluded the most responsible amendment would include the following; All cannabis production within 1000 feet of residential property (2 or more units) in the A1 zone, be contained in facilities that can accommodate carbon filters or their equivalent, which can contain 98% of the emitting terpenes. If an existing greenhouse can not be retrofitted to provide carbon filtration, the grower must new build facilities to meet this requirement. The cost of this proposal to the grower should not be a consideration since the cannabis business is extremely profitable and cities like Vancouver, Canada and Denver require carbon filtration of their growers. The County should not be in the business of providing growers excess profits so they can use a masking process such as Bayer, which may only be 80-90% effective in removing terpenes and may have near and long term health impacts on the surrounding community of Carpinteria. It's hard to believe the County is willing to endanger the health of 15,000 residents in favor of a handful of cannabis growers, many of whom have no connection to our community.

Jim Neuman
3557 Padaro Lane
805.895.0563
jbn@silcom.com

Relis, Mia

From: Lion Eye Farms <lioneyefarms@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:12 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: July 9th public comment

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

My name is Ivan and I am employed at Lion Eye Farms. I was born at Cottage Hospital in Santa Barbara and I am from the City of Lompoc. I am ecstatic to be part of a cannabis farming community. It provides me with a well paying job that has a future that I can grow with. At Lion Eye we work as a team and everyone is required to learn all aspects of the farm. I am super happy to have learned so much and proud to work on a sustainable farm.

Ivan
Employee- Lion Eye Farms

Relis, Mia

From: Lion Eye Farms <lioneyefarms@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:16 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public Comment July 9th meeting

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,
My name is Alfonso Rubio-Morales. I currently live in Lompoc. I was born in Los Angeles, CA and moved to Lompoc when I was 5 years old. I have been working at Lion Eye Farms for 10 months now. My responsibilities include, tending the plants and just to make sure everything is in proper order. I enjoy working here, I've grown with knowledge about what it takes to make and grow these plants with the best care possible. The staff is great as well and makes this job extremely enjoyable. I am grateful to be able to experience working at this farm.

Alfy
Employee-Lion Eye Farms

Relis, Mia

From: Lion Eye Farms <lioneyefarms@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:19 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public Comment July 9 meeting

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.

My name is Phil Pascal and I have lived in Santa Barbara for the past 10 years. I came here from Central California where I worked 20+ years in health care. I truly enjoy working on our farm as a facility maintenance personnel with a number of duties and responsibilities. Our farm cares for the environment and surrounding community. Excessive cannabis regulations in our County could place a strangulation on legitimacy and is only needed when warranted.

Thank you

Phil Pascal
Facility and Maintenance- Lion Eye Farms

Relis, Mia

From: Lion Eye Farms <lioneyefarms@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:22 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public Comment July 9

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.

Aloha,
My name is Mark Nabarro, I'm from Oahu, Hawaii. I am 56 years old and have been in Santa Barbara County for 24 years. I now live in beautiful Buellton, CA. I have worked on the farm for the past couple of years. I love my job and the Ohana atmosphere. My responsibility is cloning and drying of plants.

Mark Nabarro
Employee- Lion Eye Farms

Relis, Mia

From: Jill Wol <jill16wol@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:24 AM
To: Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Subject: Cannabis - Fixing the Land Use 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.

Jilla Wolsey
P.O. Box 90848
Santa Barbara, CA 93190

July 5, 2019

The Santa Barbara Board of Supervisors, et al.

I am a citizen who is deeply concerned about the consequences of the unfettered cannabis industry's growth in Carpinteira.

I commend the letters submitted by the Cities of Carpinteria and Goleta, urging significant amendments to the County's regulatory and enforcement framework for cannabis. The cannabis regulations have failed and that it's time to go back to the drawing board. Fixing the Land Use Ordinance (regulations) is the only way to do this well. We need to fix the land use and permitting aspects since they are much stronger controls.

I submit that Das Williams and Steve Lavagnino should voluntarily recuse themselves from voting on cannabis-related items given the revelations in the recent [LA Times article](#) re coziness with the cannabis lobby. Recusal is imperative to restore public trust. The Board of Supervisors should request an independent subpoena-powered investigation into how the current regulatory framework came to be.

The Coastal Zone deserves equal if not stronger protections than inland. Having stronger controls for inland Ag parcels vs coastal Ag parcels would be unacceptable differential zoning treatment. Please consider a commercial cannabis ban on AG-1-20 acre or under parcels in the Coastal Zone (given clearly demonstrated incompatible use issues), or, at minimum require CUPs (Conditional Use Permits) for any commercial cannabis grows in the Coastal Zone.

The County must stop its practice of authorizing state provisional licenses. The state keeps extending provisional license timetables, but the county does not have to be complicit in this by authorizing these at the county level (which is required in order for them to be valid).

The County should not issue any land use permits or CDP approvals until there is an independent investigation and clean up of the County's affidavit mess (which allowed cannabis cultivation to proliferate under the guise of "legal non-conforming use"). Many growers lied on their affidavits in claiming they were growing medical marijuana prior to the cutoff date in 2016. Others illegally expanded their operations when under legal non-conforming status, which is not legal. The County did nothing to validate the truthfulness of the grower affidavits. There must be an investigation into how this gross negligence occurred, as well as a county review of each affidavit to demand proof of the growers' claims (eg that they were growing medical marijuana and how many plants). Such proof should be publicly posted to restore public trust in the County's process. Any grower

who cannot prove the veracity of the affidavit needs to be shut down by the County, since it is not a valid legal non-conforming use. The County should also not approve such growers in the future (including any entities wholly or partially owned by such person or entity, including a beneficial ownership test).

Express support for the draft Urgency Ordinance submitted to the County by the Santa Barbara Coalition for Responsible Cannabis. This draft ordinance would allow the County to minimize many of the nuisance impacts of odor from ongoing, unpermitted cannabis operations and is aimed at growers who lied on affidavits or expanded operations unlawfully after becoming a "legal non conforming use," and who do not have odor control or adequate setbacks in place.

We need a date certain for 100% odor control and shutdown of non-compliant operations. This date cannot be dependent on first completing land use approvals, as growers should have to prove odor abatement before being eligible for a land use permit. The County's regulatory framework of requiring a land use permit prior to enforcement is nonsensical and risks providing an undeserved entitlement to an operator who has not earned it. It makes residents guinea pigs and is skewed shamelessly toward growers. Other counties have not taken such a backwards approach.

We need much more significant setbacks for schools, at least 1000' property line to property line. Cannabis odors and emissions can travel very long distances. Our high school and Foothill Road reek of marijuana, and this and other air quality aspects are having health impacts.

Residents are sensitive receptors. Please include them in the definition as such.

Do not allow permit stacking. The concentration and density of grows are unprecedented. The County now has the largest planned cannabis grows in the world. This is insane. We also have inappropriate density of cannabis grows in heavily populated areas surrounding residences, EDRNs and schools.

Revisit acreage caps for Carpinteria Valley. 186 acres is way too much and was clearly not an informed decision when it was taken.

Reopen CEQA review since the County's EIR did not address the impact of cannabis terpenes/VOCs on ozone and smog air pollution, which is a significant issue in Denver and Vancouver. Air pollution (ozone/smog) was not covered by the County's EIR and is a very material environmental impact that needs to be evaluated. The EIR focused on odor, when there is a much deeper air pollution issue that needs to be reckoned with.

The County and APCD should explicitly note that under applicable laws, cannabis is not considered a "crop" under the Right to Farm Act. Manufacturing is not an "Agricultural Operation". There is no nuisance exemption for cannabis as a result. APCD also has clear jurisdiction here, which they have essentially abdicated by claiming cannabis is a "crop". The County and APCD have both dropped the ball on evaluating the significant air pollution environmental issues caused by commercial cannabis grows (see above CEQA/EIR point).

Odor abatement is the County's responsibility and should not rely on residents for enforcement. The County should require the clear best practices of other states that have tread deeper into this space - carbon filtration and sealed, industrial greenhouses. Realistically, commercial cannabis growing, when done right, is an industrial, not an agricultural use, given the air pollution/emissions issues and need for sealed, closed-loop, HVAC-heavy buildings to prevent externalities. Require independent, county-funded review of odor control technologies for effectiveness and impact on public health (long-term, cumulative exposure across multiple grows) prior to allowing use.

The County should supplement police presence in Carpinteria Valley and other grow areas, given that this is a cash business and unfortunately has involved human trafficking and other criminal risks (robberies of greenhouses, etc).

We need an Economic Impact Study that more holistically addresses the realistic revenues and extensive costs of our cannabis regulations (enforcement, residential property value declines, decreases in tourism revenue, damage to existing businesses and genuine Right to Farm agricultural uses, etc). Revenues are falling far below rosy estimates, and the County should consider and estimate the full all-in cost of what it is doing, which impacts many constituents.

Sincerely,

Jilla Wolsey

Relis, Mia

From: Lion Eye Farms <lioneyefarms@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:27 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public Comment July 9

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.

My name is Jorge and I have worked at Lion Eye Farms for over a year. I am 23 years old and I was born and raised in Lompoc. I started at Lion Eye as a tarp puller in hopes to land a better position. I have since worked my way up to head of communications on the grow pad. I have learned how to do everything now at Lion eye. I can run the well, clone, mix nutrients, work the soil, and harvest. I have learned all about the hours of light, planting and all other organic farming benefits. I'm growing my future here and I'm so happy to have this opportunity. It's hard to find a good job that I can grow with. I'm proud to be a sustainable farmer in such a beautiful area so close to home.

Jorge
Employee-Lion Eye Farms

Relis, Mia

From: Leigh-Anne Anderson <leighanne@anderson-pr.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:32 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: I support our local cannabis industry.

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a local Carpinteria resident and have two young boys I'm raising in this community too. I'm the founder of Anderson-PR Public Relations and also a founding member of KopSun.

As a resident and business owner in Carpinteria, I can tell you there are many of us who support cannabis, and especially local farmers, who continue to work hard to seek and secure the required State and local permits and licenses.

The success of local agriculture is critical to the success of the local economy. Cannabis farming has the potential to bring hundreds of millions of dollars into the local economy. Cut flowers were no longer viable on the scale they had grown in Carpinteria and to sustain agriculture, farmers need to change crops and they need support from community leaders to ensure their success.

Cannabis farms in Carpinteria Valley employ about 1,000 workers and that's huge in every part of the local economy. Local stores like Carpinteria Valley Lumber and All-Around Irrigation have made hundreds of thousands of dollars from cannabis farms and they all pay sales tax. The economic opportunity brought on by cannabis farming will not bring new development and keep Carpinteria the quaint place it is today.

Carpinteria remains a small semi-rural beach town. The only change is a new plant that brings an opportunity for our existing farms in existing infrastructure. If you don't use it, you lose it. Santa Barbara County forecasts about \$6 million in taxes this year from cannabis. That money is used on enforcement, for libraries and other critical services. Both of my children are in the public school system, and I can tell you our schools need these dollars desperately.

Please know the majority of our community supports and stands with our local cannabis growers and will continue to use their voice and vote to reflect such.

All my best,

leigh-anne anderson | founder
anderson - pr

call/ [310.990.5752](tel:310.990.5752)
tweet/ [@anderson4pr](https://twitter.com/anderson4pr) | facebook/ Anderson-PR
link/www.anderson-pr.com

This message is intended only for the use of the Addressee and may contain information that is PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please erase all copies of the message and its attachments and notify us immediately. Thank You.

Relis, Mia

From: Jasmine Ramirez <jasmine@privatereserve.org>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:33 AM
To: sbcob

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 Santa Barbara County officials,

I am writing you to express my business's and my personal support of the cannabis industry in Santa Barbara County. Below are some important points I'd like to convey related to this new and legal industry. Many of the points noted below are related to why I think this industry is good for all citizens of Santa Barbara County— whether they like the cannabis plant and its byproducts or not. Additionally, the idea of making yet more changes to the cannabis ordinance that has taken so much effort already for all the different county agencies to review and approve is simply bad public policy.

- First and foremost, Cannabis for medical or recreational use is legal in California. Proposition 64 was passed by a landslide majority of California citizens in 2016.
- The Cannabis industry is providing hundreds and hundreds of good paying jobs for county residents who are therefore further supporting our county's economy.
- This new industry has created a much needed financial boost for many non-cannabis businesses like ours.
- The cannabis businesses and their employees we've gotten to know are good people who we've enjoyed working with.
- Agriculture is still the #1 economic driver in the County of Santa Barbara and cannabis is just the newest legal form of agriculture. This industry should be allowed to thrive and continue to positively contribute to our county just like any other agricultural crop.
- Further limiting any landowners' ability to grow legal, highly regulated cannabis does not fix the main problem in this County regarding cannabis—the existence of black market or non-compliant grow operations. The negative impacts of illicit indoor and outdoor cultivation on the environment have been well-documented.
- Santa Barbara County has a unique opportunity to be the leader in sun grown, sustainable cannabis and expand its tourism industry which is again good for all county residents whether they support the plant and its byproducts or not.

This new and legal industry is providing an incredible opportunity for Santa Barbara to continue to thrive through the employment, taxes and other positive contributions it is contributing to the our county. It should be allowed to thrive and continue to contribute very positively to the whole county economy.

Sincerely

Jasmine Ramirez-Velasquez

Relis, Mia

From: Jen Collins <j.m.c.jenn@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:34 AM
To: Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Subject: Santa Barbara County Supervisors Meeting 7/9, Cannabis Regulations

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.

July 5, 2019

The Santa Barbara Board of Supervisors, et al.

I am a citizen who is deeply concerned about the consequences of the unfettered cannabis industry's growth in Carpinteria. I have a child living in and attending school in Carpinteria. We love our home and community. I believe that changes need to be made to the current laws and regulations in order to protect his health and future. Please read below the points that I believe need to be addressed immediately.

I commend the letters submitted by the Cities of Carpinteria and Goleta, urging significant amendments to the County's regulatory and enforcement framework for cannabis. The cannabis regulations have failed and that it's time to go back to the drawing board. Fixing the Land Use Ordinance (regulations) is the only way to do this well. We need to fix the land use and permitting aspects since they are much stronger controls.

The Coastal Zone deserves equal if not stronger protections than inland. Having stronger controls for inland Ag parcels vs coastal Ag parcels would be unacceptable differential zoning treatment. Please consider a commercial cannabis ban on AG-1-20 acre or under parcels in the Coastal Zone (given clearly demonstrated incompatible use issues), or, at minimum require CUPs (Conditional Use Permits) for any commercial cannabis grows in the Coastal Zone.

The County must stop its practice of authorizing state provisional licenses. The state keeps extending provisional license timetables, but the county does not have to be complicit in this by authorizing these at the county level (which is required in order for them to be valid).

The County should not issue any land use permits or CDP approvals until there is an independent investigation and clean up of the County's affidavit mess (which allowed cannabis cultivation to proliferate under the guise of "legal non-conforming use"). Many growers lied on their affidavits in claiming they were growing medical marijuana prior to the cutoff date in 2016. Others illegally expanded their operations when under legal non-conforming status, which is not legal. The County did nothing to validate the truthfulness of the grower affidavits. There must be an investigation into how this gross negligence occurred, as well as a county review of each affidavit to demand proof of the growers' claims (eg that they were growing medical marijuana and how many plants). Such proof should be publicly posted to restore public trust in the County's process. Any grower who cannot prove the veracity of the affidavit needs to be shut down by the County, since it is not a valid legal non-conforming use. The County should also not approve such growers in the future (including any entities wholly or partially owned by such person or entity, including a beneficial ownership test).

Express support for the draft Urgency Ordinance submitted to the County by the Santa Barbara Coalition for Responsible Cannabis. This draft ordinance would allow the County to minimize many of the nuisance impacts of odor from ongoing, unpermitted cannabis operations and is aimed at growers who lied on affidavits or

expanded operations unlawfully after becoming a "legal non conforming use," and who do not have odor control or adequate setbacks in place.

We need a date certain for 100% odor control and shutdown of non-compliant operations. This date cannot be dependent on first completing land use approvals, as growers should have to prove odor abatement before being eligible for a land use permit. The County's regulatory framework of requiring a land use permit prior to enforcement is nonsensical and risks providing an undeserved entitlement to an operator who has not earned it. It makes residents guinea pigs and is skewed shamelessly toward growers. Other counties have not taken such a backwards approach.

We need much more significant setbacks for schools, at least 1000' property line to property line. Cannabis odors and emissions can travel very long distances. Our high school and Foothill Road reek of marijuana, and this and other air quality aspects are having health impacts.

Residents are sensitive receptors. Please include them in the definition as such.

Do not allow permit stacking. The concentration and density of grows are unprecedented. The County now has the largest planned cannabis grows in the world. This is insane. We also have inappropriate density of cannabis grows in heavily populated areas surrounding residences, EDRNs and schools.

Revisit acreage caps for Carpinteria Valley. 186 acres is way too much and was clearly not an informed decision when it was taken.

Reopen CEQA review since the County's EIR did not address the impact of cannabis terpenes/VOCs on ozone and smog air pollution, which is a significant issue in Denver and Vancouver. Air pollution (ozone/smog) was not covered by the County's EIR and is a very material environmental impact that needs to be evaluated. The EIR focused on odor, when there is a much deeper air pollution issue that needs to be reckoned with.

The County and APCD should explicitly note that under applicable laws, cannabis is not considered a "crop" under the Right to Farm Act. Manufacturing is not an "Agricultural Operation". There is no nuisance exemption for cannabis as a result. APCD also has clear jurisdiction here, which they have essentially abdicated by claiming cannabis is a "crop". The County and APCD have both dropped the ball on evaluating the significant air pollution environmental issues caused by commercial cannabis grows (see above CEQA/EIR point).

Odor abatement is the County's responsibility and should not rely on residents for enforcement. The County should require the clear best practices of other states that have tread deeper into this space - carbon filtration and sealed, industrial greenhouses. Realistically, commercial cannabis growing, when done right, is an industrial, not an agricultural use, given the air pollution/emissions issues and need for sealed, closed-loop, HVAC-heavy buildings to prevent externalities. Require independent, county-funded review of odor control technologies for effectiveness and impact on public health (long-term, cumulative exposure across multiple grows) prior to allowing use.

The County should supplement police presence in Carpinteria Valley and other grow areas, given that this is a cash business and unfortunately has involved human trafficking and other criminal risks (robberies of greenhouses, etc).

I submit that Das Williams and Steve Lavagnino should voluntarily recuse themselves from voting on cannabis-related items given the revelations in the recent LA Times article re coziness with the cannabis lobby. Recusal is imperative to restore public trust. The Board of Supervisors should request an independent subpoena-powered investigation into how the current regulatory framework came to be.

We need an Economic Impact Study that more holistically addresses the realistic revenues and extensive costs of our cannabis regulations (enforcement, residential property value declines, decreases in tourism revenue, damage to existing businesses and genuine Right to Farm agricultural uses, etc). Revenues are falling far below rosy estimates, and the County should consider and estimate the full all-in cost of what it is doing, which impacts many constituents.

I am unable to attend the meeting on Tuesday as I will be at work but I will be supporting my Fellow Concerned Carpinterian's.

Thank you for voting to ensure the health and long term well being of our beautiful beach side community!

Sincerely,

Jennifer Hansen
5365 8th Street, Unit A
Carpinteria, CA 93013
805 684 4665

Relis, Mia

From: Tom Steel <tom@freesb.org>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:34 AM
To: sbcob; Clk-RecHelpDesk, Clk-RecHelpDesk
Subject: Public Comment for 7/9 Supervisors' Meeting
Attachments: Public Comment to Supervisors (1).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.

Dear SB County,

Here is a public comment to be submitted for the July 9th Board of Supervisors' meeting.

Please let me know you've received this.

Best,

Tom Steel
Founder, Free SB



Attn: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
From: Tom Steel on behalf of FreeSB Students
Re: Opportunity to Put Higher Education Within Reach for All

Friday, July 5th, 2019

Members of the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors,

My name is Tom Steel, and I am a recent graduate of the University of California, Santa Barbara and the Founder of FreeSB. We are a group of students and young people committed to making college truly affordable for everyone in Santa Barbara County. We believe that the County Board of Supervisors can play a role in expanding college affordability programs such as the Hancock Promise, the SBCC Promise, and the UCSB Promise, and that cannabis tax revenue can play a role in putting college within reach for all Santa Barbara County students.

The goal of making college accessible to all is driven by my own experiences in higher education, and with overcoming food insecurity to persist and graduate from college. The summer before my sophomore year of college, I worked a job in agriculture as I did every summer prior. These jobs entailed long hours with only a few days off, so that I could earn enough money to pay for rent during the upcoming year. From this work, I could not afford textbooks, clothes, transportation, or notebooks—only rent.

When my family's financial hardships worsened, I sent money home to help my family. In an effort to stave off a potential foreclosure on our home, I knew that I would have to cut costs somehow in order to avoid dropping out of college and also support my family. During these trying times, my roommate and I cut our monthly grocery budget down to just \$25. As weeks turned into months, I became dangerously gaunt. I could count each of my ribs from my lower back up into my armpit when I looked in the mirror. I could not focus on my studies, my academic performance suffered, and I became depressed. My family and friends asked me why I looked so thin, why I was not eating enough, and why I was not exercising more. I did not tell them the truth because I knew it would bring them to tears knowing they could not help me out of this predicament.

Although my financial hardships are no longer as intense today, I am still left with a fear of going hungry again. This fear of food insecurity is ingrained in me. I worry that the day will come when I must eat rice, lettuce, and some bits of chicken for every meal. I worry that



once again I will go to bed hungry to save food for tomorrow. Most of all, I worry that other students will have to endure similar struggles just to pursue an education.

Students support our mission at FreeSB because my story is not unique. The true costs of college are crippling and deprive students of the opportunity to thrive while earning a degree. On a fundamental level, these costs deprive us of the basic human rights of food, housing, and the pursuit of education.

In the first few weeks of our launch, FreeSB has been falsely characterized as an extension of the cannabis industry. We are advocating for the use of cannabis revenue for college affordability because it is an issue currently under consideration by the Board. However, we believe that other sources of tax revenue can be just as important to our cause. Our hope is to pursue a constructive dialogue with the County Board of Supervisors, knowing that they share our goal of ensuring all students and young people in Santa Barbara County can thrive.

I am submitting this letter on behalf of 55 people who represent our local colleges, universities, and the community of Santa Barbara County. They submitted their comments in support of the following petition.

I support expanding college affordability to all Santa Barbara County students. I recognize the dire need to address student homelessness, skyrocketing tuition costs, crippling debt, and student food insecurity in our County's colleges and universities. These problems deserve immediate action.

Responsibly cultivated cannabis can and should be used as a solution to our community crisis. The County should use tax revenue from cannabis farming operations to fund college affordability grant programs to address these issues, so that students have true access to higher education.

Here are their voices of support:

1. Access to higher education is a crisis in our community and many people can not receive access to it because of the extremely high cost. Since cannabis cultivation has a projected tax revenue of \$25 million, at least some should go towards paying for community members to get a higher education. It would be absurd to not do so!
2. I support tax revenue for cannabis cultivation being used to fund college affordability programs. I am a recent UCSB alumni. Because of my financial situation, I was often



forced to sacrifice food in order to afford the expensive cost of university attendance and rent. Moreover, I watched many of my friends weigh the same or similar financial considerations. This initiative can help amend food insecurity & homelessness within the college community.

3. I support expanding college affordability to all Santa Barbara County students. I recognize the dire need to address student homelessness, skyrocketing tuition costs, crippling debt, and student food insecurity in our county's colleges and universities. These problems deserve immediate action.
4. Education should be accessible to all
5. This is a win win for the county, We should join the trend of marijuana legalization early to cash in on its benefits and address college affordability at the same time. Please listen to the people who need the most help! Thank you.
6. No more war on drugs. Use tax money to help with student expenses which will help the state and country thrive.
7. I have seen the consequences that the war on drugs can have in a community and it's truly disastrous to the community in its entirety. Instead of trying to eliminate cultivation are goal should to take advantage of it to ultimately benefit the community instead of hurting it!
8. I strongly support this initiative!
9. UCSB has provided me many opportunities for the future. It has also put me thousands of dollars in debt. This program would allow all students regardless of financial backgrounds to receive an education.
10. This is a smart and efficient allocation of tax dollars
11. These taxes should be directly benefitting the consumer and the consumers of college age are a huge majority that face issues like food and housing insecurity
12. Make a change
13. It's the right thing to do.
14. Please consider our needs
15. Within the last two weeks, I have watched the majority of my friends struggle with housing insecurity. They have resorted to commuting from as far as LA, sleeping on couches, cramming 8+ people into houses with only 3 beds, and sleeping in their cars. Student homelessness and food insecurity needs attention!
16. I support this proposal because it takes an industry we've traditionally criminalized and transforms it into a way we can reduce the inequities so many students fall victim to. If SB County can spearhead both the destigmatization of cannabis cultivation AND greater accessibility to education, this county will set the precedent for alleviating two kinds of Injustice we can't afford to perpetuate.



-
17. Throughout the county, students are struggling to maintain their livelihood because of lack of resources, homes, and food. Tax revenue from cannabis cultivation is the solution to these problems.
 18. As a former student and member of the community, I support measures that will collectively improve the overall environment - particularly when it relates to accessibility.
 19. Yes
 20. As a California student I am in full support of affordable education and I truly believe this is a great place to start!
 21. I support the use of revenue from cannabis cultivation by grant programs that can fund access to higher education.
 22. There is a housing & food insecurity crisis in the Santa Barbara community, specifically the community of Isla Vista surrounding UCSB which is made up of about 80% students. In this community, rent and cost of living is continually increasing even though the vast majority of residents are students & those have to pay tuition, student fees, etc on top of this increasing cost of living. It is obvious that something must be done about this crisis, and the funds are available in the form of tax revenue from cannabis cultivation. This tax revenue should be used in this form to benefit the community & increase access to education while helping to alleviate homelessness and food insecurity.
 23. I support this
 24. All people deserve equal access to college. Making it more affordable funds education, dreams, and future careers.
 25. This is beyond a necessity
 26. Prioritize education & stop criminalizing weed!!! If our elected officials & county reps utilize the benefits of CA legalizing a non-dangerous drug, we can actually promote increased access to higher education by investing in low income communities to apply and attend!
 27. Let's ensure food and housing security
 28. This is a good idea! please put the money to actual use!
 29. I support expanding college affordability.
 30. Free SB!
 31. I support expanding college affordability to all Santa Barbara County students. I recognize the dire need to address student homelessness, skyrocketing tuition costs, crippling debt, and student food insecurity in our county's colleges and universities. These problems deserve immediate action. Responsibly cultivated cannabis can and should be used as a solution to our community crisis. The County should use tax revenue from cannabis farming



operations to fund college affordability grant programs to address these issues so that students have true access to higher education.

32. I would prefer that cannabis cultivation money go toward college funding.
33. I fully support this cause. As a college student myself, countless friends and I battle food insecurity daily and have to choose our pricey education over basic nutritional needs. Something must be done about this.
34. Hello, I'm a continuing senior at UCSB. I've dealt with food insecurity and i feel like it is the main reason for most of my troubles in my 4 years here. I'd go hungry during the day during class making it difficult to concentrate during lecture and feeling self-conscious because my stomach would growl so loudly. I'd go to bed hungry making it difficult to fall asleep and rough mornings because of a lack of energy. Felt unmotivated to keep my fitness health up because I was hungry and expending more energy at the gym would not fix my hunger. Regular workouts also promotes mental health, and constantly being hungry makes you irritable and depressed which doesn't help when you have midterms, finals and papers around the corner every other week, sometimes 8 out of the 10 weeks. Rent also isn't cheap so after I paid my rent and bills, I had to use whatever money I had left to eat, which never seemed to be enough. My family is already low income and stressed with their own bills, barely making it by, so I'd go hungry some days because I didn't want to bother them and ask them for more money, so I made due with what I had. These are the issues that happen every day and CONTINUE to happen to me as I speak. Today I'll have the same pasta and the same turkey I've been eating for the past 5 days in a row. There's days where I just feel so unmotivated to eat because it get's exhausting and depressing eating it over and over and over again. It should be a basic right to not go hungry, especially when you don't have the direct support of your family to feed you. So I please ask that some of the cannabis revenue go to feeding the students here at Santa Barbara. I thank you for your time.
35. Food insecurity shouldn't be a problem on United States campuses. Neither should class hinder your emotional and physical wellbeing by stripping you of vital financial resources.
36. To Whom It May Concern,
I fully support this initiative and believe it is a great solution to college affordability. I hope it gains traction and gets SBCC/UCSB students the financial support they need. College is already hard, not being able to afford the basic necessities should not be an issue for any aspiring student.
37. I support expanding college affordability to all Santa Barbara County students. I recognize the dire need to address student homelessness, skyrocketing tuition



costs, crippling debt, and student food insecurity in our county's colleges and universities. These problems deserve immediate action.

Responsibly cultivated cannabis can and should be used as a solution to our community crisis. The County should use tax revenue from cannabis farming operations to fund college affordability grant programs to address these issues so that students have true access to higher education.

38. I support this petition.

39. Support!

40. I don't find issue with using new tax revenues to meet people's needs. But ultimately, with or without this tax, this county should be able to support its workers and students to live where they work and to study in relative peace such that both groups can engage in their communities directly instead of working multiple jobs while still being on the verge of homelessness.

Do your jobs. Tax the rich, expand low income and cooperative housing. Remove landlords from power and support union fights.

This tax is a bandaid, but one we desperately need when you have left us for years bleeding out.

41. Where will we grow the cannabis?

42. As a recent UCSB graduate, I have experienced the difficulties of food security, housing insecurity and high tuition cost. It is why I urge you all to consider this as a viable solution to the crisis within the Santa Barbara community. Let us not forget that UCSB falls under the jurisdiction of the county board of supervisors and it is your responsibility to adhere to students needs just as any other Santa Barbara county resident.

43. I am in support of this petition and this tax revenue will greatly help students as we have a huge problem with college affordability and access to resources.

44. I support this.

45. I support this petition.

46. I agree

47. I support expanding college affordability to all Santa Barbara County students. I recognize the dire need to address student homelessness, skyrocketing tuition costs, crippling debt, and student food insecurity in our county's colleges and universities. These problems deserve immediate action.

48. The Santa Barbara County Supervisors need to know why access to higher education is a crisis in our community and how responsible cannabis cultivation can be a solution.

I support expanding college affordability to all Santa Barbara County students. I recognize the dire need to address student homelessness, skyrocketing tuition



costs, crippling debt, and student food insecurity in our county's colleges and universities. These problems deserve immediate action.

Responsibly cultivated cannabis can and should be used as a solution to our community crisis. The County should use tax revenue from cannabis farming operations to fund college affordability grant programs to address these issues so that students have true access to higher education.

49. Utilizing revenue generated from cannabis cultivation is not only a possible solution in terms of addressing issues in our community regarding college affordability, but absolutely should be put towards funding programs supporting basic needs of students.
50. If we truly want to advance as a nation, logically higher education must be easier to attain. The more educated the population, the faster we can grow and become a more proud nation.
51. Please allow this tax on cannabis cultivation go to help college students in need. This would highly benefit a large portion of our population who need it the most.
52. Support affordable college and listen to the more marginalized members of the community rather than the wealthy landowners
53. Affordability is the essential for college students! We must tackle this essential issue
54. Marijuana should be legal to buy and sell, but also to grow. Funds from cultivation would be put to good use making education free!
55. I support expanding college affordability to all Santa Barbara County students. I recognize the dire need to address student homelessness, skyrocketing tuition costs, crippling debt, and student food insecurity in our county's colleges and universities. These problems deserve immediate action.

Relis, Mia

From: Kaelen Perrochet <kperrochet@ucsb.edu>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:36 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: UCSB Lobby Corps Call to Action.
Attachments: UCSB Lobby Corps Call to Action.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.

To whom it may concern—

UCSB Lobby Corps would like to submit this letter calling community leaders to take action on the issues of food and housing insecurity among college students in Santa Barbara County.

Thank you,

Kaelen Perrochet
Co-chair of UCSB Lobby Corps

UCSB Lobby Corps exists to give students a pathway to effecting political change and advocating for the policies that they are passionate about. During the 2018-2019 legislative year, meeting students' basic needs was one of those policies. Lobby Corps fought against budget cuts to basic needs programs and secured \$14 million in funding for basic needs from the California State Budget.

We might be more proud of this victory if not for the fact that, according to the University of California Global Food Initiative, 42% of students in the UC system still report food insecurity. Additionally, based on local surveys, 19% of Santa Barbara Community College students report experiencing homelessness.

As much as the students of UCSB have done to push back against the ever-encroaching threat of food insecurity, there is so much more work that needs to be done. Half-hearted measures and stopgap solutions will not solve the problem of students going to bed hungry or not having somewhere to live. Bolder measures must be taken.

For these reasons, UCSB Lobby Corps is urging local legislators to take immediate action alleviating student homelessness and food insecurity among Santa Barbara's college students. Regardless of the form of this solution, effective solutions must be arrived at and implemented. Be it by creating a more robust county food bank program aimed at supporting college students, implementing additional legal protections for renters, or supporting FreeSB's campaign to use a portion of the cannabis tax to go toward assisting students in meeting

their basic needs, Santa Barbara County must do something to address the rampant food and housing insecurity among college students.

Relis, Mia

From: Lion Eye Farms <lioneyefarms@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:37 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public comment for July 9th

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.

My name is Jonathan Nunez, I was born in Aiken, South Carolina. I moved to Lompoc, CA when I was 8 years old and have been in Santa Barbara County ever since. I started working at Lion eye Farms in 2018 and still can't believe how I got lucky enough to become a part of the Farmily. My job at Lion Eye Farms is to make sure I nurture these plants to the best of my ability up until we cut the plants down. All around great energy on and off the farm. And extremely thankful for Lion eye Farms for teaching me everything I have learned and will continue to learn in this industry!

Jonathan Nunez
Employee- Lion Eye Farms

Relis, Mia

From: Steven Rutherford <steven@privatereserve.org>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:38 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Board of supervisors meeting

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 Santa Barbara County officials,

I am writing you to express my business's and my personal support of the cannabis industry in Santa Barbara County. Below are some important points I'd like to convey related to this new and legal industry. Many of the points noted below are related to why I think this industry is good for all citizens of Santa Barbara County—whether they like the cannabis plant and its byproducts or not. Additionally, the idea of making yet more changes to the cannabis ordinance that has taken so much effort already for all the different county agencies to review and approve is simply bad public policy.

- First and foremost, Cannabis for medical or recreational use is legal in California. Proposition 64 was passed by a landslide majority of California citizens in 2016.
- The Cannabis industry is providing hundreds and hundreds of good paying jobs for county residents who are therefore further supporting our county's economy.
- This new industry has created a much needed financial boost for many non-cannabis businesses like ours.
- The cannabis businesses and their employees we've gotten to know are good people who we've enjoyed working with.
- Agriculture is still the #1 economic driver in the County of Santa Barbara and cannabis is just the newest legal form of agriculture. This industry should be allowed to thrive and continue to positively contribute to our county just like any other agricultural crop.
- Further limiting any landowners' ability to grow legal, highly regulated cannabis does not fix the main problem in this County regarding cannabis—the existence of black market or non-compliant grow operations. The negative impacts of illicit indoor and outdoor cultivation on the environment have been well-documented.
- Santa Barbara County has a unique opportunity to be the leader in sun grown, sustainable cannabis and expand its tourism industry which is again good for all county residents whether they support the plant and its byproducts or not.

This new and legal industry is providing an incredible opportunity for Santa Barbara to continue to thrive through the employment, taxes and other positive contributions it is contributing to the our county. It should be allowed to thrive and continue to contribute very positively to the whole county economy.

Sincerely

Relis, Mia

From: Cassandra Diaz <cassandra@privatereserve.org>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:41 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Santa Barbara county meeting

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 Santa Barbara County officials,

I am writing you to express my business's and my personal support of the cannabis industry in Santa Barbara County. Below are some important points I'd like to convey related to this new and legal industry. Many of the points noted below are related to why I think this industry is good for all citizens of Santa Barbara County—whether they like the cannabis plant and its byproducts or not. Additionally, the idea of making yet more changes to the cannabis ordinance that has taken so much effort already for all the different county agencies to review and approve is simply bad public policy.

- First and foremost, Cannabis for medical or recreational use is legal in California. Proposition 64 was passed by a landslide majority of California citizens in 2016.
- The Cannabis industry is providing hundreds and hundreds of good paying jobs for county residents who are therefore further supporting our county's economy.
- This new industry has created a much needed financial boost for many non-cannabis businesses like ours.
- The cannabis businesses and their employees we've gotten to know are good people who we've enjoyed working with.
- Agriculture is still the #1 economic driver in the County of Santa Barbara and cannabis is just the newest legal form of agriculture. This industry should be allowed to thrive and continue to positively contribute to our county just like any other agricultural crop.
- Further limiting any landowners' ability to grow legal, highly regulated cannabis does not fix the main problem in this County regarding cannabis—the existence of black market or non-compliant grow operations. The negative impacts of illicit indoor and outdoor cultivation on the environment have been well-documented.
- Santa Barbara County has a unique opportunity to be the leader in sun grown, sustainable cannabis and expand its tourism industry which is again good for all county residents whether they support the plant and its byproducts or not.

This new and legal industry is providing an incredible opportunity for Santa Barbara to continue to thrive through the employment, taxes and other positive contributions it is contributing to the our county. It should be allowed to thrive and continue to contribute very positively to the whole county economy.

Sincerely

Cassandra Diaz

Relis, Mia

From: Gail Herson <devesi@me.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:42 AM
To: Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Subject: Letter for Board of Supervisors meeting July 9,2019

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please amend the cannabis regulations in order to protect residents, schoolchildren, tourism and existing Right to Farm agricultural interests. I commend the letters submitted to you by the Cities of Carpinteria and Goleta, urging changes to the County's regulatory and enforcement framework for cannabis. The cannabis regulatory framework has failed, and it is time to go back to the drawing board. **Fixing the Land Use Ordinance (regulations) is the only way to do this well. Amending only the Business License is not sufficient-** we need to fix the land use and permitting aspects since they are much stronger controls.

No Differential Zoning Treatment for Coastal Zone:

The Coastal Zone deserves equal if not stronger protections than inland. Having stronger controls for inland Ag parcels vs coastal Ag parcels would be unacceptable (and legally fraught) differential zoning treatment. Please consider a **commercial cannabis ban on AG-1-20 acre or under parcels in the Coastal Zone** (given clearly demonstrated incompatible use issues), or, at minimum **require CUPs (Conditional Use Permits) for any commercial cannabis grows in the Coastal Zone.**

Provisional Licenses, Land Use Permits & CDPs:

-- **stop authorizing state provisional licenses.** The state keeps extending provisional license timetables, but the County does not have to be complicit in this by authorizing these at the county level (which is required in order for them to be valid).

--**Do not issue any more land use permits or CDP approvals** until there is a clean up of the County's affidavit mess (which allowed cannabis cultivation to proliferate under the guise of "legal non-conforming use"). Many growers lied on their affidavits in claiming they were growing medical marijuana prior to the cutoff date in 2016. Others illegally expanded their operations when under legal non-conforming status, which is not legal. The County did nothing to validate the truthfulness of the grower affidavits. **Review each affidavit to demand proof of the growers' claims** (eg that they were growing medical marijuana and how many plants). **Publicly post proof to restore public trust** in the County's process. **Shut down any grower who cannot prove the veracity of the affidavit**, since it is not a valid legal non-conforming use. The County should also not approve such growers in the future (including any entities wholly or partially owned by such person or entity, including a beneficial ownership test).

--**I support the draft Urgency Ordinance submitted to the County by the Santa Barbara Coalition for Responsible Cannabis.** This draft ordinance would allow the County to minimize many of the nuisance impacts of odor from ongoing, unpermitted cannabis operations and is aimed at growers who lied on affidavits or expanded operations unlawfully after becoming a "legal non conforming use," and who do not have odor control or adequate setbacks in place.

Environmental and Health - EIR and APCD Concerns:

--Under applicable laws, **cannabis is not considered a "crop" under the Right to Farm Act.** Manufacturing is not an "Agricultural Operation". APCD also has clear jurisdiction here, which they have essentially abdicated by referring to cannabis as a "crop". The County and APCD have not evaluated the significant air pollution environmental issues caused by commercial cannabis grows. Other areas (Denver and Vancouver) are grappling with this - we need to care about the environment and air quality and adjust the regulations accordingly.

--**Reopen CEQA review since the County's EIR did not address the impact of cannabis terpenes/VOCs on ozone and smog air pollution,** which is a significant issue in Denver and Vancouver. Air pollution (ozone/smog formation due to cannabis cultivation in sunny, high-traffic, inversion-layer-prone areas) was not covered in the County's EIR and is a very material environmental impact that needs to be evaluated. **The EIR focused on odor, when VOC emissions is a much deeper air pollution issue that needs to be reckoned with. Ozone and smog affect respiratory and cardiovascular health.**

Nuisance Protections for Impacted Groups:

--**Set a date for 100% odor control and shutdown of non-compliant operations.** This date cannot be dependent on first completing land use approvals, as growers should have to prove odor abatement before being eligible for a land use permit. The County's regulatory framework of requiring a land use permit prior to enforcement is nonsensical and risks providing an undeserved entitlement to an operator who has not earned it. It makes residents guinea pigs and is skewed shamelessly toward growers. Other counties have not taken such a backwards approach.

— **increase setbacks for schools** to at least 1000' property line to property line.

--**designate all Residents as sensitive receptors.**

--**Focus on eliminating emissions as the basis of Odor abatement. Require sealed, industrial greenhouses using carbon filtration and powered by alternative energy.** The County should require the clear best practices of other states that have tread deeper into this space - carbon filtration and sealed, industrial greenhouses. Realistically, commercial cannabis growing, when done right, is an industrial, not an agricultural use, given the air pollution/emissions issues and need for sealed, closed-loop, HVAC-heavy buildings to prevent externalities.

I agree with attorney Marc Chyttilo regarding odor standards and controls:(underlining is mine)

Adopt an Objective Odor Standard – No Detect at the Property Line

The County's cannabis ordinance lacks an objective or enforceable odor standard. The ns be non-detectable at the property line. This should apply to both AG-I lands, where air pollution control technology will be identified in an application, be evaluated in environmental review, and become part of the Project Description or a condition of approval. On AG-II lands, where the cultivation acreage should be limited to a small fraction of the total parcel (see below), on-site buffers must provide assurance that the smell will not reach the property line.

Currently, the odor standard (AG-I only) is the requirement that the applicant submit and implement an Odor Abatement Plan. "The Odor Abatement Plan must prevent odors from being experienced within residential zones, as determined by the Director." Id. This standard is flawed in several respects.

First, it applies only to residential zones. Most AG-I zones are not near residential zones, so this standard is inapplicable to most lands surrounding commercial cannabis cultivation and processing operations on AG-I lands. This standard does not protect Cate School, which is in an AG-I-10 zone.

Second, the reliance on a “determination of the Director” renders the standard arbitrary. As argued by G&K Farms, cannabis odors “are subjective and interpretative depending on the sensitivities of unique receptors.” Letter, Peter Candy, Hollister & Brace, June 3, 2019 to Santa Barbara County Planning Commission, for G&K Farms, page 4. The applicant contends that the County’s existing language “was never intended by the County to establish an objective standard for determining when an odor violation exists.” Id.

Finally, the standard is vague and meaningless. The Planning Commission wrestled with the form of the odor standard with the G&K Appeal, and crafted additional language purporting to enhance the monitoring associated with demonstrating compliance with the illusory standard. PDD staff would visit the site quarterly to “conduct an inspection of the odor control system to assess its compliance with the requirements of this condition and § 35-44U.C.6. 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 control system meets the requirements of this condition and § 35-44U.C.6.” The “Requirements of the Condition” and § 35-44U.C.6 each require that the odor abatement plan “prevent odors from being experienced within residential zones as determined by the Director.” This additional requirement appears to allow an engineer or hygienist to substitute their determination of “experience” in place of the Director’s.

San Luis Obispo County has adopted the following cannabis odor standard:

8. Nuisance Odors. All cannabis cultivation shall be sited and/or operated in a manner that prevents cannabis nuisance odors from being detected offsite. All structures utilized for indoor cannabis cultivation shall be equipped and/or maintained with sufficient ventilation controls (e.g. carbon scrubbers) to eliminate nuisance odor emissions from being detected offsite.

§ 22.40.050

Santa Barbara County should adopt an equally clear and specific “no detect” of odors at or beyond the property line of any parcel containing commercial cannabis cultivation and processing operations. Applications should include air pollution control systems capable of meeting that standard.

Require Emissions Control, not Odor Neutralization

Cannabis odors, and the chemicals used in neutralizing systems, can impact persons with multiple chemical sensitivity. Although terpenes, a class of chemicals, are responsible for the distinctive odor, dozens of other chemicals are offgassed from cannabis cultivation and processing, in addition to the unspecified chemicals. These emissions have potential consequence to criteria pollutants, as VOCs acting as ozone precursors. They also have significance as toxic, hazardous and/or respiratory irritants. While the science is nascent, human health effects have been observed within various populations in the Carpinteria Valley.

The quantities of airborne chemicals emitted to the local atmosphere are significant. Applying applicant-supplied statements of the volume of the Ecosorb chemical product used in the Byers Neutralization system stated for the commercial cannabis cultivation, nursery and processing operations (between 3-6 gallons per day) that was recently heard by the Planning Commission, this one 8.17 acre operation will emit between 4.57 and 9.14 tons of aerosol spray into Carpinteria's air per year. If all 186 acres of Carpinteria's allowable grows used this system at these emissions rates, the Carpinteria valley airshed would receive between 104 and 208 tons of this chemical per year, or between 570 to 1140 pounds sprayed into the air each day. My property is downwind from the heart of the Carpinteria growing region, so I would be forced to inhale this product on a daily basis.

Public Review of Odor Abatement Plan (and Other Mitigation Plans)

As the cannabis ordinance is currently configured, an applicant shall submit an Odor Abatement Plan, Lighting Plan, Security Fencing Plan, Landscape and Screening Plan, Noise Plan and Transportation Plan that is then subject to the exclusive review and approval of staff. There is no public review and comment process to review an Odor Abatement Plan entirely. These Plans are critical to avoid and reduce commercial cannabis cultivation and processing operation impacts on surrounding land uses, and should be circulated and made available for public review and comment.

—Require independent, county-funded review of odor control technologies for effectiveness and impact on public health (long-term, cumulative exposure across multiple grows) prior to allowing use.

--The County should supplement police presence in Carpinteria Valley and other grow areas, given that this is a cash business and unfortunately has involved human trafficking and other criminal risks (robberies of greenhouses, etc).

Reduce Density and Concentration of Use:

--**Do not allow permit stacking.** The concentration and density of grows are unprecedented. The County now has the largest planned cannabis grows in the world and inappropriate density of cannabis grows in heavily populated areas surrounding residences, EDRNs and schools.

--**Reduce density. Lower acreage caps for Carpinteria Valley. 186 acres is way too much.**

Conduct an Economic Impact Study to address realistic revenues and extensive costs of our cannabis regulations (enforcement, residential property value declines, decreases in tourism revenue, damage to existing businesses and genuine Right to Farm agricultural uses, etc). Revenues are far below initial estimates, and the County should consider and estimate the full all-in cost of what it is doing, which impacts many constituents.

Respectfully,
Gail Herson
Carpinteria, CA

Relis, Mia

From: Ted Fox <ted@privatereserve.org>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:43 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public comments for July 9th Board of Supervisors meeting
Attachments: Prop 64 vote by SB County precinct.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.

Dear Supervisors,

I support the legal cannabis industry, which supports a wide array of high paying jobs in our County. I am writing to request no additional changes be made to the Cannabis Ordinance.

Proposition 64 passed statewide with a 57% majority, yet one would assume by the recent vitriol at the Board of Supervisors meetings that it failed passage. I have attached copies of the precinct voting for each polling site in Santa Barbara County for your review.

You will note that cities such as Goleta, Isla Vista and Santa Barbara passed the resolution by a two-thirds majority and in a number of precincts the affirmative vote exceeded over 7 out of every 10 voters. However, listening to the public comments of the Supervisor representing those constituents I can't help but note a huge disconnect.

Cannabis is the most highly regulated industry in our country and adding additional restrictions before the original ordinance has had a chance to take shape seems arbitrary and capricious.

I am concerned by the Board's impatience in letting the current ordinance and the Land Use Permit process play out. I am further concerned that a loud, vocal minority - backed by Big Alcohol companies that are prevented from entering the California cannabis market until 2023 - has hijacked the regulatory process in a predatory attempt to forestall the growth of a competing industry.

Santa Barbara has an opportunity to be a leader in sun grown, sustainable cannabis and expand its agri-tourism industry. Don't allow a small group of vocal opponents with vested interests manipulate the regulatory process for competitive gain.

--

Ted Fox, Vice President of Operations and Compliance
Farm and Ranch Management Services LLC
cellphone 517-974-1675

Statewide result Yes 57.13% No 42.87%

Santa Barbara County
 Presidential General Election
 November 8, 2016
 Certified Results

Date: 12/06/16
 Time: 12:25:18
 Page: 1387 of 1800

PROPOSITION 64 MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION.

	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	YES	NO
Jurisdiction Wide					
10-1002 M-1ST UCORP BT2					
Polling	154	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	154	1	135	95 70.37%	40 29.63%
Total	154	2	135	95 70.37%	40 29.63%
10-1003 M-1ST UCORP BT3					
Polling	18	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	18	1	12	5 41.67%	7 58.33%
Total	18	2	12	5 41.67%	7 58.33%
10-1004 M-1ST UCORP BT4					
Polling	0	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	0	1	0	0	0
Total	0	2	0	0	0
10-1005 M-1ST UCORP BT5					
Polling	1	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	1	1	0	0	0
Total	1	2	0	0	0
10-1006 M-1ST UCORP BT6					
Polling	151	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	151	1	140	110 78.57%	30 21.43%
Total	151	2	140	110 78.57%	30 21.43%
10-1007 M-1ST UCORP BT7					
Polling	184	1	2	1 50.00%	1 50.00%
Vote by Mail	184	1	141	105 74.47%	36 25.53%
Total	184	2	143	106 74.13%	37 25.87%
10-1008 M-1ST UCORP BT8					
Polling	47	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	47	1	37	29 78.38%	8 21.62%
Total	47	2	37	29 78.38%	8 21.62%
10-1009 M-1ST UCORP BT9					
Polling	24	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	24	1	18	10 55.56%	8 44.44%
Total	24	2	18	10 55.56%	8 44.44%
10-1010 M-1ST UCORP BT10					
Polling	40	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	40	1	34	21 61.76%	13 38.24%
Total	40	2	34	21 61.76%	13 38.24%
10-1011 M-1ST UCORP BT11					
Polling	18	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	18	1	14	10 71.43%	4 28.57%
Total	18	2	14	10 71.43%	4 28.57%
10-1012 M-1ST UCORP BT12					
Polling	0	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	0	1	0	0	0
Total	0	2	0	0	0
10-1013 M-1ST UCORP BT13					
Polling	87	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	87	1	73	33 45.21%	40 54.79%
Total	87	2	73	33 45.21%	40 54.79%
10-1014 M-1ST UCORP BT14					
Polling	287	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	287	1	213	83 38.97%	130 61.03%
Total	287	2	213	83 38.97%	130 61.03%
10-1510 CARP					
Polling	1211	1	298	169 56.71%	129 43.29%
Vote by Mail	1211	1	714	424 59.38%	290 40.62%
Total	1211	2	1012	593 58.60%	419 41.40%
10-1520 CARP					
Polling	669	1	112	72 64.29%	40 35.71%
Vote by Mail	669	1	449	267 59.47%	182 40.53%
Total	669	2	561	339 60.43%	222 39.57%

Santa Barbara County
 Presidential General Election
 November 8, 2016
 Certified Results

Date: 12/06/16
 Time: 12:25:18
 Page: 1388 of 1800

PROPOSITION 64 MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION.

	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	YES	NO
10-1530 SMLD					
Polling	1252	1	323	219 67.80%	104 32.20%
Vote by Mail	1252	1	782	555 70.97%	227 29.03%
Total	1252	2	1105	774 70.05%	331 29.95%
10-1560 MONT					
Polling	1091	1	276	188 68.12%	88 31.88%
Vote by Mail	1091	1	644	421 65.37%	223 34.63%
Total	1091	2	920	609 66.20%	311 33.80%
10-1570 MONT					
Polling	1109	1	263	166 63.12%	97 36.88%
Vote by Mail	1109	1	692	386 55.78%	306 44.22%
Total	1109	2	955	552 57.80%	403 42.20%
10-1580 MONT					
Polling	1104	1	248	153 61.69%	95 38.31%
Vote by Mail	1104	1	701	433 61.77%	268 38.23%
Total	1104	2	949	586 61.75%	363 38.25%
10-1590 MONT					
Polling	1102	1	255	149 58.43%	106 41.57%
Vote by Mail	1102	1	676	380 56.21%	296 43.79%
Total	1102	2	931	529 56.82%	402 43.18%
10-1610 CSPR					
Polling	1210	1	306	198 64.71%	108 35.29%
Vote by Mail	1210	1	725	473 65.24%	252 34.76%
Total	1210	2	1031	671 65.08%	360 34.92%
10-1630 MCYN					
Polling	1183	1	309	230 74.43%	79 25.57%
Vote by Mail	1183	1	687	505 73.51%	182 26.49%
Total	1183	2	996	735 73.80%	261 26.20%
10-1640 MCYN					
Polling	839	1	190	144 75.79%	46 24.21%
Vote by Mail	839	1	557	420 75.40%	137 24.60%
Total	839	2	747	564 75.50%	183 24.50%
11-1010 CITY CARP					
Polling	1197	1	315	211 66.98%	104 33.02%
Vote by Mail	1197	1	673	448 66.57%	225 33.43%
Total	1197	2	988	659 66.70%	329 33.30%
11-1020 CITY CARP					
Polling	1344	1	353	226 64.02%	127 35.98%
Vote by Mail	1344	1	772	518 67.10%	254 32.90%
Total	1344	2	1125	744 66.13%	381 33.87%
11-1030 CITY CARP					
Polling	1205	1	332	191 57.53%	141 42.47%
Vote by Mail	1205	1	685	420 61.31%	265 38.69%
Total	1205	2	1017	611 60.08%	406 39.92%
11-1040 CITY CARP					
Polling	1341	1	370	256 69.19%	114 30.81%
Vote by Mail	1341	1	721	490 67.96%	231 32.04%
Total	1341	2	1091	746 68.38%	345 31.62%
11-1070 CITY CARP					
Polling	1035	1	305	179 58.69%	126 41.31%
Vote by Mail	1035	1	565	332 58.76%	233 41.24%
Total	1035	2	870	511 58.74%	359 41.26%
11-1080 CITY CARP					
Polling	1081	1	322	188 58.39%	134 41.61%
Vote by Mail	1081	1	611	378 61.87%	233 38.13%
Total	1081	2	933	566 60.66%	367 39.34%
12-0020 M-CITY STBR BT20					
Polling	19	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	19	1	16	13 81.25%	3 18.75%
Total	19	2	16	13 81.25%	3 18.75%
12-1110 CITY STBR					

Santa Barbara County
 Presidential General Election
 November 8, 2016
 Certified Results

Date:12/06/16
 Time:12:25:18
 Page:1389 of 1800

PROPOSITION 64 MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION.

	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	YES	NO
Polling	661	1	189	143 75.66%	46 24.34%
Vote by Mail	661	1	234	175 74.79%	59 25.21%
Total	661	2	423	318 75.18%	105 24.82%
12-1120 CITY STBR					
Polling	595	1	143	104 72.73%	39 27.27%
Vote by Mail	595	1	311	228 73.31%	83 26.69%
Total	595	2	454	352 73.13%	122 26.87%
12-1130 CITY STBR					
Polling	1594	1	505	360 71.29%	145 28.71%
Vote by Mail	1594	1	698	504 72.21%	194 27.79%
Total	1594	2	1203	864 71.82%	339 28.18%
12-1170 CITY STBR					
Polling	1556	1	480	358 74.58%	122 25.42%
Vote by Mail	1556	1	743	579 77.93%	164 22.07%
Total	1556	2	1223	937 76.61%	286 23.39%
12-1180 CITY STBR					
Polling	1207	1	389	308 79.18%	81 20.82%
Vote by Mail	1207	1	582	460 79.04%	122 20.96%
Total	1207	2	971	768 79.09%	203 20.91%
12-1190 CITY STBR					
Polling	790	1	269	218 81.04%	51 18.96%
Vote by Mail	790	1	424	320 75.47%	104 24.53%
Total	790	2	693	538 77.63%	155 22.37%
12-1210 CITY STBR					
Polling	1807	1	501	392 78.24%	109 21.76%
Vote by Mail	1807	1	905	704 77.79%	201 22.21%
Total	1807	2	1406	1096 77.95%	310 22.05%
12-1216 M-CITY STBR BT16					
Polling	84	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	84	1	74	56 75.68%	18 24.32%
Total	84	2	74	56 75.68%	18 24.32%
12-1218 M-CITY STBR BT18					
Polling	212	1	1	1 100.00%	0 0.00%
Vote by Mail	212	1	189	103 54.50%	86 45.50%
Total	212	2	190	104 54.74%	86 45.26%
12-1219 M-CITY STBR BT19					
Polling	23	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	23	1	17	10 58.82%	7 41.18%
Total	23	2	17	10 58.82%	7 41.18%
12-1220 CITY STBR					
Polling	1534	1	450	367 81.56%	83 18.44%
Vote by Mail	1534	1	788	626 79.44%	162 20.56%
Total	1534	2	1238	993 80.21%	245 19.79%
12-1230 CITY STBR					
Polling	1512	1	424	327 77.12%	97 22.88%
Vote by Mail	1512	1	754	597 79.18%	157 20.82%
Total	1512	2	1178	924 78.44%	254 21.56%
12-1240 CITY STBR					
Polling	686	1	180	144 80.00%	36 20.00%
Vote by Mail	686	1	352	261 74.15%	91 25.85%
Total	686	2	532	405 76.13%	127 23.87%
12-1260 CITY STBR					
Polling	1371	1	380	266 70.00%	114 30.00%
Vote by Mail	1371	1	694	509 73.34%	185 26.66%
Total	1371	2	1074	775 72.16%	299 27.84%
12-1280 CITY STBR					
Polling	1353	1	353	286 81.02%	67 18.98%
Vote by Mail	1353	1	788	620 78.68%	168 21.32%
Total	1353	2	1141	906 79.40%	235 20.60%
12-1290 CITY STBR					
Polling	1091	1	246	169 68.70%	77 31.30%

Santa Barbara County
 Presidential General Election
 November 8, 2016
 Certified Results

Date: 12/06/16
 Time: 12:25:18
 Page: 1390 of 1800

PROPOSITION 64 MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION.

	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	YES	NO
Vote by Mail	1091	1	701	497 70.90%	204 29.10%
Total	1091	2	947	666 70.33%	281 29.67%
12-1310 CITY STBR					
Polling	1418	1	415	289 69.64%	126 30.36%
Vote by Mail	1418	1	699	519 74.25%	180 25.75%
Total	1418	2	1114	808 72.53%	306 27.47%
12-1320 CITY STBR					
Polling	1457	1	428	296 69.16%	132 30.84%
Vote by Mail	1457	1	714	512 71.71%	202 28.29%
Total	1457	2	1142	808 70.75%	334 29.25%
12-1340 CITY STBR					
Polling	1559	1	388	273 70.36%	115 29.64%
Vote by Mail	1559	1	751	534 71.11%	217 28.89%
Total	1559	2	1139	807 70.85%	332 29.15%
12-1370 CITY STBR					
Polling	1701	1	362	265 73.20%	97 26.80%
Vote by Mail	1701	1	1074	761 70.86%	313 29.14%
Total	1701	2	1436	1026 71.45%	410 28.55%
12-1380 CITY STBR					
Polling	1181	1	229	140 61.14%	89 38.86%
Vote by Mail	1181	1	828	512 61.84%	316 38.16%
Total	1181	2	1057	652 61.68%	405 38.32%
12-1390 CITY STBR					
Polling	761	1	199	138 69.35%	61 30.65%
Vote by Mail	761	1	508	368 72.44%	140 27.56%
Total	761	2	707	506 71.57%	201 28.43%
12-1430 CITY STBR					
Polling	1414	1	394	295 74.87%	99 25.13%
Vote by Mail	1414	1	823	595 72.30%	228 27.70%
Total	1414	2	1217	890 73.13%	327 26.87%
12-1440 CITY STBR					
Polling	646	1	143	84 58.74%	59 41.26%
Vote by Mail	646	1	426	262 61.50%	164 38.50%
Total	646	2	569	346 60.81%	223 39.19%
12-1460 CITY STBR					
Polling	1034	1	242	159 65.70%	83 34.30%
Vote by Mail	1034	1	651	437 67.13%	214 32.87%
Total	1034	2	893	596 66.74%	297 33.26%
12-1470 CITY STBR					
Polling	1412	1	353	223 63.17%	130 36.83%
Vote by Mail	1412	1	851	576 67.69%	275 32.31%
Total	1412	2	1204	799 66.36%	405 33.64%
20-2005 M-2ND UCORP BT5					
Polling	630	1	6	5 83.33%	1 16.67%
Vote by Mail	630	1	527	390 74.00%	137 26.00%
Total	630	2	533	395 74.11%	138 25.89%
20-2009 M-2ND UCORP BT9					
Polling	646	1	5	3 60.00%	2 40.00%
Vote by Mail	646	1	547	353 64.53%	194 35.47%
Total	646	2	552	356 64.49%	196 35.51%
20-2010 M-2ND UCORP BT10					
Polling	42	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	42	1	34	20 58.82%	14 41.18%
Total	42	2	34	20 58.82%	14 41.18%
20-2011 M-2ND UCORP BT11					
Polling	136	1	1	0 0.00%	1 100.00%
Vote by Mail	136	1	98	57 58.16%	41 41.84%
Total	136	2	99	57 57.58%	42 42.42%
20-2021 M-2ND UCORP BT21					
Polling	399	1	3	2 66.67%	1 33.33%
Vote by Mail	399	1	336	227 67.56%	109 32.44%

Santa Barbara County
 Presidential General Election
 November 8, 2016
 Certified Results

Date: 12/06/16
 Time: 12:25:18
 Page: 1391 of 1800

PROPOSITION 64 MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION.

	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	YES	NO
Total	399	2	339	229 67.55%	110 32.45%
20-2022 M-2ND UCORP BT22					
Polling	6	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	6	1	6	3 50.00%	3 50.00%
Total	6	2	6	3 50.00%	3 50.00%
20-2530 HOPE					
Polling	715	1	189	136 71.96%	53 28.04%
Vote by Mail	715	1	409	300 73.35%	109 26.65%
Total	715	2	598	436 72.91%	162 27.09%
20-2540 HOPE					
Polling	493	1	143	101 70.63%	42 29.37%
Vote by Mail	493	1	293	176 60.07%	117 39.93%
Total	493	2	436	277 63.53%	159 36.47%
20-2560 HOPE					
Polling	1205	1	158	76 48.10%	82 51.90%
Vote by Mail	1205	1	860	485 56.40%	375 43.60%
Total	1205	2	1018	561 55.11%	457 44.89%
20-2570 HOPE					
Polling	1494	1	409	246 60.15%	163 39.85%
Vote by Mail	1494	1	853	548 64.24%	305 35.76%
Total	1494	2	1262	794 62.92%	468 37.08%
20-2580 HOPE					
Polling	1387	1	313	189 60.38%	124 39.62%
Vote by Mail	1387	1	877	487 55.53%	390 44.47%
Total	1387	2	1190	676 56.81%	514 43.19%
20-2610 GLTA					
Polling	1151	1	285	176 61.75%	109 38.25%
Vote by Mail	1151	1	680	441 64.85%	239 35.15%
Total	1151	2	965	617 63.94%	348 36.06%
20-2620 GLTA					
Polling	1115	1	301	206 68.44%	95 31.56%
Vote by Mail	1115	1	661	424 64.15%	237 35.85%
Total	1115	2	962	630 65.49%	332 34.51%
20-2630 GLTA					
Polling	948	1	299	188 62.88%	111 37.12%
Vote by Mail	948	1	475	307 64.63%	168 35.37%
Total	948	2	774	495 63.95%	279 36.05%
20-2640 GLTA					
Polling	927	1	285	174 61.05%	111 38.95%
Vote by Mail	927	1	493	299 60.65%	194 39.35%
Total	927	2	778	473 60.80%	305 39.20%
20-2660 GLTA					
Polling	1206	1	331	220 66.47%	111 33.53%
Vote by Mail	1206	1	641	404 63.03%	237 36.97%
Total	1206	2	972	624 64.20%	348 35.80%
20-2710 GLTA					
Polling	1094	1	249	163 65.46%	86 34.54%
Vote by Mail	1094	1	692	469 67.77%	223 32.23%
Total	1094	2	941	632 67.16%	309 32.84%
20-2720 GLTA					
Polling	1450	1	322	193 59.94%	129 40.06%
Vote by Mail	1450	1	958	530 55.32%	428 44.68%
Total	1450	2	1280	723 56.48%	557 43.52%
20-2730 GLTA					
Polling	1132	1	274	156 56.93%	118 43.07%
Vote by Mail	1132	1	715	438 61.26%	277 38.74%
Total	1132	2	989	594 60.06%	395 39.94%
20-2740 GLTA					
Polling	1121	1	264	143 54.17%	121 45.83%
Vote by Mail	1121	1	700	437 62.43%	263 37.57%
Total	1121	2	964	580 60.17%	384 39.83%

Santa Barbara County
 Presidential General Election
 November 8, 2016
 Certified Results

Date: 12/06/16
 Time: 12:25:18
 Page: 1392 of 1800

PROPOSITION 64 MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION.

	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	YES	NO
20-2760 GLTA					
Polling	1075	1	259	152 58.69%	107 41.31%
Vote by Mail	1075	1	650	377 58.00%	273 42.00%
Total	1075	2	909	529 58.20%	380 41.80%
20-2770 GLTA					
Polling	1555	1	347	174 50.14%	173 49.86%
Vote by Mail	1555	1	1014	583 57.50%	431 42.50%
Total	1555	2	1361	757 55.62%	604 44.38%
22-2010 CITY STBR					
Polling	588	1	192	155 80.73%	37 19.27%
Vote by Mail	588	1	297	244 82.15%	53 17.85%
Total	588	2	489	399 81.60%	90 18.40%
22-2020 CITY STBR					
Polling	1410	1	352	249 70.74%	103 29.26%
Vote by Mail	1410	1	736	515 69.97%	221 30.03%
Total	1410	2	1088	764 70.22%	324 29.78%
22-2030 CITY STBR					
Polling	1117	1	305	226 74.10%	79 25.90%
Vote by Mail	1117	1	630	440 69.84%	190 30.16%
Total	1117	2	935	666 71.23%	269 28.77%
22-2040 CITY STBR					
Polling	1185	1	340	257 75.59%	83 24.41%
Vote by Mail	1185	1	658	468 71.12%	190 28.88%
Total	1185	2	998	725 72.65%	273 27.35%
22-2070 CITY STBR					
Polling	1646	1	308	188 61.04%	120 38.96%
Vote by Mail	1646	1	1069	614 57.44%	455 42.56%
Total	1646	2	1377	802 58.24%	575 41.76%
22-2080 CITY STBR					
Polling	639	1	129	82 63.57%	47 36.43%
Vote by Mail	639	1	427	259 60.66%	168 39.34%
Total	639	2	556	341 61.33%	215 38.67%
22-2090 CITY STBR					
Polling	1141	1	307	220 71.66%	87 28.34%
Vote by Mail	1141	1	660	475 71.97%	185 28.03%
Total	1141	2	967	695 71.87%	272 28.13%
22-2110 CITY STBR					
Polling	1120	1	248	176 70.97%	72 29.03%
Vote by Mail	1120	1	709	482 67.98%	227 32.02%
Total	1120	2	957	658 68.76%	299 31.24%
22-2120 CITY STBR					
Polling	1144	1	286	219 76.57%	67 23.43%
Vote by Mail	1144	1	632	460 72.78%	172 27.22%
Total	1144	2	918	679 73.97%	239 26.03%
22-2130 CITY STBR					
Polling	1483	1	455	335 73.63%	120 26.37%
Vote by Mail	1483	1	829	633 76.36%	196 23.64%
Total	1483	2	1284	968 75.39%	316 24.61%
22-2160 CITY STBR					
Polling	1498	1	350	250 71.43%	100 28.57%
Vote by Mail	1498	1	939	623 66.35%	316 33.65%
Total	1498	2	1289	873 67.73%	416 32.27%
22-2180 CITY STBR					
Polling	1197	1	293	199 67.92%	94 32.08%
Vote by Mail	1197	1	694	479 69.02%	215 30.98%
Total	1197	2	987	678 68.69%	309 31.31%
22-2190 CITY STBR					
Polling	1142	1	248	184 74.19%	64 25.81%
Vote by Mail	1142	1	708	520 73.45%	188 26.55%
Total	1142	2	956	704 73.64%	252 26.36%
22-2210 CITY STBR					

Santa Barbara County
 Presidential General Election
 November 8, 2016
 Certified Results

Date: 12/06/16
 Time: 12:25:18
 Page: 1393 of 1800

PROPOSITION 64 MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION.

	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	YES	NO
Polling	995	1	201	124 61.69%	77 38.31%
Vote by Mail	995	1	634	340 53.63%	294 46.37%
Total	995	2	835	464 55.57%	371 44.43%
22-2217 M-CITY STBR BT17					
Polling	544	1	2	1 50.00%	1 50.00%
Vote by Mail	544	1	412	294 71.36%	118 28.64%
Total	544	2	414	295 71.26%	119 28.74%
22-2220 CITY STBR					
Polling	1291	1	351	268 76.35%	83 23.65%
Vote by Mail	1291	1	671	489 72.88%	182 27.12%
Total	1291	2	1022	757 74.07%	265 25.93%
22-2224 M-CITY STBR BT24					
Polling	0	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	0	1	0	0 -	0 -
Total	0	2	0	0 -	0 -
22-2225 M-CITY STBR BT25					
Polling	0	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	0	1	0	0 -	0 -
Total	0	2	0	0 -	0 -
22-2230 CITY STBR					
Polling	798	1	259	192 74.13%	67 25.87%
Vote by Mail	798	1	425	331 77.88%	94 22.12%
Total	798	2	684	523 76.46%	161 23.54%
22-2240 CITY STBR					
Polling	746	1	169	110 65.09%	59 34.91%
Vote by Mail	746	1	472	316 66.95%	156 33.05%
Total	746	2	641	426 66.46%	215 33.54%
22-2260 CITY STBR					
Polling	884	1	216	157 72.69%	59 27.31%
Vote by Mail	884	1	520	336 64.62%	184 35.38%
Total	884	2	736	493 66.98%	243 33.02%
22-2280 CITY STBR					
Polling	1257	1	339	223 65.78%	116 34.22%
Vote by Mail	1257	1	677	447 66.03%	230 33.97%
Total	1257	2	1016	670 65.94%	346 34.06%
23-2310 CITY GLTA					
Polling	1220	1	317	221 69.72%	96 30.28%
Vote by Mail	1220	1	667	438 65.67%	229 34.33%
Total	1220	2	984	659 66.97%	325 33.03%
23-2320 CITY GLTA					
Polling	1063	1	319	201 63.01%	118 36.99%
Vote by Mail	1063	1	472	335 70.97%	137 29.03%
Total	1063	2	791	536 67.76%	255 32.24%
23-2326 M-CITY GLTA BT26					
Polling	299	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	299	1	241	172 71.37%	69 28.63%
Total	299	2	241	172 71.37%	69 28.63%
23-2327 M-CITY GLTA BT27					
Polling	11	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	11	1	11	8 72.73%	3 27.27%
Total	11	2	11	8 72.73%	3 27.27%
23-2330 CITY GLTA					
Polling	1479	1	292	163 55.82%	129 44.18%
Vote by Mail	1479	1	914	519 56.78%	395 43.22%
Total	1479	2	1206	682 56.55%	524 43.45%
23-2360 CITY GLTA					
Polling	1444	1	369	204 55.28%	165 44.72%
Vote by Mail	1444	1	902	441 48.89%	461 51.11%
Total	1444	2	1271	645 50.75%	626 49.25%
23-2370 CITY GLTA					
Polling	1480	1	408	240 58.82%	168 41.18%

Santa Barbara County
 Presidential General Election
 November 8, 2016
 Certified Results

Date: 12/06/16
 Time: 12:25:18
 Page: 1394 of 1800

PROPOSITION 64 MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION.

	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	YES	NO
Vote by Mail	1480	1	860	537 62.44%	323 37.56%
Total	1480	2	1268	777 61.28%	491 38.72%
23-2380 CITY GLTA					
Polling	1448	1	420	221 52.62%	199 47.38%
Vote by Mail	1448	1	797	452 56.71%	345 43.29%
Total	1448	2	1217	673 55.30%	544 44.70%
23-2420 CITY GLTA					
Polling	1000	1	300	186 62.00%	114 38.00%
Vote by Mail	1000	1	509	346 67.98%	163 32.02%
Total	1000	2	809	532 65.76%	277 34.24%
23-2430 CITY GLTA					
Polling	983	1	285	176 61.75%	109 38.25%
Vote by Mail	983	1	545	313 57.43%	232 42.57%
Total	983	2	830	489 58.92%	341 41.08%
23-2440 CITY GLTA					
Polling	1045	1	289	183 63.32%	106 36.68%
Vote by Mail	1045	1	562	350 62.28%	212 37.72%
Total	1045	2	851	533 62.63%	318 37.37%
30-3028 M-3RD UCORP BT28					
Polling	210	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	210	1	185	126 68.11%	59 31.89%
Total	210	2	185	126 68.11%	59 31.89%
30-3031 M-3RD UCORP BT31					
Polling	381	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	381	1	323	176 54.49%	147 45.51%
Total	381	2	323	176 54.49%	147 45.51%
30-3032 M-3RD UCORP BT32					
Polling	8	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	8	1	5	4 80.00%	1 20.00%
Total	8	2	5	4 80.00%	1 20.00%
30-3033 M-3RD UCORP BT33					
Polling	95	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	95	1	76	53 69.74%	23 30.26%
Total	95	2	76	53 69.74%	23 30.26%
30-3034 M-3RD UCORP BT34					
Polling	1426	1	4	4 100.00%	0 0.00%
Vote by Mail	1426	1	1179	641 54.37%	538 45.63%
Total	1426	2	1183	645 54.52%	538 45.48%
30-3035 M-3RD UCORP BT35					
Polling	36	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	36	1	31	18 58.06%	13 41.94%
Total	36	2	31	18 58.06%	13 41.94%
30-3036 M-3RD UCORP BT36					
Polling	49	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	49	1	38	23 60.53%	15 39.47%
Total	49	2	38	23 60.53%	15 39.47%
30-3037 M-3RD UCORP BT37					
Polling	649	1	2	2 100.00%	0 0.00%
Vote by Mail	649	1	556	289 51.98%	267 48.02%
Total	649	2	558	291 52.15%	267 47.85%
30-3038 M-3RD UCORP BT38					
Polling	10	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	10	1	10	7 70.00%	3 30.00%
Total	10	2	10	7 70.00%	3 30.00%
30-3039 M-3RD UCORP BT39					
Polling	170	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	170	1	135	63 46.67%	72 53.33%
Total	170	2	135	63 46.67%	72 53.33%
30-3040 M-3RD UCORP BT40					
Polling	99	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	99	1	87	54 62.07%	33 37.93%

Santa Barbara County
 Presidential General Election
 November 8, 2016
 Certified Results

Date:12/06/16
 Time:12:25:18
 Page:1395 of 1800

PROPOSITION 64 MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION.

	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	YES	NO
Total	99	2	87	54 62.07%	33 37.93%
30-3044 M-3RD UCORP BT44					
Polling	372	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	372	1	225	165 73.33%	60 26.67%
Total	372	2	225	165 73.33%	60 26.67%
30-3045 M-3RD UCORP BT45					
Polling	43	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	43	1	38	20 52.63%	18 47.37%
Total	43	2	38	20 52.63%	18 47.37%
30-3046 M-3RD UCORP BT46					
Polling	11	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	11	1	7	1 14.29%	6 85.71%
Total	11	2	7	1 14.29%	6 85.71%
30-3047 M-3RD UCORP BT47					
Polling	99	1	1	0 0.00%	1 100.00%
Vote by Mail	99	1	76	37 48.68%	39 51.32%
Total	99	2	77	37 48.05%	40 51.95%
30-3048 M-3RD UCORP BT48					
Polling	21	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	21	1	17	7 41.18%	10 58.82%
Total	21	2	17	7 41.18%	10 58.82%
30-3110 UCSB					
Polling	1117	1	719	547 76.08%	172 23.92%
Vote by Mail	1117	1	31	25 80.65%	6 19.35%
Total	1117	2	750	572 76.27%	178 23.73%
30-3120 UCSB					
Polling	516	1	343	276 80.47%	67 19.53%
Vote by Mail	516	1	10	7 70.00%	3 30.00%
Total	516	2	353	283 80.17%	70 19.83%
30-3130 UCSB					
Polling	994	1	659	523 79.36%	136 20.64%
Vote by Mail	994	1	77	59 76.62%	18 23.38%
Total	994	2	736	582 79.08%	154 20.92%
30-3140 UCSB					
Polling	797	1	587	466 79.39%	121 20.61%
Vote by Mail	797	1	18	16 88.89%	2 11.11%
Total	797	2	605	482 79.67%	123 20.33%
30-3160 UCSB					
Polling	1362	1	680	575 84.56%	105 15.44%
Vote by Mail	1362	1	395	337 85.32%	58 14.68%
Total	1362	2	1075	912 84.84%	163 15.16%
30-3170 UCSB					
Polling	764	1	512	409 79.88%	103 20.12%
Vote by Mail	764	1	8	6 75.00%	2 25.00%
Total	764	2	520	415 79.81%	105 20.19%
30-3180 UCSB					
Polling	836	1	525	409 77.90%	116 22.10%
Vote by Mail	836	1	21	17 80.95%	4 19.05%
Total	836	2	546	426 78.02%	120 21.98%
30-3190 UCSB					
Polling	647	1	352	289 82.10%	63 17.90%
Vote by Mail	647	1	200	173 86.50%	27 13.50%
Total	647	2	552	462 83.70%	90 16.30%
30-3260 IV					
Polling	1265	1	641	518 80.81%	123 19.19%
Vote by Mail	1265	1	175	146 83.43%	29 16.57%
Total	1265	2	816	664 81.37%	152 18.63%
30-3270 IV					
Polling	1210	1	604	504 83.44%	100 16.56%
Vote by Mail	1210	1	157	128 81.53%	29 18.47%
Total	1210	2	761	632 83.05%	129 16.95%

Santa Barbara County
 Presidential General Election
 November 8, 2016
 Certified Results

Date: 12/06/16
 Time: 12:25:18
 Page: 1396 of 1800

PROPOSITION 64 MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION.

	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	YES	NO
30-3280 IV					
Polling	1192	1	595	506 85.04%	89 14.96%
Vote by Mail	1192	1	176	148 84.09%	28 15.91%
Total	1192	2	771	654 84.82%	117 15.18%
30-3290 IV					
Polling	1270	1	620	526 84.84%	94 15.16%
Vote by Mail	1270	1	172	144 83.72%	28 16.28%
Total	1270	2	792	670 84.60%	122 15.40%
30-3310 IV					
Polling	1521	1	803	664 82.69%	139 17.31%
Vote by Mail	1521	1	170	149 87.65%	21 12.35%
Total	1521	2	973	813 83.56%	160 16.44%
30-3320 IV					
Polling	1415	1	637	514 80.69%	123 19.31%
Vote by Mail	1415	1	213	175 82.16%	38 17.84%
Total	1415	2	850	689 81.06%	161 18.94%
30-3330 IV					
Polling	1306	1	570	463 81.23%	107 18.77%
Vote by Mail	1306	1	260	216 83.08%	44 16.92%
Total	1306	2	830	679 81.81%	151 18.19%
30-3340 IV					
Polling	1274	1	578	477 82.53%	101 17.47%
Vote by Mail	1274	1	194	171 88.14%	23 11.86%
Total	1274	2	772	648 83.94%	124 16.06%
30-3360 IV					
Polling	1226	1	516	422 81.78%	94 18.22%
Vote by Mail	1226	1	220	186 84.55%	34 15.45%
Total	1226	2	736	608 82.61%	128 17.39%
30-3370 IV					
Polling	868	1	335	271 80.90%	64 19.10%
Vote by Mail	868	1	136	115 84.56%	21 15.44%
Total	868	2	471	386 81.95%	85 18.05%
30-3530 BLRD					
Polling	905	1	254	131 51.57%	123 48.43%
Vote by Mail	905	1	528	256 48.48%	272 51.52%
Total	905	2	782	387 49.49%	395 50.51%
30-3610 STYN					
Polling	1098	1	311	170 54.66%	141 45.34%
Vote by Mail	1098	1	623	398 63.88%	225 36.12%
Total	1098	2	934	568 60.81%	366 39.19%
30-3620 STYN					
Polling	962	1	243	114 46.91%	129 53.09%
Vote by Mail	962	1	591	251 42.47%	340 57.53%
Total	962	2	834	365 43.76%	469 56.24%
30-3630 STYN					
Polling	876	1	233	122 52.36%	111 47.64%
Vote by Mail	876	1	517	262 50.68%	255 49.32%
Total	876	2	750	384 51.20%	366 48.80%
30-3640 STYN					
Polling	208	1	64	36 56.25%	28 43.75%
Vote by Mail	208	1	96	61 63.54%	35 36.46%
Total	208	2	160	97 60.63%	63 39.38%
30-3670 LSOL					
Polling	785	1	239	125 52.30%	114 47.70%
Vote by Mail	785	1	450	258 57.33%	192 42.67%
Total	785	2	689	383 55.59%	306 44.41%
30-3810 PUR					
Polling	1585	1	512	278 54.30%	234 45.70%
Vote by Mail	1585	1	766	433 56.53%	333 43.47%
Total	1585	2	1278	711 55.63%	567 44.37%
30-3820 PUR					

Santa Barbara County
 Presidential General Election
 November 8, 2016
 Certified Results

Date: 12/06/16
 Time: 12:25:18
 Page: 1397 of 1800

PROPOSITION 64 MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION.

	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	YES	NO
Polling	1365	1	348	165 47.41%	183 52.59%
Vote by Mail	1365	1	784	393 50.13%	391 49.87%
Total	1365	2	1132	558 49.29%	574 50.71%
30-3830 PUR					
Polling	1484	1	315	134 42.54%	181 57.46%
Vote by Mail	1484	1	960	474 49.38%	486 50.63%
Total	1484	2	1275	608 47.69%	667 52.31%
30-3840 PUR					
Polling	936	1	264	103 39.02%	161 60.98%
Vote by Mail	936	1	550	255 46.36%	295 53.64%
Total	936	2	814	358 43.98%	456 56.02%
30-3860 PUR					
Polling	1167	1	321	181 56.39%	140 43.61%
Vote by Mail	1167	1	566	358 63.25%	208 36.75%
Total	1167	2	887	539 60.77%	348 39.23%
30-3880 LSAL					
Polling	919	1	315	176 55.87%	139 44.13%
Vote by Mail	919	1	469	278 59.28%	191 40.72%
Total	919	2	784	454 57.91%	330 42.09%
30-3910 STMR					
Polling	675	1	218	120 55.05%	98 44.95%
Vote by Mail	675	1	239	131 54.81%	108 45.19%
Total	675	2	457	251 54.92%	206 45.08%
33-3010 CITY GLTA					
Polling	1395	1	394	259 65.74%	135 34.26%
Vote by Mail	1395	1	747	484 64.79%	263 35.21%
Total	1395	2	1141	743 65.12%	398 34.88%
33-3020 CITY GLTA					
Polling	1162	1	350	231 66.00%	119 34.00%
Vote by Mail	1162	1	610	406 66.56%	204 33.44%
Total	1162	2	960	637 66.35%	323 33.65%
33-3030 CITY GLTA					
Polling	1234	1	338	252 74.56%	86 25.44%
Vote by Mail	1234	1	611	483 79.05%	128 20.95%
Total	1234	2	949	735 77.45%	214 22.55%
33-3040 CITY GLTA					
Polling	1231	1	314	193 61.46%	121 38.54%
Vote by Mail	1231	1	712	475 66.71%	237 33.29%
Total	1231	2	1026	668 65.11%	358 34.89%
33-3060 CITY GLTA					
Polling	1314	1	357	212 59.38%	145 40.62%
Vote by Mail	1314	1	724	422 58.29%	302 41.71%
Total	1314	2	1081	634 58.65%	447 41.35%
33-3349 M-CITY GLTA BT49					
Polling	0	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	0	1	0	0 -	0 -
Total	0	2	0	0 -	0 -
33-3350 M-CITY GLTA BT50					
Polling	0	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	0	1	0	0 -	0 -
Total	0	2	0	0 -	0 -
34-3080 CITY SLVG					
Polling	1228	1	358	185 51.68%	173 48.32%
Vote by Mail	1228	1	711	360 50.63%	351 49.37%
Total	1228	2	1069	545 50.98%	524 49.02%
34-3090 CITY SLVG					
Polling	851	1	223	126 56.50%	97 43.50%
Vote by Mail	851	1	500	261 52.20%	239 47.80%
Total	851	2	723	387 53.53%	336 46.47%
34-3110 CITY SLVG					
Polling	1027	1	250	154 61.60%	96 38.40%

Santa Barbara County
 Presidential General Election
 November 8, 2016
 Certified Results

Date: 12/06/16
 Time: 12:25:18
 Page: 1398 of 1800

PROPOSITION 64 MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION

	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	YES	NO		
Vote by Mail	1027	1	595	283	47.56%	312	52.44%
Total	1027	2	845	437	51.72%	408	48.28%
34-3451 M-CITY SLVG BT51							
Polling	336	1	0	0	-	0	-
Vote by Mail	336	1	291	135	46.39%	156	53.61%
Total	336	2	291	135	46.39%	156	53.61%
35-3120 CITY BLTN							
Polling	1352	1	329	187	56.84%	142	43.16%
Vote by Mail	1352	1	782	440	56.27%	342	43.73%
Total	1352	2	1111	627	56.44%	484	43.56%
35-3130 CITY BLTN							
Polling	1499	1	431	238	55.22%	193	44.78%
Vote by Mail	1499	1	851	480	56.40%	371	43.60%
Total	1499	2	1282	718	56.01%	564	43.99%
35-3552 M-CITY BLTN BT52							
Polling	3	1	0	0	-	0	-
Vote by Mail	3	1	2	1	50.00%	1	50.00%
Total	3	2	2	1	50.00%	1	50.00%
36-3653 M-CITY LMPC BT53							
Polling	277	1	3	2	66.67%	1	33.33%
Vote by Mail	277	1	213	90	42.25%	123	57.75%
Total	277	2	216	92	42.59%	124	57.41%
36-3654 M-CITY LMPC BT54							
Polling	1	1	0	0	-	0	-
Vote by Mail	1	1	0	0	-	0	-
Total	1	2	0	0	-	0	-
36-3655 M-CITY LMPC BT55							
Polling	74	1	0	0	-	0	-
Vote by Mail	74	1	53	31	58.49%	22	41.51%
Total	74	2	53	31	58.49%	22	41.51%
38-3170 CITY GDLP							
Polling	1120	1	289	161	55.71%	128	44.29%
Vote by Mail	1120	1	464	254	54.74%	210	45.26%
Total	1120	2	753	415	55.11%	338	44.89%
38-3180 CITY GDLP							
Polling	1256	1	294	147	50.00%	147	50.00%
Vote by Mail	1256	1	591	323	54.65%	268	45.35%
Total	1256	2	885	470	53.11%	415	46.89%
40-4057 M-4TH UCORP BT57							
Polling	337	1	0	0	-	0	-
Vote by Mail	337	1	266	125	46.99%	141	53.01%
Total	337	2	266	125	46.99%	141	53.01%
40-4058 M-4TH UCORP BT58							
Polling	165	1	0	0	-	0	-
Vote by Mail	165	1	136	64	47.06%	72	52.94%
Total	165	2	136	64	47.06%	72	52.94%
40-4059 M-4TH UCORP BT59							
Polling	23	1	0	0	-	0	-
Vote by Mail	23	1	17	9	52.94%	8	47.06%
Total	23	2	17	9	52.94%	8	47.06%
40-4060 M-4TH UCORP BT60							
Polling	40	1	0	0	-	0	-
Vote by Mail	40	1	32	17	53.13%	15	46.88%
Total	40	2	32	17	53.13%	15	46.88%
40-4061 M-4TH UCORP BT61							
Polling	0	1	0	0	-	0	-
Vote by Mail	0	1	0	0	-	0	-
Total	0	2	0	0	-	0	-
40-4062 M-4TH UCORP BT62							
Polling	0	1	0	0	-	0	-
Vote by Mail	0	1	0	0	-	0	-

Santa Barbara County
 Presidential General Election
 November 8, 2016
 Certified Results

Date: 12/06/16
 Time: 12:25:18
 Page: 1399 of 1800

PROPOSITION 64 MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION.

	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	YES	NO
Total	0	2	0	0	0
40-4063 M-4TH UCORP BT63					
Polling	48	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	48	1	40	16 40.00%	24 60.00%
Total	48	2	40	16 40.00%	24 60.00%
40-4064 M-4TH UCORP BT64					
Polling	31	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	31	1	28	16 57.14%	12 42.86%
Total	31	2	28	16 57.14%	12 42.86%
40-4065 M-4TH UCORP BT65					
Polling	701	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	701	1	557	265 47.58%	292 52.42%
Total	701	2	557	265 47.58%	292 52.42%
40-4066 M-4TH UCORP BT66					
Polling	2	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	2	1	2	0 0.00%	2 100.00%
Total	2	2	2	0 0.00%	2 100.00%
40-4067 M-4TH UCORP BT67					
Polling	11	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	11	1	11	5 45.45%	6 54.55%
Total	11	2	11	5 45.45%	6 54.55%
40-4068 M-4TH UCORP BT68					
Polling	10	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	10	1	10	7 70.00%	3 30.00%
Total	10	2	10	7 70.00%	3 30.00%
40-4069 M-4TH UCORP BT69					
Polling	14	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	14	1	9	8 88.89%	1 11.11%
Total	14	2	9	8 88.89%	1 11.11%
40-4610 ORCT					
Polling	1208	1	279	130 46.59%	149 53.41%
Vote by Mail	1208	1	742	330 44.47%	412 55.53%
Total	1208	2	1021	460 45.05%	561 54.95%
40-4620 ORCT					
Polling	1549	1	415	190 45.78%	225 54.22%
Vote by Mail	1549	1	831	368 44.28%	463 55.72%
Total	1549	2	1246	558 44.78%	688 55.22%
40-4630 ORCT					
Polling	1160	1	267	118 44.19%	149 55.81%
Vote by Mail	1160	1	663	281 42.38%	382 57.62%
Total	1160	2	930	399 42.90%	531 57.10%
40-4640 ORCT					
Polling	1283	1	312	154 49.36%	158 50.64%
Vote by Mail	1283	1	747	392 52.48%	355 47.52%
Total	1283	2	1059	546 51.56%	513 48.44%
40-4660 ORCT					
Polling	1225	1	337	124 36.80%	213 63.20%
Vote by Mail	1225	1	709	266 37.52%	443 62.48%
Total	1225	2	1046	390 37.28%	656 62.72%
40-4670 ORCT					
Polling	1335	1	348	140 40.23%	208 59.77%
Vote by Mail	1335	1	794	333 41.94%	461 58.06%
Total	1335	2	1142	473 41.42%	669 58.58%
40-4710 ORCT					
Polling	1227	1	342	162 47.37%	180 52.63%
Vote by Mail	1227	1	638	310 48.59%	328 51.41%
Total	1227	2	980	472 48.16%	508 51.84%
40-4720 ORCT					
Polling	1099	1	326	142 43.56%	184 56.44%
Vote by Mail	1099	1	570	269 47.19%	301 52.81%
Total	1099	2	896	411 45.87%	485 54.13%

Santa Barbara County
 Presidential General Election
 November 8, 2016
 Certified Results

Date:12/06/16
 Time:12:25:18
 Page:1400 of 1800

PROPOSITION 64 MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION.

	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	YES	NO
40-4730 ORCT					
Polling	1305	1	335	140 41.79%	195 58.21%
Vote by Mail	1305	1	733	355 48.43%	378 51.57%
Total	1305	2	1068	495 46.35%	573 53.65%
40-4740 ORCT					
Polling	1189	1	300	145 48.33%	155 51.67%
Vote by Mail	1189	1	703	348 49.50%	355 50.50%
Total	1189	2	1003	493 49.15%	510 50.85%
40-4760 ORCT					
Polling	1279	1	307	143 46.58%	164 53.42%
Vote by Mail	1279	1	746	343 45.98%	403 54.02%
Total	1279	2	1053	486 46.15%	567 53.85%
40-4770 ORCT					
Polling	993	1	255	128 50.20%	127 49.80%
Vote by Mail	993	1	504	275 54.56%	229 45.44%
Total	993	2	759	403 53.10%	356 46.90%
40-4780 ORCT					
Polling	1124	1	360	177 49.17%	183 50.83%
Vote by Mail	1124	1	568	269 47.36%	299 52.64%
Total	1124	2	928	446 48.06%	482 51.94%
40-4810 ORCT					
Polling	1268	1	291	137 47.08%	154 52.92%
Vote by Mail	1268	1	735	333 45.31%	402 54.69%
Total	1268	2	1026	470 45.81%	556 54.19%
40-4820 ORCT					
Polling	1282	1	299	142 47.49%	157 52.51%
Vote by Mail	1282	1	694	340 48.99%	354 51.01%
Total	1282	2	993	482 48.54%	511 51.46%
46-4010 CITY LMPC					
Polling	1018	1	251	151 60.16%	100 39.84%
Vote by Mail	1018	1	543	306 56.35%	237 43.65%
Total	1018	2	794	457 57.56%	337 42.44%
46-4020 CITY LMPC					
Polling	1112	1	286	147 51.40%	139 48.60%
Vote by Mail	1112	1	637	369 57.93%	268 42.07%
Total	1112	2	923	516 55.90%	407 44.10%
46-4030 CITY LMPC					
Polling	1211	1	302	200 66.23%	102 33.77%
Vote by Mail	1211	1	593	374 63.07%	219 36.93%
Total	1211	2	895	574 64.13%	321 35.87%
46-4040 CITY LMPC					
Polling	1172	1	333	206 61.86%	127 38.14%
Vote by Mail	1172	1	595	340 57.14%	255 42.86%
Total	1172	2	928	546 58.84%	382 41.16%
46-4060 CITY LMPC					
Polling	1026	1	282	153 54.26%	129 45.74%
Vote by Mail	1026	1	558	315 56.45%	243 43.55%
Total	1026	2	840	468 55.71%	372 44.29%
46-4080 CITY LMPC					
Polling	1470	1	289	179 61.94%	110 38.06%
Vote by Mail	1470	1	630	406 64.44%	224 35.56%
Total	1470	2	919	585 63.66%	334 36.34%
46-4090 CITY LMPC					
Polling	1300	1	291	188 64.60%	103 35.40%
Vote by Mail	1300	1	602	362 60.13%	240 39.87%
Total	1300	2	893	550 61.59%	343 38.41%
46-4110 CITY LMPC					
Polling	1225	1	315	162 51.43%	153 48.57%
Vote by Mail	1225	1	595	336 56.47%	259 43.53%
Total	1225	2	910	498 54.73%	412 45.27%
46-4120 CITY LMPC					

Santa Barbara County
 Presidential General Election
 November 8, 2016
 Certified Results

Date: 12/06/16
 Time: 12:25:18
 Page: 1401 of 1800

PROPOSITION 64 MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION.

	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	YES	NO
Polling	1145	1	321	190 59.19%	131 40.81%
Vote by Mail	1145	1	579	339 58.55%	240 41.45%
Total	1145	2	900	529 58.78%	371 41.22%
46-4130 CITY LMPC					
Polling	1241	1	290	177 61.03%	113 38.97%
Vote by Mail	1241	1	548	312 56.93%	236 43.07%
Total	1241	2	838	489 58.35%	349 41.65%
46-4140 CITY LMPC					
Polling	1294	1	336	183 54.46%	153 45.54%
Vote by Mail	1294	1	632	389 61.55%	243 38.45%
Total	1294	2	968	572 59.09%	396 40.91%
46-4160 CITY LMPC					
Polling	1105	1	318	181 56.92%	137 43.08%
Vote by Mail	1105	1	569	298 52.37%	271 47.63%
Total	1105	2	887	479 54.00%	408 46.00%
46-4170 CITY LMPC					
Polling	1134	1	329	181 55.02%	148 44.98%
Vote by Mail	1134	1	548	290 52.92%	258 47.08%
Total	1134	2	877	471 53.71%	406 46.29%
46-4180 CITY LMPC					
Polling	1324	1	324	163 50.31%	161 49.69%
Vote by Mail	1324	1	686	390 56.85%	296 43.15%
Total	1324	2	1010	553 54.75%	457 45.25%
46-4670 M-CITY LMPC BT70					
Polling	2	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	2	1	2	1 50.00%	1 50.00%
Total	2	2	2	1 50.00%	1 50.00%
47-4220 CITY STMR					
Polling	1065	1	262	105 40.08%	157 59.92%
Vote by Mail	1065	1	634	281 44.32%	353 55.68%
Total	1065	2	896	386 43.08%	510 56.92%
47-4230 CITY STMR					
Polling	1792	1	453	230 50.77%	223 49.23%
Vote by Mail	1792	1	879	415 47.21%	464 52.79%
Total	1792	2	1332	645 48.42%	687 51.58%
47-4270 CITY STMR					
Polling	1044	1	211	114 54.03%	97 45.97%
Vote by Mail	1044	1	598	292 48.83%	306 51.17%
Total	1044	2	809	406 50.19%	403 49.81%
47-4280 CITY STMR					
Polling	999	1	207	107 51.69%	100 48.31%
Vote by Mail	999	1	399	221 55.39%	178 44.61%
Total	999	2	606	328 54.13%	278 45.87%
47-4771 M-CITY STMR BT71					
Polling	368	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	368	1	274	120 43.80%	154 56.20%
Total	368	2	274	120 43.80%	154 56.20%
47-4773 M-CITY STMR BT73					
Polling	0	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	0	1	0	0 -	0 -
Total	0	2	0	0 -	0 -
50-5012 M-5TH UCORP BT12					
Polling	0	1	0	0 -	0 -
Vote by Mail	0	1	0	0 -	0 -
Total	0	2	0	0 -	0 -
50-5014 M-5TH UCORP BT14					
Polling	26	1	1	1 100.00%	0 0.00%
Vote by Mail	26	1	22	15 68.18%	7 31.82%
Total	26	2	23	16 69.57%	7 30.43%
50-5064 M-5TH UCORP BT64					
Polling	1	1	0	0 -	0 -

Santa Barbara County
 Presidential General Election
 November 8, 2016
 Certified Results

Date:12/06/16
 Time:12:25:18
 Page:1402 of 1800

PROPOSITION 64 MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION.

	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	YES	NO
Vote by Mail	1	1	0	0	0
Total	1	2	0	0	0
50-5066 M-5TH UCORP BT12					
Polling	206	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	206	1	160	77 48.13%	83 51.88%
Total	206	2	160	77 48.13%	83 51.88%
50-5067 M-5TH UCORP BT67					
Polling	69	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	69	1	65	23 35.38%	42 64.62%
Total	69	2	65	23 35.38%	42 64.62%
50-5068 M-5TH UCORP BT68					
Polling	410	1	1	0 0.00%	1 100.00%
Vote by Mail	410	1	337	171 50.74%	166 49.26%
Total	410	2	338	171 50.59%	167 49.41%
50-5069 M-5TH UCORP BT69					
Polling	74	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	74	1	54	14 25.93%	40 74.07%
Total	74	2	54	14 25.93%	40 74.07%
50-5075 M-5TH UCORP BT75					
Polling	0	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	0	1	0	0	0
Total	0	2	0	0	0
50-5076 M-5TH UCORP BT76					
Polling	0	1	0	0	0
Vote by Mail	0	1	0	0	0
Total	0	2	0	0	0
57-5010 CITY STMR					
Polling	1001	1	183	86 46.99%	97 53.01%
Vote by Mail	1001	1	594	259 43.60%	335 56.40%
Total	1001	2	777	345 44.40%	432 55.60%
57-5020 CITY STMR					
Polling	832	1	227	119 52.42%	108 47.58%
Vote by Mail	832	1	418	214 51.20%	204 48.80%
Total	832	2	645	333 51.63%	312 48.37%
57-5030 CITY STMR					
Polling	951	1	234	121 51.71%	113 48.29%
Vote by Mail	951	1	460	230 50.00%	230 50.00%
Total	951	2	694	351 50.58%	343 49.42%
57-5040 CITY STMR					
Polling	1461	1	325	178 54.77%	147 45.23%
Vote by Mail	1461	1	648	352 54.32%	296 45.68%
Total	1461	2	973	530 54.47%	443 45.53%
57-5060 CITY STMR					
Polling	1008	1	261	146 55.94%	115 44.06%
Vote by Mail	1008	1	485	279 57.53%	206 42.47%
Total	1008	2	746	425 56.97%	321 43.03%
57-5070 CITY STMR					
Polling	826	1	221	124 56.11%	97 43.89%
Vote by Mail	826	1	400	192 48.00%	208 52.00%
Total	826	2	621	316 50.89%	305 49.11%
57-5080 CITY STMR					
Polling	1198	1	274	155 56.57%	119 43.43%
Vote by Mail	1198	1	518	289 55.79%	229 44.21%
Total	1198	2	792	444 56.06%	348 43.94%
57-5110 CITY STMR					
Polling	1574	1	391	213 54.48%	178 45.52%
Vote by Mail	1574	1	751	379 50.47%	372 49.53%
Total	1574	2	1142	592 51.84%	550 48.16%
57-5210 CITY STMR					
Polling	1146	1	274	124 45.26%	150 54.74%
Vote by Mail	1146	1	628	296 47.13%	332 52.87%

Santa Barbara County
 Presidential General Election
 November 8, 2016
 Certified Results

Date:12/06/16
 Time:12:25:18
 Page:1403 of 1800

PROPOSITION 64 MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION.							
	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	YES		NO	
Total	1146	2	902	420	46.56%	482	53.44%
57-5220 CITY STMR							
Polling	1202	1	237	111	46.84%	126	53.16%
Vote by Mail	1202	1	668	322	48.20%	346	51.80%
Total	1202	2	905	433	47.85%	472	52.15%
57-5230 CITY STMR							
Polling	1276	1	269	131	48.70%	138	51.30%
Vote by Mail	1276	1	690	295	42.75%	395	57.25%
Total	1276	2	959	426	44.42%	533	55.58%
57-5240 CITY STMR							
Polling	1120	1	310	150	48.39%	160	51.61%
Vote by Mail	1120	1	529	274	51.80%	255	48.20%
Total	1120	2	839	424	50.54%	415	49.46%
57-5260 CITY STMR							
Polling	1051	1	244	143	58.61%	101	41.39%
Vote by Mail	1051	1	522	280	53.64%	242	46.36%
Total	1051	2	766	423	55.22%	343	44.78%
57-5310 CITY STMR							
Polling	1194	1	222	123	55.41%	99	44.59%
Vote by Mail	1194	1	570	332	58.25%	238	41.75%
Total	1194	2	792	455	57.45%	337	42.55%
57-5320 CITY STMR							
Polling	1169	1	287	140	48.78%	147	51.22%
Vote by Mail	1169	1	587	294	50.09%	293	49.91%
Total	1169	2	874	434	49.66%	440	50.34%
57-5330 CITY STMR							
Polling	1388	1	295	151	51.19%	144	48.81%
Vote by Mail	1388	1	557	301	54.04%	256	45.96%
Total	1388	2	852	452	53.05%	400	46.95%
57-5340 CITY STMR							
Polling	1506	1	335	172	51.34%	163	48.66%
Vote by Mail	1506	1	551	272	49.36%	279	50.64%
Total	1506	2	886	444	50.11%	442	49.89%
57-5360 CITY STMR							
Polling	1508	1	383	194	50.65%	189	49.35%
Vote by Mail	1508	1	631	314	49.76%	317	50.24%
Total	1508	2	1014	508	50.10%	506	49.90%
57-5370 CITY STMR							
Polling	1411	1	322	167	51.86%	155	48.14%
Vote by Mail	1411	1	617	324	52.51%	293	47.49%
Total	1411	2	939	491	52.29%	448	47.71%
57-5380 CITY STMR							
Polling	1269	1	248	134	54.03%	114	45.97%
Vote by Mail	1269	1	526	286	54.37%	240	45.63%
Total	1269	2	774	420	54.26%	354	45.74%
57-5390 CITY STMR							
Polling	1024	1	256	132	51.56%	124	48.44%
Vote by Mail	1024	1	490	281	57.35%	209	42.65%
Total	1024	2	746	413	55.36%	333	44.64%
57-5410 CITY STMR							
Polling	1086	1	248	114	45.97%	134	54.03%
Vote by Mail	1086	1	588	300	51.02%	288	48.98%
Total	1086	2	836	414	49.52%	422	50.48%
57-5420 CITY STMR							
Polling	1268	1	286	139	48.60%	147	51.40%
Vote by Mail	1268	1	627	321	51.20%	306	48.80%
Total	1268	2	913	460	50.38%	453	49.62%
57-5774 M-CITY STMR BT74							
Polling	303	1	1	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
Vote by Mail	303	1	191	101	52.88%	90	47.12%
Total	303	2	192	102	53.13%	90	46.88%

Santa Barbara County
 Presidential General Election
 November 8, 2016
 Certified Results

Date: 12/06/16
 Time: 12:25:18
 Page: 1404 of 1800

PROPOSITION 64 MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION.

	Reg. Voters	Vote For	Total Votes	YES		NO	
Total							
Polling	222983	259	59392	37883	63.78%	21509	36.22%
Vote by Mail	222983	259	116551	70345	60.36%	46206	39.64%
Total	222983	518	175943	108228	61.51%	67715	38.49%

Relis, Mia

From: Sandy Weil <sandyweil@cox.net>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:44 AM
To: Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; peteradam@countyofsb.org; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Cc: Allan & Sandra Weil
Subject: Moratorium on Future Business Licences in Santa Barbara 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.

TO: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors

FROM: Sandra Weil, Resident of Carpinteria Valley

SUBJECT: MORATORIUM ON FUTURE BUSINESS LICENSES FOR CANNABIS GROWERS

I am recommending a moratorium on the issuance of any new permits to cultivate Cannabis in the Carpinteria Valley. In addition, I am asking the Board of Supervisors to re-examine the effects of the present permits in regard to the cultivation of Cannabis in the Carpinteria Valley.

- Fix the current Land Use Ordinances because the current cannabis regulations have failed. Do not just amend the Business Licenses.
- Das Williams and Steve Lavagnino should recuse themselves from voting on cannabis related items given the revelations in the June 12th LA Times article.

Recusal is needed to restore public trust. PERCEPTION IS EVERYTHING!

- The Coastal Zone deserves equal if not stronger protections than inland. Having stronger controls for Inland v. Coastal agriculture parcels is unacceptable.
- Stop issuing state provisional permits in the Carpinteria Valley. You have no true enforcement powers until the grower applies for a permit! This has allowed growers to continue growing without an odor abatement system in place or an adequate system in place. The present process allows other nuisances to plague us in the Carpinteria Valley. Investigate all cannabis growers with provisional permits for truthfulness regarding their applications.
- The 186 acres of permitted cannabis growth in the Carpinteria Valley should be removed and only allow what has been permitted to this point. No new permits should be given!
- No consideration for the existing agriculture appears to have been considered. New growers should not hinder any present crops—and they have! What about our avacodo growers and their ability to spray their crops?
-

Relis, Mia

From: Sara Rotman <sara@busybeesorganics.org>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:46 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: North County Farmer's Guild Comments on July 9, 2019 Hearing Agenda Items 2 and 3: Amendments to the Cannabis Ordinance, LUDC and Chapter 50
Attachments: North County Farmers Guild 7.9.19 Comments to BOS re Proposed Amendments to Cannabis Ordinance.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.

Dear Honorable Supervisors,

Please find attached a letter submitted by the North County Farmers Guild outlining our organizations collective comments for your review and inclusion in the public record regarding the July 9th Board of Supervisors Hearing as it relates to agenda items 2 and 3.

Respectfully,

Sara Rotman

Co-Founder
North County Farmers Guild



VIA EMAIL

sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

July 5, 2019

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
County of Santa Barbara
105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 407
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

From: The North County Farmer's Guild

**Re: North County Farmer's Guild Comments on July 9, 2019 Hearing Agenda
Items 2 and 3: Amendments to the Cannabis Ordinance, LUDC and Chapter 50.**

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

The North County Farmer's Guild represents many of the applicants for outdoor cannabis cultivation in the inland area of Santa Barbara County. We provide the following comments on proposed amendments to the Cannabis Ordinance (Ordinance) that will come before you on July 9.

I. Who We Are

Our organization represents a new crop for Santa Barbara County and California farmers. We are farmers. We love the land. We love the miracle of growing and we deeply value our connection with our community. We are dedicated to making Santa Barbara County a model of community-friendly farming.

Over the years, Santa Barbara County farmers have responded to market forces by moving from lemons to avocados and in recent history adding flowers and grapes. The

freedom to grow what is demanded and profitable is why our county has enjoyed agriculture and the open space that we all treasure.

Yet today, higher water and labor costs, combined with lower crop prices due to international competition, changing consumer tastes and challenging distribution models, has put many of our farmers under great pressure. That is why cannabis has become an attractive option for many of us.

Our county has written an ordinance that is viewed as a model for California's legal cannabis industry. Other counties are currently in the process of replicating our ordinance, which is roughly 100 pages of detailed rules and regulations and which took more than a year to research and draft. Our ordinance is just starting to be implemented and enforced. It deserves a chance to prove itself. As you know, Santa Barbara Sheriff's office has been using cannabis tax funds to diligently shut down illegal operations while legal operations are only beginning to make it through the rigorous Land Use permitting and Business Licensing processes. Thanks to projected cannabis tax revenues, our County has a new source of revenue.

Beyond tax dollars, cannabis farms create high-paying jobs that support a vast network of local businesses. And the environmentally friendly, pesticide-free plants grown by our local farmers serve as the foundation for minority and women-led small businesses. The economic benefits of this fledgling industry are bolstering non-cannabis businesses throughout our community. Supporting economic opportunity and our workforce is something we take great pride in. Cannabis is the first new industry in this county in decades and thousands of county residents are reaping the benefits.

Because cannabis is arguably the most regulated crop in the world, it is taking County staff many months to process cannabis permit applications. That process ensures that cannabis farmers comply with the hundreds of new regulations that were drafted to protect our community and natural resources.

In the meantime, as legal growers, we will continue to work hard to be good neighbors, listen with an open mind when there are legitimate issues to be solved, and make warranted changes. North County Farmer's Guild growers are in this for the long haul. Farming is what we love, and Santa Barbara County is our home.

We understand that a small, vocal minority of County residents have expressed concerns with the cultivation of cannabis. However, some of the agenda items before you today will not address those concerns. Northern Santa Barbara County is an agricultural community and we strongly believe that legal cannabis cultivators exemplify and model pro-community agricultural operations. We are beginning to prove that already but we need more time to differentiate ourselves in the community's eyes from the bad actors. In addition, per the County's request, we are reaching out to the wine community to discuss and address their concerns and to develop new ideas to increase the number of tourists that visit our valley. This will take time.

Our members have been engaged in the processes of studying, drafting, implementing, and helping your staff and Sheriff enforce the cannabis ordinance. We have studied your staff's proposals and appreciate the opportunity to submit our input on the proposed amendments to the Ordinance below.

II. POTENTIAL LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

a. Existing Noticing Requirements are Sufficient

Santa Barbara County noticing requirements for cannabis are already over three times more expansive than what California state law requires. Nonetheless, North County Farmer's Guild supports this change for the greater good. However, expanded noticing requirements is not good public policy for properties within an EDRN/RN or for properties that require the use of a public roadway within that EDRN/RN because the existing rules are sufficient and adequately protect the public.

b. CUPs for Cannabis Cultivation on AG-1 Parcels

We support this amendment for the greater public good and as a way to address some of the concerns raised in North County vis-a-vis projects on Ag-1 parcels. However, we believe this change is this change is mis-directed policy and will lead to unintended consequences for the following reasons:

- This amendment would detrimentally impact small farmers and landowners and push cultivation onto Ag-II parcels. Local Ag-1 farmers may be considering diversifying into cannabis to support their food crops in the future, but a CUP will be too cost-prohibitive. Small farmers that are currently farming on Ag-1 parcels likely do not have the resources to purchase Ag-II parcels.
- This amendment would adversely impact applicants who have already applied for land use permits on Ag-1 parcels. The existing permitting process for all cannabis cultivators is already very detailed and time consuming, and unprecedented for an agricultural use. Adding another layer of requirements at this late date would not address the public's concerns and would punish smaller landowners.
- This amendment would "result in an increase in time and costs associated with processing CUPs, as compared to LUPs..."
- This amendment is unnecessary because existing regulations require a CUP for cannabis activities on AG-I lots located within an EDRN (44% of all AG-I lots).
- This amendment would lead to more delays as the Planning Commission is already overtasked with hearing appeals for cannabis land use permits; adding additional hearings to their plate would further slow the process of permitting cannabis cultivators. We must allow farmers to timely make improvements to

their properties and to implement the detailed mitigation measures (e.g. fencing and security plans, landscape plans, updates to buildings, etc.) required by the Ordinance. Our farmers have already collectively spent millions of dollars to navigate the Ordinance and should be allowed the opportunity to implement these new requirements. Both the farmers and the opposition are requesting this.

III. PROPOSAL TO LIMIT CANNABIS CULTIVATION OPERATIONS COUNTYWIDE

a. We Support A Carefully Crafted Cap on Cannabis Operations

As highlighted by your County Executive Office, Santa Barbara County currently has 679 active State provisional annual cultivation and nursery licenses in the county. Those licenses represent only 156 acres of cannabis canopy throughout the county, or 0.02% of all agriculturally zoned property in Santa Barbara County. There are additional acres of cannabis in the permitting queue, but even if all projects are permitted (est. 1000 acres), this represents less than 1% of agricultural land in the County. This small quantity of acreage is dwarfed by the 20,000+ acres of grapes in our county.

The North County Farmer's Guild believe that it is in the County's affirmative interest for that number to increase organically over time because more cannabis under legal cultivation means fewer pesticides in our soil and groundwater; more taxes in county coffers, and more and higher paying jobs for our agricultural community.

For the reasons stated below, we believe that establishing a cap on cultivation, without further study is ill-advised, but we are committed to remaining engaged as our community struggles to settle upon an optimal cannabis ordinance. We therefore respectfully submit the following proposed cannabis canopy cap:

1. No more than 5% of all agriculturally zoned land throughout Santa Barbara County shall be cultivated as cannabis canopy.
2. All applicants that have submitted a land use application and paid the application fees to the County should be protected from being wiped out in the event a new cap is imposed.
3. "Canopy" shall be defined in accordance with the with State Regulations as enforced by the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) regulations.
4. The limitation on cannabis cultivation shall sunset 24 months after implementation, which will allow for an analysis of the impacts of legal cannabis cultivation after all permits are issued.

b. We have significant questions that need answer before considering any proposal to limit cannabis cultivation operations countywide

The North County Farmer's Guild has wrestled with how to consider limiting cultivation countywide at this juncture. Before we can intelligently consider if, how, and/or to what extent cannabis cultivation should be considered in Santa Barbara County, the following questions must be answered:

1. Why? What is the policy objective of limiting cannabis cultivation?

The report from your County Executive Office states that "members of the public have expressed concerns about cumulative impacts" of "cannabis cultivation sites in operation." That is no doubt true. We highlight, however, that these concerns are based upon fear of future cultivation or observations of the number of sites "in operation," as opposed to "licensed to operate." In addition, it appears most of the complaints are coming from residential areas in South County (e.g. Goleta), not in North County. Because the majority of the projects and agriculture land exist in the North County, it is unclear what impacts to these individuals a cap would limit or remove.

Because the ordinance has not yet been fully implemented, there is no basis by which to assess those impacts. Once the impacts of legal cannabis cultivations have had time to be better understood, the task of any prudent policymaker would be to mitigate or eliminate those negative impacts, while preserving the associated benefits to the greatest degree possible.

We also suggest that limiting cannabis cultivation now will not assuage the concerns of those few in our community who oppose cannabis *per se*. This would be contrary to the results of Prop 64 and recent polls that demonstrate a super-majority of your constituents support cannabis cultivation.

We underscore the vital importance of deliberating over evidence-based policy considerations that align with the spirit and intent of Proposition 64 and subsequent state laws that further the will of the people. The will of the people is to bring the cannabis industry out of the darkness and into the daylight of the open market. Further, several pieces of federal legislation are already making their way through Congress on a bi-partisan basis that would recognize states' rights and allow inter-state commerce among regulated markets. California stands to prosper from this new interstate market but our community risks missing that opportunity if we preemptively impair the creativity of cannabis farmers.

2. How would the County optimally limit cannabis cultivation operations countywide?

Your County Executive Office suggests several ways to limit the number or scale of cannabis cultivation, including capping the number of licenses, capping the number of

acres, or combining those two in some way. Our concerns about those approaches are as follows:

a. Capping the number of licenses is a vague idea that creates the wrong incentive structure for landowners, might-be cultivators, and soon-to-be applicants. If this proposal is seriously considered, the result will almost certainly be a rush of low-quality applications from outside interests submitted to your already overstrained Planning and Development staff.

How do you determine what number of licenses is the right number? Nobody knows how many applications are currently being assembled, but we do know that it can cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to do so. Is there no reprieve for those soon-to-be applicants who do not submit in time?

The County has already shown that a total license cap is very hard to implement. As of today, the County has still failed to issue the six (6) retail licenses. In addition, the City of Santa Barbara has wound up in lawsuits over its process to issue a limited number of licenses. It would appear that this model is fraught with problems that have already shown to be problematic.

b. Capping the number of acres of cannabis cultivation countywide while maintaining the established Carpinteria Ag Overlay cap is a very risk-fraught proposition that again creates a destructive incentive structure and is also overly broad. For example, if an individual purchases land and applies to permit a huge number acres of cannabis in Cuyama Valley, that could effectively eliminate the possibility of growing legal cannabis for the rest of Santa Barbara County's existing farmers. We have found that a growing number of row crop farmers are interested in cultivating a portion of their property as cannabis, in order to diversify their revenue streams and supplement the revenue from specialty food crops. In this way cannabis helps Santa Barbara food farmers stay in business.

Currently, the vast majority of cannabis operators in our county are effectively locally owned and operated. If the total number of acres is capped, that would send a signal to applicants that they should push to permit the maximum possible number of acres as soon as possible, even when the amount may not be commercially justifiable. It could also prove to be very counterproductive to assisting the existing agricultural community in transitioning to this crop as other crops that they are growing are no longer profitable.

3. To what extent?

There is no indication in the Board materials released the day before July 4th what the proposed acreage cap would be, so it is extremely difficult for our organization to understand the scope and scale of the proposal. Nor do we know how many acres are in the queue for licensing. Nor do we know how many acres are about to join the queue via submission of a land use permit. The North County Farmer's Guild would be more

open to discussing a proposed acreage cap, if we were aware of the parameters of the discussion.

It is also important to note that any cap on acreage based on the existing acreage in the queue to date is a de facto moratorium on new cannabis cultivation activities. Such a moratorium would be illegal, under Government Code §65858(e), as noted on page 2 of County Executive Office's "Board Letter" for this meeting notes.

4. Where does this lead?

As mentioned above, we believe that those advocating for a cap on cannabis cultivation either do not fully understand where we find ourselves from a policymaking framework (cannabis ordinance is beginning to be implemented), do not understand the facts surrounding our industry, or are not representing their true agenda in good faith. Fundamentally, we cannot let a vocal minority influence our well-crafted Ordinance or adversely influence a nascent industry supported by the vast majority of Santa Barbarans.

IV. WE SUPPORT ACTION REGARDING PROPOSALS #2-#5

We appreciate the County's efforts to develop proposals that will make the permit process more efficient and streamlined. In addition, we support the following proposals, which address specific concerns expressed by the public.

- a. **We support requiring that cultivators currently growing cannabis on Ag-1 zoned parcels demonstrate odor control compliance during the business license application process.**
- b. **We support the dual processing of Land Use Permits and Cannabis Business Licenses.**
- c. **We support placing operators in the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay on an "Eligible List" for the 186-acre cultivation cap upon approval of a land use entitlement.**
- d. **We support broadening the definition of Hearing Officer to match County Code Chapter 24A.**

Thank you for your time and consideration. We will be offering additional oral testimony on July 9. Please do not hesitate to reach out to us to discuss our comments.

Sincerely,

Sara Rotman, on behalf of the *North County Farmer's Guild*:

John DeFriel, Sara Rotman, Nathan Diaz, Wil Crummer, Keith Crummer, Cathy Duncan, Derek Duncan, Ila Hubbard, Jack Motter, Jeffrey Kramer, Vahagn Nahabedian

Relis, Mia

From: Brad Ross <rossbrada@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:48 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Cannabis Land Use Ordinance Amendment - Public Comment 7/9/19

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 keep cannabis cultivation away from residential areas in the Santa Barbara county.

Many thanks,

Brad Ross, Los Olivos

Relis, Mia

From: Sergio Gallo <sergio@privatereserve.org>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:48 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Cannabis Agriculture Support

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 Santa Barbara County officials,

I am writing you to express my business's and my personal support of the cannabis industry in Santa Barbara County. Below are some important points I'd like to convey related to this new and legal industry. Many of the points noted below are related to why I think this industry is good for all citizens of Santa Barbara County— whether they like the cannabis plant and its byproducts or not. Additionally, the idea of making yet more changes to the cannabis ordinance that has taken so much effort already for all the different county agencies to review and approve is simply bad public policy.

- First and foremost, Cannabis for medical or recreational use is legal in California. Proposition 64 was passed by a landslide majority of California citizens in 2016.
- The Cannabis industry is providing hundreds and hundreds of good paying jobs for county residents who are therefore further supporting our county's economy.
- This new industry has created a much needed financial boost for many non-cannabis businesses like ours.
- The cannabis businesses and their employees we've gotten to know are good people who we've enjoyed working with.
- Agriculture is still the #1 economic driver in the County of Santa Barbara and cannabis is just the newest legal form of agriculture. This industry should be allowed to thrive and continue to positively contribute to our county just like any other agricultural crop.
- Further limiting any landowners' ability to grow legal, highly regulated cannabis does not fix the main problem in this County regarding cannabis—the existence of black market or non-compliant grow operations. The negative impacts of illicit indoor and outdoor cultivation on the environment have been well-documented.
- Santa Barbara County has a unique opportunity to be the leader in sun grown, sustainable cannabis and expand its tourism industry which is again good for all county residents whether they support the plant and its byproducts or not.

This new and legal industry is providing an incredible opportunity for Santa Barbara to continue to thrive through the employment, taxes and other positive contributions it is contributing to the our county. It should be allowed to thrive and continue to contribute very positively to the whole county economy.

Sincerely,
-Sergio G.

Relis, Mia

From: Evan Turpin <epturpin@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:48 AM
To: Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Subject: Cannabis comment for July 9th meeting

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

I am a resident of Carpinteria on Foothill Road, near Cravens Lane. I have been a homeowner in Carpinteria since 1986.

I support the draft Urgency Ordinance submitted to the county by the Santa Barbara Coalition for Responsible Cannabis. The ordinance would allow the County to minimize many of the nuisance impacts of odor from ongoing, un-permitted cannabis operations and is aimed at growers who lied on affidavits or expanded operations unlawfully after becoming a "legal non conforming use", and who do not have odor control or adequate setbacks in place.

I also believe our Coastal Zone deserves equal protections to that of the inland zone. Please consider a commercial cannabis ban on AG-1-20 acre or under parcels in the Coastal Zone, or at minimum, require Conditional Use Permits for any commercial cannabis grows in the Coastal Zone.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration on this issue.

Evan Turpin
4038 Foothill Road
Carpinteria, CA

Relis, Mia

From: fnemerson <fnemerson@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:47 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: WE Watch letters for Items 19-00536 and 19-00616
Attachments: WEWBOS19-00536719.docx; WEWBOS19-00616.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.

Good morning,

I have attached two letters from WE Watch for the July 9 meeting of the Board of Supervisors, the two cannabis related hearings.

Nancy E.

WE Watch, P.O Box 830, Solvang CA93463

July 3, 2019

TO: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
FROM: Nancy Emerson, WE Watch President
RE: Commercial Cannabis Regulation



What regulations are needed to avoid new commercial cannabis problems in our County and to allow coexistence? WE Watch's goal is to protect neighbors but enable commercial cannabis to coexist with them where feasible. The Inland Cannabis Land Use Ordinance's Purpose states clearly the County's intent to protect neighborhoods and neighbors.

However, currently, in the County's Inland Ordinance, weak controls favor cannabis interests rather than providing neighbors with needed protection. Commercial cannabis **indoor** grows can occur on any agriculturally zoned land. A commercial **outdoor** grow can occur on agricultural land zoned AG-1-20 or larger. Nurseries, manufacturing and wholesale distribution are allowed in all zones of AG-1 and AG- II with few controls. No odor control is required in AG II.

The proposed CUP requirement may help some with the inland AG-1 larger parcels but more is needed.

1. The Santa Ynez Valley has been asking since December that commercial cannabis be excluded from AG-1-5 and AG-1-10 because these lots are primarily residential and are too small to allow coexistence of neighborhoods and neighbors with any commercial cannabis. The Board's January consensus regarding this was somehow lost in the planning process. It is critical that you act on this at this hearing.

2. Exclude commercial cannabis from AG-1-20 unless more data indicates coexistence can successfully occur with some parcels. If so, then use CUPs with specific guidelines that enable the Planning Commission to determine if strategically locating commercial cannabis on parcels may allow coexistence.

3. Some regulation is needed on AG-II parcels for coexistence to work. Use CUPs with specific cannabis guidelines.

4. Utilize individual parcel grow size limits and a total acreage cap to protect neighbors and prevent over expansion of commercial cannabis.

5. Provide increased buffers for cities/townships/sensitive receptors.

6. If an Urgency Ordinance will enable the County to correct existing and, in some cases, long standing neighborhood and neighbor problems with commercial cannabis cultivation, then adopt it.

Neighbor-Cannabis Coexistence

A variety of regulatory tools are required to successfully achieve any coexistence in the Santa Ynez Valley and elsewhere. The following questions, not yet answered satisfactorily, need answers. Otherwise, any attempts at coexistence will result in similar problems to those currently being experienced by nearby residences, wineries, other agriculture, tourists, cities and townships. These questions are examples of specific cannabis guidelines needed for CUPs.

1. How far away from residences, wine tasting and other agricultural activities must commercial cannabis be located to coexist?
2. How far away from other agricultural activities must commercial cannabis be located so its products can meet purity requirements?
3. How far away from city and township boundaries and child serving sites must cannabis be located to protect these residents?
4. Can regulations be less restrictive for indoor cultivation than for outdoor cultivation?
5. Is there sufficient differentiation in terms of odor problems from various species so that species should be considered when developing odor regulations?
6. How does increasing acreage of indoor and outdoor grows affect impact of odor?
7. How reliable is the current odor control technology? Can it really eliminate odor or does it simply mask it? Is there any effective odor control technology available for cannabis grown in hoop structures?
8. What are the air quality impacts? How do factors like frequent wind impact the above questions?
9. Will the water efficiency regulations be sufficient to protect other residential and agricultural users from commercial cannabis over drafting available water supplies?
10. A person wishing to farm cannabis faces substantial expense but, financially, the return is potentially substantial, too. There has been interest in encouraging smaller scale farmers. What cannabis acreage is needed to be profitable and what would net income be?

WE Watch, P.O Box 830, Solvang CA93463



June 5, 2019

TO: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
FROM: Nancy Emerson, WE Watch President
RE: Business Licensing Ordinance

Thank you for opposing state legislation if it gives counties no opportunity to regulate hemp. We recognize that hemp can be a useful crop, but share your concern about such issues as odor and potential negative impact on other agricultural crops, including cannabis, if totally unregulated.

WE Watch expressed concern about the lack of transparency with the Business Licensing Ordinance processes on April 2. We ask that the public receive better noticing about the Pre-Qualified Retail Applicants List than simply posting it on your website. Not everyone checks it daily or weekly. We ask that the public be able to comment on applications before final selections are made. Shouldn't there be an appeal process for the public for these licenses?

Other issues being addressed in hearing.

1. Countywide cap on cannabis cultivation acreage. We commented on this during the hearing on the Inland Cannabis Land Use Ordinance. We need an overall commercial cap on cultivation acreage for the inland areas of the County, especially since no moratorium is possible.
2. Moving to concurrent processing of Business License with Land Use Permit, which would achieve earlier demonstration of odor control operation. No potential negative effects of concurrently processing permits and licenses were mentioned. Please examine whether there are significant reasons not to do this before adopting it..
3. Expand eligible Hearing Officer list. Our concern is that any Hearing Officer be well informed about the issues surrounding commercial cannabis, particularly retail licenses and unbiased so these hearings are fair to all, including neighborhoods.

Relis, Mia

From: susan belloni <susanbelloni@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:49 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: July 9 Cannabis Hearing

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

To: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
From: Susan Belloni
Re: Cannabis Hearing, July 9, 2019
Date: July 5, 2019

Dear Chair Lavagnino and Supervisors,

Thank you for looking at excluding cannabis cultivation from AG-I five to twenty acres on 1,900 parcels in the inland area. The concern for those of us standing up for the SYV Community Plan is about land use, not human use. We are NOT in a “proxy war” against people using cannabis. We want the SYV Community Plan upheld.

Due to current experience with cannabis cultivation, other neighborhoods have been suffering and the path forward to protect neighborhoods has not been made. The County is processing a permit for a commercial greenhouse on the City Limits of Solvang right next to a neighbor, which makes no sense. Continuing to allow cannabis cultivation with no limits will create endless complaints and hearings. Excluding it may have an added benefit to facilitate more ADUs to relieve the current housing shortage. Thank you for having the wisdom to change the Cannabis Ordinance.

If you haven't already, please read this concise article about our neighborhoods, The SYV Plan and local control.

Thank you for your time and hard work on the Cannabis Ordinance.

Susan Belloni
Solvang Resident

Understanding and appreciating AG-I zoning

- Bob Field/Community Matters
- Dec 8, 2011

The Santa Ynez Valley is special for many reasons, one of which is the historic AG-I zoning that has protected the look and feel of the Valley, simultaneously enabling the rural residential lifestyle.

In Santa Barbara County, not all privately owned land is zoned either urban or agricultural. AG-I, primarily parcels from five to 20 acres, is a hybrid zone that represents an intermediate land use — partly residential, partly agricultural.

Picture a bull's-eye with the center being urban uses, such as commercial districts and residential housing. The middle ring, functioning as a buffer, is the hybrid AG-I. The outer ring is the real-agriculture AG-II, with parcels of at least 100 acres and ranch sizes of several hundred acres or more.

Viewed from urban areas with an urban mindset, AG-I properties look like small ranches. However, viewed from the large AG-II perspective, they look like residential neighborhoods with big yards.

Agriculturally, AG-I zoning allows rural uses prohibited in residential zones, such as the keeping of farm animals including horses, alpacas and roosters. In addition, it may allow — but only with conditional-use permits, to ensure neighborhood compatibility — certain commercial agricultural operations that are allowed by right in the larger parcel AG-II zones.

Residentially, the AG-I housing density greatly exceeds that of AG-II. In addition to significantly smaller parcels, AG-I is allowed residential second units, and about one-third of these parcels have them.

Consequently, areas zoned AG-I are not purely urban or agricultural, they are rural neighborhoods. An example of the difference — a mile of rural roads in an AG-II zone may have one or two driveways, while in an AG-I zone there may be 30 or 40.

What makes our community unique is that about 1,600 AG-I properties are located within the relatively small Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan area. Remarkably, this is two-thirds of the total AG-I properties in all of Santa Barbara County. There are only about 100 in the rest of the entire North County.

How influential is this? Almost 40 percent of our Community Plan area is zoned AG-I.

Coincidentally, about 95 percent of all of the AG-I parcels in Santa Barbara wine country are in the Santa Ynez Valley. The high residential density of AG-I neighborhoods is an obvious source of friction with wineries that wish to conduct public wine tasting and commercial events at nearby winery sites.

For exactly this reason, prior to approving commercial visitor-serving activities at a winery, county decision-makers are required to find that these privileges are not detrimental to the rights of the adjacent neighborhoods.

On the downside, this zoning consumes a huge amount of land otherwise available for real agriculture, so the Community Plan wisely created no more of it.

The unusual concentration of AG-I-zoned properties in the Santa Ynez Valley has contributed greatly to the unique character of this community. It has encouraged a concentration of horse lovers that results in our world-class equestrian scene. It has enabled the breeding and raising a wide variety of other animals, and facilitated specialty farming.

It has attracted nature lovers, artists and others who cherish beauty, peace and quiet. Parents choose to live here so their children can grow up in a wholesome and safe rural environment.

AG-I zoning, and the residents it has attracted, are key parts of why this community is so special.

Community Matters explores local topics of public interest. Retired businessman Bob Field is president of his neighborhood's mutual water company and past chairman of the Valley Plan Advisory Committee.

Relis, Mia

From: Allan Weil <alweil@cox.net>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:50 AM
To: Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Cc: Al Weil; Sandy Weil
Subject: Cannabis Cultivation and Sensitive Receptors

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.

Santa Barbara Board of Supervisors:

The Sensitive Areas of Schools, Day Care and Youth Care facilities seem to be the only areas being minimally addressed for odor and health control.

There is no consideration being addressed for those same individuals when they are not in those sensitive areas and are exposed many hours at home, 24 hours a day on weekends, 24/7 vacation and 24/7 during the summers.

What about the vulnerable elderly and asthmatics as sensitive receptors?

Also, is the General Public "Second Class Citizens" and have no expectation of equal rights, or health protection while being exposed 24/7 to the effects of long term low levels of VOC's/terpenes as well as the effects of VOC's/Terpenes on the Ozone and Smog Pollutions levels?

The rank odor is definitely a public nuisance for all sensitive receptors and the general public with no valid exemption.

Close the loophole:

Change the Ag-I Existing Developed Residential Neighborhood (EDRN) protections be applied to EDRN in Ag-I zone as well.

The Coastal Zone deserves equal if not stronger protections than inland.

Stop the practice of authorizing state provisional licenses.

I support the Urgency Ordinance submitted to the County by the Santa Barbara Coalition for Responsible Cannabis.

I support at a minimum the 1000 foot property line to property line setbacks.

Do not allow permit stacking.

And finally, Odor abatement is the County's responsibility.

Sincerely,
Al Weil
7165b Shepard Mesa Rd.
Carpinteria 93013

Relis, Mia

From: Eli Lopez <elilopez106@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:51 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Amendments to 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.

Dear Santa Barbara County officials,

I am writing you to express my business's and my personal support of the cannabis industry in Santa Barbara County. Below are some important points I'd like to convey related to this new and legal industry. Many of the points noted below are related to why I think this industry can benefit all citizens of Santa Barbara County— whether they like the cannabis plant and its byproducts or not. Additionally, the idea of making yet more changes to the cannabis ordinance that has taken so much effort already for all the different county agencies to review and approve is simply bad public policy.

- First and foremost, Cannabis for medical or recreational use is legal in California. Proposition 64 was passed by a landslide majority of California citizens in 2016.
- The Cannabis industry is providing hundreds and hundreds of good paying jobs for county residents who are therefore further supporting our county's economy.
- Agriculture is still the #1 economic driver in the County of Santa Barbara and cannabis is just the newest legal form of agriculture. This industry should be allowed to thrive and continue to positively contribute to our county just like any other agricultural crop.
- Further limiting any landowners' ability to grow legal, highly regulated cannabis does not fix the main problem in this County regarding cannabis—the existence of black market or non-compliant grow operations. The negative impacts of illicit indoor and outdoor cultivation on the environment have been well-documented.
- Santa Barbara County has a unique opportunity to be the leader in sun grown, sustainable cannabis and expand its tourism industry which is again good for all county residents whether they support the plant and its byproducts or not.

This new and legal industry is providing an incredible opportunity for Santa Barbara to continue to thrive through the employment, taxes and other positive contributions it is contributing to the our county. It should be allowed to thrive and continue to contribute very positively to the whole county economy.

Sincerely,

Eli Lopez

Relis, Mia

From: Angelo Bellah <abellah18@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:52 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: County Board of Supervisors Meeting; July 9, 2019 - Re Amendments to 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.

Re Amendments to Cannabis Ordinance

Dear Supervisors,

I think it's very important to support legal cannabis businesses and industries, both locally and worldwide. These emerging industries not only support the livelihoods of many individuals and families (especially in Santa Barbara County), but also lay the groundwork for eliminating black markets and turning cannabis into a commodity/crop that can sustainably grow and support a thriving and healthy community. I'm writing you to request that no additional changes be made to the Cannabis Ordinance.

My name is Angelo Bellah and I've been working in the legal cannabis industry in Washington State since its inception in 2013. Over the last 6 years I've worked in a managerial role for 2 producer/processors (what you would call Nursery, Cultivation, and Processing) during their spin-up and first year phases and I've experienced first-hand how reactionary and fear based legislature negatively impacted (intentionally or not) the ability of a business to function "normally" and create a sustainable model. In my opinion, it's very important for local and state municipalities that allow cannabis business to operate within their jurisdiction to support those businesses from undue hardship and unfair persecution. Cannabis has been demonized and used as a tool for racial prejudice for far too long. The cannabis industry (from the business owners to the workers to the tax beneficiaries) needs the help and protection of friendly communities and municipalities so we can have the regulatory flexibility to operate sustainably and establish normal/healthy business practices. We also need these municipalities and communities to be an advocate for businesses that have done their due diligence and jumped through all the permitting and licensing hoops as these businesses are the "good actors" and their behavior should be recognized and praised.

I recently accepted a role as Director of Track and Traceability for a cannabis farm located Santa Barbara County and am now a resident of your beautiful county! Besides the fact that the proposals in the Cannabis Ordinance would directly affect our operation and my job, I'm also concerned that Santa Barbara County is not and won't be an advocate for the cannabis businesses that will generate millions of dollars in tax revenue and provide thousands of jobs for our communities. Everything we do is a team effort, and we really need the County to be on our team.

I am concerned about the Board's consideration of additional restrictions and amendments to the Land Use and Development Code and the Coastal Zoning Ordinance. Cannabis is already the most highly regulated agricultural crop in

Santa Barbara County. It would be a disservice to and undue burden on the individuals and businesses that have worked diligently to secure all required local and state licenses and permits. In the process of obtaining a cannabis license, these individuals and businesses have tirelessly worked through every painstaking detail of the permitting process, which becomes even more painstaking when it feels like the regulatory requirements change/shift on a whim and without regard to the impact they will have on an already challenging business/industry. The Board's consideration of further amendments is no exception.

I am troubled by the Board's disregard for the numerous restrictions the County has already placed on cannabis growers in the Valley. Now, seeking further changes to the Ordinance, the Board is placing an even heavier burden on the shoulders of those who have relied on the County's regulations and invested our life and business by choosing to grow cannabis in Santa Barbara County. Further limiting landowners' ability to grow legal, highly regulated cannabis does not fix the main problem in this County—the existence of black market or non-compliant grow operations. The negative impacts of illicit indoor and outdoor cultivation on the environment have been well-documented.

Santa Barbara has a unique opportunity to be the leader in sun grown, sustainable cannabis and expand its tourism industry. Polling demonstrates that the majority of our residents support the industry. We cannot allow a small group of vocal opponents to upend this unique opportunity. For these reasons, I ask that you reject the additional amendments in their entirety.

Sincerely,

Angelo Bellah

Relis, Mia

From: Maribeth Hammond <maribeth@privatereserve.org>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 11:54 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Fwd: Time to spread the word!

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

Dear Supervisors:

I support the legal cannabis industry, which supports numerous new, high paying jobs in our County and know of many who benefit from the use of legal CBD's, releasing them from the use of prescription drugs which are more harmful. I'm writing to request that no additional changes be made to the Cannabis Ordinance.

I am Maribeth Hammond and have been working with cultivators for 2 1/2 years. We have jumped through many hoops, changes and more changes and laws from the previous changes and laws. We have been trying to comply with all the requests and they keep coming and changing, very expensive and difficult to know what is expected of us on a daily basis. It is uncanny as to why Cannabis growers are taxed so heavily with taxes being paid to the County of SB, the cultivation tax, the 4% quarterly county tax, sales tax as well as the Federal and State taxes. The Ag laws for Cannabis are so much heavier than for Ag itself including the

labor laws. I think that everyone seems to want to be involved in the process with regards to income but, do not seem to want to help us make the County more lucrative and successful with all the taxes we are paying. They say Yes for the increased income and No for the very product that could give more jobs and better salaries to the County and employees of the Industry.

I am concerned about the Board's consideration of additional restrictions and amendments to the Land Use and Development Code and the Coastal Zoning Ordinance. Cannabis is already the most highly regulated agricultural crop in Santa Barbara County. I have worked diligently with our company and employees to secure all required local and state licenses and permits, as well as comply with the regulatory requirements imposed by state and local agencies. I have been a part of and observed every painstaking detail of the permitting process with the State and the County, even though it often feels like we are chasing moving targets. The Board's consideration of further amendments is no exception. Some of the rebuttal is very inaccurate and shows a lack of education, or will to be educated with regard to Cannabis.

I am troubled by the Board's disregard for the numerous restrictions the County has already placed on cannabis growers in the Valley. Now, seeking further changes to the Ordinance, the Board is placing an even heavier burden on the shoulders of those who have relied on the County's regulations and invested our life and business by choosing to grow cannabis in Santa Barbara County. Further limiting landowners' ability to grow legal, highly regulated cannabis does not fix the main problem in this County Re: the existence of black market or non-compliant grow operations which still exist in this County, however I am aware of the raids and closures

and acknowledge and respect your efforts with regards to the black market.

The negative impacts of illicit indoor and outdoor cultivation on the environment have been well-documented.

Santa Barbara has a unique opportunity to be the leader in sun grown, sustainable cannabis and expand its tourism industry. Polling demonstrates that the majority of our residents (well above 60%) support the industry. We cannot allow a small group of vocal opponents to upend this unique opportunity, as we have had an open mind to the wine industry, the board should reciprocate. The smell of cannabis has a bad reputation as it had been illegal to grow in the past, but, all Ag crops have an odor, be it from natural growth or primarily toxic pesticide spraying.

We are bending over backwards to comply with all the requests, creating jobs and spending a fortune along the way, it is difficult to stay on top of all the expenses,

We have had to increase our grow to subsidize all the regulatory requirements.

To not gain respect or recognition for compliance is very dis-heartening.

For these reasons, I ask that you reject the additional amendments in their entirety.

Sincerely,

Maribeth Hammond

Relis, Mia

From: Wil Crummer <wil@privatereserve.org>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 12:01 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public comments for July 9th Board of supervisors meeting

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

Dear Supervisors

I was born and raised in Santa Barbara county and everyday I consider myself blessed to continue to call this place home. I care deeply about our community and hope to contribute as much as I can to the vitality of our community.

My family owns and operates a cannabis farm in north county. Each and every day we are so proud of our accomplishments and the people who we have shared them with. Currently we have around 100 great employees whose livelihoods depend on our farms success.

I think it is important that cannabis businesses in Santa Barbara be locally owned and operated. The people of our community deserve the opportunity to partake in this thriving industry, and to give back to the community that supports us. In 2023, the floodgates will open for big, out-of-state businesses to come in and stake their claim. We need these next few years to allow us local farmers to establish ourselves before its too late. We have worked so hard to comply with all local and state requirements. Please be mindful of the effect of adding more regulations and restrictions, which ultimately makes it harder for cannabis operators such as ourselves to establish a foot hold.

I respectfully ask that we give the county's diligently crafted ordinance a chance to succeed before making any additional changes.

Sincerely,

Wil Crummer
Owner, Heirloom Valley

Wil Crummer
Email: wil@privatereserve.org
Phone: 805-453-4110

Relis, Mia

From: Jesse Zaragoza <jesse@privatereserve.org>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 12:01 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: County Board of Supervisors Meeting – July 9, 2019

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

RE: County Board of Supervisors Meeting – July 9, 2019
Re Amendments to Cannabis Ordinance

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to request that no additional changes be made to the Cannabis Ordinance. I am a HUGE supporter of the cannabis industry and its ability to provide jobs across a broad spectrum of entry to executive level in our County.

My name is Jesse Zargoza and I am a fourth generation Santa Barbara County resident and each generation has been involved in agriculture in some way, shape, or form. I currently am part of a cannabis organization that employees' over 150 people from the County throughout the calendar year, and utilizes numerous local County business' from local hardware and irrigation to civil engineering and lawyers.

I am concerned and worried that the amount of rules, regulations, and restrictions already in existence compounded with future rules and regulations will cause the industry not to flourish to its full capabilities and provide thousands of jobs and millions of dollars of annual tax dollars to the County.

For these reasons, I ask that you reject the additional amendments in their entirety.

Sincerely,

Jesse Zaragoza

Relis, Mia

From: Thijs Vink <thijs@privatereserve.org>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 12:07 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Re Amendments to 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.

RE: County Board of Supervisors Meeting – July 9, 2019
Re Amendments to Cannabis Ordinance

Dear Supervisors:

I support the legal cannabis industry, which supports numerous new, high paying jobs in our County. I'm writing to request that no additional changes be made to the Cannabis Ordinance.

My name is Thijs Vink and I'm a professional grower with more the 30 years of experience out of the Santa Maria farming industry. I have a strong farming back ground and support the farming community. I have seen crops come and go, cannabis is just the next crop.

I currently work For an organic farm in Buellton as director of Cultivation, realizing an old dream of growing organically to sustain our Agricultural soils with the hope that all farms will convert their operations to produce a better quality food and provide farmers with a better income.

I am concerned about the Board's consideration of additional restrictions and amendments to the Land Use and Development Code and the Coastal Zoning Ordinance. It seems like the discussion is moving into the emotional part of not in my backyard principle . The odor issue is being used to prevent farmers from operation their business. This as a ridiculous argument for fields in the middle of traditional agricultural lands and undercutting the principle of farmers right to farm in favor to please city people.

Santa Barbara has a unique opportunity to be the leader in sun grown, sustainable cannabis and expand its tourism industry. Polling demonstrates that the majority of our residents support the industry. We cannot allow a small group of vocal opponents to upend this unique opportunity.

For these reasons, I ask that you reject the additional amendments in their entirety.

Sincerely,

Thijs Vink

4 Attachments

[Preview YouTube video Acreage Cannabis Ad Rejected For Super Bowl By CBS](#)



[Preview YouTube video Super Bowl / Academy Awards 2019 Best Cannabis Commercial MedMen #mmnewnormal "The New Normal"](#)



Relis, Mia

From: Patricia Saragosa <patricia.saragosa@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 12:10 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Possible Marijuana Nursery at 4555 Foothill Rd. Carp.

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.

My wife and I are against any Preliminary or Final permits being approved until it can be shown that Ivan Van Wingerden can prove that he has an odor protection system, or sound and that it has been inspected by an independent inspector, if not NO Permit.

Relis, Mia

From: Abe - SecurePRO <abe@secureproinc.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 12:06 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: July 9th Meeting
Attachments: Letter - SBCBS 7-5-2019 (1).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.

See attached Letter of support.

Abe

--



Abe Schryer
President & CEO
SecurePRO, Inc.

The POWER behind:
Performance Audio
Central Coast Broadband
Observables

SecurePRO, Inc.
119 N Milpas Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93103

P: 805.880.1200 x701
F: 888.701.8105
M: 805.245.2302
abe@secureproinc.com
www.secureproinc.com

License Information:
Electrical Contractor = C10 994529
Alarm Contractor = ACO 7328
Locksmith = LCO 5943
Private Patrol Operator (guard Services) = PPO 17734

The information contained in this E-mail message and its attachments, if any, may be privileged, confidential and protected from disclosure. This information is the property of SecurePRO, Inc. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution, reading, or the taking of any actions in reliance on or in response to this information (except as specifically permitted in this notice) is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission and you are not a named recipient, or if you think you have received this E-mail message in error, please E-mail the sender at abe@secureproinc.com.

SecurePRO, Inc.
119 N. Milpas Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93103



Phone (805) 880-1200
Fax (888) 701-8105
www.secureproinc.com

License C10 994529, ACO 7328, LCO 5943, PPO 17734

TO: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors

FR: Abe Schryer, President & CEO

RE: Support for Cannabis Cultivation and Farming

SecurePRO, Inc. is a Santa Barbara based Security Systems integration firm and is a nationally recognized leader in providing fully automated systems for cyber and physical security for every level of business operation. We design, install and monitor many business sectors from government facilities, schools, houses of worship to small business and residential clients.

Over the past several years, we have developed a collaborative relationship with major cannabis farmers and auxiliary businesses in Santa Barbara County.

We feel very fortunate that this emerging industry has become a consistent, reliable and aware customer base. The industry is contributing to our progressive growth and economic bottomline.

Throughout the years, our company has always remained steadfast that economic prosperity is a two way street and we need to support new opportunities that help our local economy.

We are very confident that cannabis cultivation and farming in the County has been a viable economic engine that our business, employees and their families have benefited.

We all win when businesses work together to be successful and have a commitment to economic growth.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Abe Schryer". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Abe Schryer
President & CEO

Relis, Mia

From: Cwilliams <cwilliams@techag.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 12:14 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Board of Supervisors Meeting

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 Santa Barbara County officials,

I can't make the meeting next week so I wanted to write you to express my support of the cannabis industry in Santa Barbara County. Below are some important points I'd like to convey related to this new and legal industry.

- First and foremost, Cannabis for medical or recreational use is legal in California. Proposition 64 was passed by a landslide majority of California citizens in 2016.
- The Cannabis industry is providing hundreds and hundreds of good paying jobs for county residents who are therefore further supporting our county's economy.
- This new industry has created a much needed financial boost for many non-cannabis businesses like ours.
- The cannabis businesses and their employees we've gotten to know are good people who we've enjoyed working with.
- Agriculture is still the #1 economic driver in the County of Santa Barbara and cannabis is just the newest legal form of agriculture. This industry should be allowed to thrive and continue to positively contribute to our county just like any other agricultural crop.
- Further limiting any landowners' ability to grow legal, highly regulated cannabis does not fix the main problem in this County regarding cannabis—the existence of black market or non-compliant grow operations. The negative impacts of illicit indoor and outdoor cultivation on the environment have been well-documented.
- Santa Barbara County has a unique opportunity to be the leader in sun grown, sustainable cannabis and expand its tourism industry which is again good for all county residents whether they support the plant and its byproducts or not.

This new and legal industry is providing an incredible opportunity for Santa Barbara to continue to thrive through the employment, taxes and other positive contributions it is contributing to the our county.

Thank you for your time,

Clayton Williams
Salesman/PCA
Buttonwillow Warehouse Co., Inc.

Relis, Mia

From: Renee ONeill <chasingstar2701@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 12:14 PM
To: Lavagninó, Steve; Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; Hart, Gregg; Adam, Peter
Cc: sbcob; Miyasato, Mona; Bozanich, Dennis
Subject: Public Comment for July 9 2019
Attachments: Public Comment - 2 for July 9 BOS .docx; BOS Public Comment, July 9.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 two Public Comment letters. The first one was sent a couple days ago but I forgot to add information in item#4 re a suggestion for UCSB and GIS proposal.

Please forward this correspondence to the Planning Commissioners. I do not want to miss the deadline to submit Public Comment.

*Thank You,
Renée O'Neill*

Dear Supervisors,
July 5, 2019

“We the People,” insist that you remedy major fundamental urgency ordinances re the following:

1. Stop issuing cannabis licenses until affidavits are verified, bad actors are removed and problems are resolved
2. Immediately implement verification processes to validate existing affidavits, prior to issuing any further licenses (See UCSB – GIS, below)
3. Prohibit cannabis in EDRN’s (especially, single-access EDRN’s).
4. Prohibit cannabis on all parcels in AG I, especially those within EDRN’s (Tepusquet, Cebada)
 - a. CAPS: Total number of licenses issued to County – not to exceed 800. (I believe 800 was orig. staff proposal, in Scoping meeting documents, prior to adoption of 2017 EIR)
 - b. Eliminate stacking, which is a violation of ordinances that were meant to encourage small growers to have opportunity to develop, first.
 - c. Limit total square footage on hoop structures for SBC and for each parcel (not per LLC)
5. Require CUP’s and CEQA review for all cannabis operations
6. Automatically disqualify any applicant and their associates/partners/managers/family members, et al:
 - a. That perjured themselves on state and/or county applications. Remove present offenders and prohibit not only these applicants but their associated partners, managers, family members, et al, from receiving future licenses. Do not create a “loophole” for violators to operate on the same site, under the pretense of another license, a different name etc. To ensure this, restrict any cannabis activity on that property, until countywide problems are resolved.).
Illicit operators know all the tricks of the trade and will never be “ethical or compliant growers.”
 - b. That violated county, state or federal ordinances (these violations are filed/recorded with all three agencies)
 - c. That expanded their operations or “footprint,” after January 2016
7. Support small cannabis farmers that develop in appropriate areas that are more suitable for our scenic Central Coast (Max. 1-acre cultivation or 10,000 sq. ft. greenhouse). All Cannabis should be developed where it is compatible with regard to residential/rural neighborhoods, sensitive receptors and traditional Ag that would otherwise be negatively impacted.
8. Re AB 97 (two-year extension). Not in Our County and Not on Current BOS’ Watch.

Please protect public health, safety and welfare and the environment, by voting to approve above-listed recommendations.

Re a proposal to BOS for UCSB – GIS verification of existing operations: (was supposed to be in previous letter)

Hire consultants to verify that the existing operations were and are legally in compliance with state law.

BOS has authorized \$100k for a tax audit of the revenue generated by the gross receipts, from cannabis sales.

A corresponding audit should be conducted by the UCSB Geography Department to verify the information as to historical use of land (use all satellite imagery that is available), to create a Geographical Information System (GIS) and data base, for purposes of cannabis enforcement and regulation.

The current cannabis ordinance is that it is completely one-sided and has no checks and balances for purposes of development of regulations, enforcement and environmental compliance. The county needs to allocate more funds for photo interpretation, geographical information systems and verifying the data which has been submitted re “legal non-conforming” or “grandfather in” existing marijuana land uses.

Renée O’Neill

Tepusquet Community and Countywide Advocate for Responsible Cannabis

To: The Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
July 3, 2019
Cc: Santa Barbara County Planning Commissioners

It's high time we rein in the unruly-cannabis-horse and lead the wild beast back to the legislative arena for some long-overdue, "Round-Pen-Reasoning."

"We the People," will continue to advocate for "Responsible Cannabis Regulations," until our elected BOS fulfills their duty to protect Public-Health-Safety-Welfare and the Environment, from unethical legislators and illicit, cannabis industry.

"We the People," voted to Legalize and Decriminalize Marijuana (Prop 64). We did not vote for SBC regulations re zoning or quantity of cannabis development. We expected BOS to develop reasonable regulations but instead, you disregarded all prudent advice from staff and pleas from your constituents, in support of cannabis industry and Revenue.

"We the People," approve of County Council Michael Ghizzoni, for adding the Coalition for Responsible Cannabis (CRC) proposed items to the July 9 Agenda. We also recognize that the BOS is (*finally*) willing to listen to their constituent's and amend the Cannabis Ordinances to remedy problems. If you are truly having a change of heart then consider the following:

1. Stop issuing cannabis licenses until affidavits are verified, bad actors are removed and problems are resolved
2. Hire more Special Forces Sheriffs for the Cannabis Compliance Team, to better enforce on countywide problems
3. Appeal to Governor Newsom to redeploy National Guard to the Central Coast, as he did in Northern California
4. Prohibit Cannabis in all AG-I, AG-II, EDRN's and unincorporated rural regions, like Tepusquet and Cebada Cyn.
5. Prohibit Cannabis in the unincorporated, residential regions like Carpinteria, etc.
6. Rewrite the cannabis ordinances to incorporate *reasonable* and *responsible cannabis regulations* for SB County.

"We the People," encourage you to support small cannabis farmers (1-acre or 10,000 sq. ft. max.) that can develop in appropriate areas. This is more suitable for the Central Coast. Cannabis should be developed where it is compatible with regard to residential/rural neighborhoods, sensitive receptors or traditional Ag that would be negatively impacted.

I was informed of Cannabis industry's proposal to spend cannabis tax revenue to fund college students.

1. When has our county ever used 'tax-payer-dollars' to fund college tuitions?
2. If this were to occur, how could county provide public with proof/names, under student confidentiality laws?
3. If cannabis industry folks are sincere in supporting a worthy cause, then fund our county's/country's desperate need for drug-treatment programs, recovery centers and mental-health-treatment facilities, for the poor souls who are battling drug addiction.

While you are cleaning up this nationwide crisis, use your mega-bucks to fund university research programs that discover *why people are self-medicating*, to cope with life, in the first place. Feel free to fund a plethora of students/programs that may answer that multi-zillion-dollar question, without the use of drugs!

4. Feel free to pick up the tab for this proposed UCSB project, too, if BOS will not agree to approve the audit.

Respectfully Submitted,
Renée O'Neill
Tepusquet Community and Countywide Advocate

Relis, Mia

From: Barak Moffitt <filmosound@me.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 12:30 PM
To: steve.lavignino@countyofsb.org; Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; Hart, Gregg; Adam, Peter; sbcob
Subject: Comment for July 9th BOS meeting

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.

From: The Moffitt Family

To: The Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors and Staff, Whom it May Concern

RE: Jul 9 BOS meeting, Agenda Item D3

Dear Supervisors and Staff,

Since the BOS approved the most permissive ordinances for cannabis land use permitting in all of California, it has become incontestable that results of such an accommodating and broad approach to cannabis cultivation far exceeds voters' intentions and expectations, creates massive pragmatic and economic problems for Santa Barbara's most treasured agricultural industries (vintners, wineries, avocado farms), introduces serious health and safety hazards for thousands of community members and tourists, and injures Santa Barbara's precious and unique ecosystem.

Major, fundamental amendments are required to rectify the damage already done and to create a sustainable roadmap for cannabis cultivation in our unique county. We are writing to urge that you pass serious, rigorous consequential, and targeted amendments including what follows:

Prohibit industrial cannabis cultivation in Existing Developed Rural Neighborhoods, particularly single-road-access communities with limited access to emergency services like Tepusquet Canyon.

Revoke licenses for growers who falsified information on their affidavits, who have since illegally expanded operations, and/or who have cannabis-related land use violations since 2016. Require validation of affidavits prior to and as a condition of issuing cultivation and land use permits of any kind.

Prohibit grows on all AG I parcels.

Eliminate license "stacking" and support small grows as required by Proposition 64, and license only in appropriate areas.

Staff enforcement with adequate resources to keep illegal operators off the market, and cap licenses to allow a path to profitable, small-scale, legal grows only in proportion to the legal consumption demand in this state.

We expect our voted representatives to act decisively and conclusively to resolve the issues they created when rushing through the cannabis ordinances for our county.

Regards,
The Moffitt Family

Relis, Mia

From: Veronica Benton <veronica@vitalitydetective.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 12:23 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Cannabis Growers

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 Santa Barbara County officials,

I am writing you to express my business's and my personal support of the cannabis industry in Santa Barbara County. Below are some important points I'd like to convey related to this new and legal industry. Many of the points noted below are related to why I think this industry is good for all citizens of Santa Barbara County— whether they like the cannabis plant and its byproducts or not. Additionally, the idea of making yet more changes to the cannabis ordinance that has taken so much effort already for all the different county agencies to review and approve is simply bad public policy.

- First and foremost, Cannabis for medical or recreational use is legal in California. Proposition 64 was passed by a landslide majority of California citizens in 2016.
- The Cannabis industry is providing hundreds and hundreds of good paying jobs for county residents who are therefore further supporting our county's economy.
- This new industry has created a much needed financial boost for many non-cannabis businesses like ours.
- The cannabis businesses and their employees we've gotten to know are good people who we've enjoyed working with.
- Agriculture is still the #1 economic driver in the County of Santa Barbara and cannabis is just the newest legal form of agriculture. This industry should be allowed to thrive and continue to positively contribute to our county just like any other agricultural crop.
- Further limiting any landowners' ability to grow legal, highly regulated cannabis does not fix the main problem in this County regarding cannabis—the existence of black market or non-compliant grow operations. The negative impacts of illicit indoor and outdoor cultivation on the environment have been well-documented.
- Santa Barbara County has a unique opportunity to be the leader in sun grown, sustainable cannabis and expand its tourism industry which is again good for all county residents whether they support the plant and its byproducts or not.

This new and legal industry is providing an incredible opportunity for Santa Barbara to continue to thrive through the employment, taxes and other positive contributions it is contributing to the our county. It should be allowed to thrive and continue to contribute very positively to the whole county economy.

Sincerely,

Veronica Benton

Certified FDN Practitioner

Certified Neurogistics Practitioner

Certified Autoimmune Disease Specialist

Visit my website <http://vitalitydetective.com>

Connect with me on Facebook: <http://facebook.com/vitalitydetective>

Or Instagram: @vitalitydetective

Relis, Mia

From: Barbk <barbk77@cox.net>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 12:32 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: JULY 9 BOS LETTER

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.

County Board of Supervisors:

We have lived entirely too long with the ill effects of the cannabis growers/industry taking advantage of the hastily made regulations and ordinance. It's time to pull back and reconsider the tremendous negative impacts that we residents and communities are experiencing. The public's trust of our County leaders has diminished and requires some serious roll-backs of the cannabis regulations in order to stop some of the horrendous effects the industry barging into our communities without regard for the how we are being effected. Please consider the following items for your July 9th meeting:

- The County should stop issuing land use permits or CDP approvals until there is an independent investigation and clean-up of the County's affidavit mess. Many growers lied on their affidavits in claiming they were growing medical marijuana prior to the cutoff date in 2016. Others illegally expanded their operations when under legal non-conforming status, which is not legal. The County did nothing to validate the truthfulness of the grower affidavits. There needs to be a County review of each affidavit to demand proof of the growers' claims.
- I support a draft Urgency Ordinance submitted to the County by the Santa Barbara Coalition for Responsible Cannabis. This would minimize many of the nuisance impacts of odor from ongoing, unpermitted cannabis operations and is aimed at growers who lied on affidavits or expanded operations unlawfully after becoming a "legal non-conforming use," and who do not have odor control or adequate setbacks in place.
- Do not allow permit stacking. The concentration and density of grows are unprecedented. We also have inappropriate density of cannabis grows in heavily populated areas surrounding residences, EDRNs and schools.
- The Coastal Zone should have strong and same protections as inland policies. We should not have different zoning actions for the same zoning depending on where properties are located.
- Supervisors Das Williams and Steve Lavagnino should voluntarily recuse themselves from voting on cannabis-related items given their tight relationship with the cannabis lobby. Public trust has been destroyed. The Board of Supervisors should request an independent subpoena-powered investigation into how the current regulatory framework came to be. The establishment of an Ethics Committee would be appropriate.

Thank you,
Barbara Kloos
2nd District Resident

Relis, Mia

From: Peter Imhof <pimhof@cityofgoleta.org>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 12:35 PM
To: Kim Dominguez; Lenzi, Chelsea; sbcob
Cc: Ann Wells
Subject: RE: City of Goleta Resolution No. 19-40

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.

Hi Chelsea,

Now that the agenda is available for the 7/9/19 Board of Supervisors meeting, one important clarification: the City's comment letter and resolution apply to both Items 2 and 3 on the Departmental Agenda and should be so treated.

Thanks,

Peter T. Imhof
Director, Planning & Environmental Review Department
City of Goleta
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, California 93117
(805) 961-7541

From: Kim Dominguez
Sent: Wednesday, July 03, 2019 5:07 PM
To: Lenzi, Chelsea <clenzi@countyofsb.org>; sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us
Cc: Peter Imhof <pimhof@cityofgoleta.org>; Anne Wells <awells@cityofgoleta.org>
Subject: City of Goleta Resolution No. 19-40

Dear Chelsea,

I wanted to also send over a copy of the City of Goleta's Resolution No. 19-40 that was passed, approved and adopted on July 2, 2019; Requesting the County of Santa Barbara take immediate action to address and mitigate the impacts of outdoor cannabis cultivation. Would also like this to be delivered to the County Board of Supervisors as well.

Best Regards,

Kim Dominguez

Management Assistant

Planning and Environmental Review Department

City of Goleta

130 Cremona Drive, Suite B

Goleta, CA 93117

(805)961-7540 (direct)

From: Lenzi, Chelsea <clenzi@countyofsb.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 03, 2019 10:03 AM
To: Kim Dominguez <kdominguez@cityofgoleta.org>
Subject: RE: Comment letter on Cannabis Ordinance Amendments 19ORD-00000-00001 and 19ORD-00000-00002 for the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisor's July 9, 2019 meeting

Hi Kim,

Thank you for the email. I'll be sure this is included in the record. For future reference, we have an email dedicated to comment items related to items scheduled on the Board of Supervisors' Agenda. Please send these emails to: sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us. Please feel free to contact me with any questions regarding the Board of Supervisors' Agendas.

Best,

Chelsea Lenzi

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
County of Santa Barbara
105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 407
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
Direct: 805.568.2242
Fax: 805.568.2249
clenzi@countyofsb.org



www.countyofsb.org

READY SBC.ORG
SIGN UP • FILL IN • UNDERSTAND



One County. One Future.

The content of this email is confidential and intended for the recipient specified in the message only. It is strictly forbidden to share any part of this message with any third party, without a written consent of the sender. Any views, opinions or conclusions expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and do not necessarily reflect the views of the County of Santa Barbara, its subsidiaries or affiliates. If you received this message by mistake, please reply to this message and follow with its deletion, so that we can ensure such a mistake does not occur in the future.

From: Kim Dominguez <kdominguez@cityofgoleta.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 3, 2019 9:40 AM
To: Lenzi, Chelsea <clenzi@countyofsb.org>
Subject: FW: Comment letter on Cannabis Ordinance Amendments 19ORD-00000-00001 and 19ORD-00000-00002 for the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisor's July 9, 2019 meeting
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.

Dear Ms. Lenzi,

Please find attached the electronic copy of the comment letter I sent to Mike Allen, Clerk of the Board, yesterday evening. My email to him is shown below. I received his out of office reply and wanted to forward this information to you as according to his email you are covering the Board of Supervisor Agenda Items. I wanted to make sure that you were aware of the comment letter from the City of Goleta's Mayor, Paula Perotte for the July 9, 2019 Board of Supervisors Meeting for the Cannabis Ordinances – 19ORD-00000-00001 and 19ORD-00000-00002. The original letter was sent via USPS 1st class yesterday to the attention of the Steve Lavagnino c/o the Board of Supervisors.

Best,
Kim Dominguez
Management Assistant
Planning and Environmental Review Department
City of Goleta
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117
(805)961-7540 (direct)

From: Kim Dominguez
Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2019 5:24 PM
To: 'allen@co.santa-barbara.ca.us' <allen@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>
Subject: Comment letter on Cannabis Ordinance Amendments 19ORD-00000-00001 and 19ORD-00000-00002 for the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisor's July 9, 2019 meeting

Dear Chief Deputy Clerk of the Board,

Please find attached the electronic copy of the comment letter from City of Goleta's Mayor Paula Perotte, regarding Santa Barbara County's Cannabis Ordinance Amendments that are scheduled to be addressed at the upcoming July 9, 2019 Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors Meeting. This comment letter relates to Case No.'s 19ORD00000-00001 and 19ORD00000-00002; I was unable to reference the Agenda Item specifically as the Agenda for July 9, 2019 has not yet been published to the County Board of Supervisors website.

The original letter was sent via USPS 1st class mail this evening.

Best Regards,
Kim Dominguez
Management Assistant
Planning and Environmental Review Department
City of Goleta
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117
(805)961-7540 (direct)

Relis, Mia

From: vml@freshstartharvest.com
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 1:21 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: support letter
Attachments: Cannabis_2019-07-05-131936135.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.

TO: SANTA BARBARA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS



TO: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors

FR: Victor M Landey - Owner

RE: Support for Cannabis Cultivation and Farming

Agnutrients is a company comprised of experienced agronomists in plant and soil research in California.

Over the past several years, we have developed a collaborative relationship with major cannabis farmers and auxiliary businesses in Santa Barbara County.

We feel very fortunate that this emerging industry has become a consistent and reliable customer. The industry is contributing to our progressive growth and economic bottomline.

Our company has always remained steadfast that economic prosperity is a two way street - where everyone benefits.

We are very confident that cannabis cultivation and farming in the County has been a viable economic engine that our business, employees and their families have benefited.

We all win when businesses work together to be successful and have a commitment to economic growth.

Should you have any questions, please contact me at 805-361-5324

Regards,


Victor M. Landey – Owner

Relis, Mia

From: Steve Battaglia <srb@battagliare.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 2:08 PM
To: sbcob
Cc: jbattagmac@gmail.com; gretchen@battagliare.com
Subject: Cannabis Land Use Ordinance Amendment - Public Comment 7/9/19

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

Dear County Supervisors

I am respectfully requesting the Board of Supervisors implement immediate the following changes to the current Cannabis Ordinance.

1. Exclude cannabis cultivation from AG-1-20 and smaller parcels for the Inland Area to protect residential areas as is the stated intent of the cannabis ordinance.
2. Require a CUP for all AG-1-40 for the same reason and in keeping with the Planning Commission recommendation.
3. Leverage the ordinance section 35.42.075 (A.3.) so that any ordinance modifications passed by the Board of Supervisors on 7/9 apply to all current pending land use applications as well as future.
4. Institute a County wide acreage cap similar to the one in place for the First District.

Best Regards

Steven Battaglia
1311 Tiana Pl.
Santa Ynez, California

Relis, Mia

From: SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis <coalition4responsiblecannabis@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 2:16 PM
To: Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve
Cc: sbcob; Miyasato, Mona
Subject: Coalition Comment Letter on July 9, 2019 BOS Cannabis item(s)
Attachments: FINAL BOS LETTER 7-9-19 Cannabis items.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, submitted for consideration re the Cannabis-related items and public hearings on the July 9, 2019 Board of Supervisors Agenda.

We are requesting that D2 and D3 be heard together, for the sake of clarity of the public process, and please post letter on both D2 and D3 agenda attachments.

Thank you
SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis

July 5, 2019

TO: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors

FROM: Santa Barbara County Coalition for Responsible Cannabis

Hearing date: July 9, 2019

Re: Cannabis Land Use & Regulatory Programs- Items #2 and #3

Dear Chair Lavagnino and Honorable Supervisors:

On behalf of the Santa Barbara Coalition for Responsible Cannabis, we request that you take the following actions at your hearing of July 9:

First, we request that these items be heard together. Board actions on Chapter 50 and the zoning ordinances are intertwined, specifically in their treatment of "legal" (sic) nonconforming operations. The noticing and scheduling of separate Agenda items on these related matters continues a long history of confusion, if not obfuscation, as to the relationship and effects of the County's actions under Chapter 50 and the zoning ordinance, renders the noticing and the Agendas inadequate under the Brown Act, and substantially impairs the public's ability to comment. As just one example, despite a specific request and submittal of materials on July 2 to the Board and County Counsel, and a specific request that the Agenda include proposed draft urgency ordinances, staff failed to even include these materials on the Board's website as public comment, necessitating a resubmission to the Clerk. Nevertheless, the Board letter regarding Chapter 50 purports to respond to the public's request for immediate implementation of odor controls on existing, nonconforming cultivators. It does not.

Please do the following:

1. **Adopt urgency ordinances** for both the coastal and inland areas, drafts of which were submitted to your Board on July 2 for County Counsel review.

Your staff reports ignore these proposed draft ordinances, and merely recite that a 'general' emergency ordinance is not allowed under Government Code Section 65858(e). While it is inappropriate for staff, rather than counsel, to set forth legal conclusions, it is *inconceivable* that your staff is not aware of Government Code Section 65858(f), which directly follows Section 65858(e), is quoted verbatim in the Coalition's cover letter, and in the proposed ordinance findings. Government Code Section 65858(f) specifically authorizes additional urgency or interim ordinances in these circumstances.

These ordinances are necessary to address an ongoing and immediate threat to the public health safety and welfare, as evidenced by testimony of the public orally and in writing, and the Resolutions of the City of Goleta and the City of Carpinteria, and are narrowly crafted to provide your constituents short term relief from the ongoing nuisance effects of marijuana cultivation over the last two years. These ordinances are directed at those operating without benefit of permits or compliance with County standards, and or which have illegally expanded their operations. Implementation of these ordinances would address several critical needs:

- a. Odor abatement either through installation of 'best available technology' for indoor grows, or establishment of significant buffers from residential uses, sensitive receptors and pre-existing agricultural operations;

- b. A basis to abate nonconforming operations which were either never eligible for provisional licenses, or became illegal nonconforming operations through expansion after January 19, 2016;
- c. Summary denial of applications which were not complete under the Permit Streamlining Act at the end of the amortization period (June 17, 2019), and/or for which environmental review had not commenced, and cessation of cultivation on those sites.

The public does not care if the substance of the relief from the public and private nuisance your Board has created and continues to tolerate is incorporated into the zoning ordinance, or into Chapter 50. But your staff's vaguely stated 'possible' future amendments to Chapter 50 accomplish none of these things. The staff summary of possible amendments is misleading, and unresponsive, at best, and will do little or nothing to abate the nuisance created by the County's willful disregard of its duty to terminate illegal nonconforming uses:

The suggestion to require odor controls 'during the business license process' (page 6 of D2 Board letter) will not provide your constituents and residents of affected cities any relief until after the land use permit process is complete. This is meaningless, and will subject members of the public to nuisance odors for at least another year to two years, in the best case. It also would intimidate members of the public from exercising their statutory and constitutional right to comment and participate in the permitting process, because doing so would additionally delay mitigation. There is no purpose to this delay, other than to enable operators who may have no intention of *ever* installing odor control, to maximize their profits during the period of delay. These growers are engaged in ongoing acts of unfair competition under the Business and Professions Code, Section 17200. One would think that those law-abiding growers who assert that they have voluntarily installed odor controls would support their neighbors in these requests.

Staff's claim (at page 6 of D3 letter) that the County is *actively* enforcing against illegal expansion of nonconforming uses is not supported by any facts. How and where has the County notified the public which operators have been determined to have lied on their affidavits, or illegally expanded their operation? Where is the notice posted of revocation of licenses under Chapter 50? Despite being provided repeatedly with evidence of what appear to be illegal expansions of nonconforming uses, (see, memo and supporting documents submitted by Coalition Board member Rob Salomon) the Board has failed to set any hearings to terminate illegally expanded non-conforming uses, as it is authorized to do under its zoning ordinances. The fact is that the Board continues to violate its duty to abate expansions of both legal and illegal nonconforming uses.

The Supreme Court has clearly established that a County **cannot consent** to a violation of zoning laws. (Hansen Brothers Enterprises, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors (1996) 12 Cal.4th 533, 560. The [County's implied] findings of fact are not determinative. The court must make its own decision as to the legal impact of those facts [And, indeed] the [County] lacks the power to waive or consent to [a] violation of the zoning law." (Id. at pp. 563–564, emphasis added)

"The exception for a nonconforming use has been "preserved only as allowed by statute or as protected against a taking violative of due process of law." (City of Los Altos, supra,

206 Cal.App.2d at p. 609.) “ ‘Unless owners of nonconforming uses in zoning areas are required to adhere to the excepted use in volume of trade as well as character of business, zoning laws will be rendered ineffectual and such favored parcels of property will assume great values based not upon a natural growth, but upon the right of the owner to extend and enlarge the existing nonconforming use.’ ” (Edmonds, supra, 40 Cal.2d at p. 652.)” **Point San Pedro Road Coalition v County of Marin** (San Rafael Rock Quarry) A150002, certified for publication 4/3/2019.

Nothing in Deputy CEO Bozanich’s ‘list’ of possible future amendments addresses this fundamental failure of duty. If the Board wishes to amend Chapter 50 to include the specific provisions of our proposed urgency ordinances, instead of placing them in the zoning code, just do it. Do not, however, pretend you are taking meaningful action when it is clear to those who have to live with the consequences of your continuing disregard of what the law requires that you are doing no such thing.

Third, the same Board letter dodges the fact that all of the ‘nonconforming’ operations remain in the permit process, regardless of the expiration of the ‘amortization’ period, and regardless of the fact that many of these applications have not been called complete under the Permit Streamlining Act, and the fact that if a CEQA checklist was not completed prior to June 17, 2019, environmental review was not ‘underway’ for those individual applications under any theory.

In light of the above, we continue to request that you vote on the ordinances we have proposed. We request that you take a vote to place the draft urgency ordinances on the Agenda, so the public may know your rationale- as individuals responsible to your constituents,- for either implementing or rejecting them. To our knowledge, there has been no threat of litigation which would justify your consideration of this issue in closed session. If you contend that you have been specifically advised, in a properly noticed closed session, that notwithstanding the plain language of Government Code Section 65858(f), no urgency ordinance can be defended, then have County Counsel take responsibility for that opinion and announce that fact in open session, as required under the Brown Act. Bear in mind that the purpose of § 54956.9 is to permit the body to receive legal advice and make litigation decisions only; it is not to be used as a subterfuge to reach non-litigation oriented policy decisions. *Trancas Property Owners Assn. v. City of Malibu*, 138 Cal. App. 4th 172, 184-84, 41 Cal. Rptr. If you persist in your view that adoption of the draft ordinances is legally impossible, you should direct your staff to place the draft ordinances on your first available Agenda, for first reading, as regular ordinances.

2. Add the following to the amendments already recommended by the Planning Commission:

- a. Consider allowing cultivation only on Ag-1 20 or greater; if cultivation on smaller Ag 1 parcels is allowed,
- b. Require a CUP for grows in both AG-I and AG-II zone districts, **both** inland and coastal;
- c. Adopt an odor standard which requires that odor not be perceptible beyond the parcel line of the parcel on which the grow occurs; **implement independent odor abatement analysis and mitigation for all cultivation;**

- d. Limit grows to not more than 1 acre per legal parcel on AG I-20 parcels and above;
- e. Limit grows to not more than one acre per legal parcel on AG-II parcels up to AG-II-320. For every additional 100 acres, you can add an acre of cannabis up to an 8-acre total limit on a 1020-acre parcel;
- f. Adopt buffer requirements as follows:
 - (1) 1500' buffer from sensitive receptors, residences and existing developed agriculture, including but not limited to avocados and vineyards;
 - (2) Measure buffers from property line to property line;
 - (3) Consider a one-mile buffer for any outdoor cultivation along the urban limit line;
- g. Set an overall acreage cap in the county;
- h. Develop policies to prevent overconcentration and/or clustering of cannabis operations within a particular community.

There is nothing radical in these requests. The per parcel acreage recommendations we suggest are reflective of those of the next most permissive County following ours, Humboldt County. In Humboldt County, one acre of cultivation is allowed on parcels between 10-320 acres. For every additional 100 acres, a grower can add an acre of cannabis up to an 8-acre total limit on 1020-acre parcel. ¹

Your constituents are merely asking you to enforce the law as it is written, and to weed out the opportunists and scofflaws. It seems to us that the 'legitimate' cultivators- some of whom have voluntarily installed odor controls- would support enforcement. Please take these steps to protect the public health, safety and welfare.

We would urge your Board to take note of the comment by Goleta City councilmember Stuart Kasdin during the City of Goleta Special Meeting of July 2, 2019: "When you're in a hole....stop digging" in reference to what many perceive as the County's absence of concern for the impacts of its staggeringly permissive approach to industrialized cannabis operations. While some of you and your staff may be wed to the idea of "promoting a robust cannabis industry" please note that objective may not reflect the views of the majority of residents, long-time agriculturalists, environmentalists and land use experts. We look to our "sister counties" up and down the State who have found a way to balance the needs of the community with a reasonable, slow approach to the introduction of commercial cannabis operations.

Your "open letter" to County residents painted an idealistic and condescending view of your ordinance and your need for residents to "have patience" with it. Please keep in mind, we may never actually know how effective your ordinance might have been, because you made a decision in late 2017 to allow the industry to "self-regulate" via unsubstantiated affidavits- with cultivation projects that had no relationship to the ordinance you often describe as "tough". As a result, the rush and authorization for hundreds of State temporary licenses in the County took place weeks before your Board even *adopted* the land use ordinance and licensing regulations on February 6, 2018. As you know, the ordinance would not be effective countywide for months. Since then, a multitude of promises have been made, assuring residents that "soon" all growers would be in compliance and subject to this "strict" ordinance.

¹ <https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2019/5/Th7b/Th7b-5-2019-exhibits.pdf>

Many if not most County residents became aware of the policy decisions you'd made only after hundreds of acres of white plastic appeared in the central and northern parts of the County, and odors and emissions increased in the already impacted area of Carpinteria and new projects began to crop up in Goleta and nearby foothills. Residents of EDRNs, e.g. Cebada and Tepesquet Canyons, who were promised "CUPs" for grows, CONTINUE to this day to endure the impacts of unregulated industrial cannabis operations in their fire-prone, rural neighborhoods, as "temporary" licenses became "provisional" licenses, and commercial growers take their time completing or in some cases even starting the permitting process.

It is past time for you to truly listen to your constituents.

3. Finally, regardless of your action or inaction on any ameliorating ordinances, *you have the authority to direct your staff to implement existing law through administrative action.* Therefore, we request that you direct staff as follows:

Direct P&D to:

Review all applications for permits which have been submitted to date and where cultivation is ongoing and

- a. Summarily deny all applications for which a determination of application completeness under the Permit Streamlining Act did not occur by June 17, 2019 and/or
- b. Summarily deny all applications for which an Initial Study was not complete before June 17, 2019.
- c. Direct all applicants whose applications have been denied to cease cultivation, and
- d. Post copies of all such directives on the County's website.

Direct your Administrative Office to:

- a. Notify all holders of provisional licenses and lessors or owners of property on which cultivation is occurring to submit evidence that they were lawfully operating, on the same property, in the same quantity, prior to January 2016. For all those who fail to meet their burden to establish lawful operation, revoke their license per the procedures of the Business licensing ordinance and notify the State Licensing Authority.
- b. Stop authorizing provisional licenses immediately until all of the above actions have been taken.

Sincerely,
SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis

Relis, Mia

From: Lion Eye Farms <lioneyefarms@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 2:33 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: July 9 Board of Supervisors meeting comment

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

Dear supervisors,

My name is Jason Friedmann, I was raised and schooled in Santa Barbara. I Am a musician who was part of saving the Wilcox property. I have done benefits for the surf rider foundation, American Cancer Society, and raised money for many private-individuals with health problems etc. I also was a part of the Kokua for japan benefit to help the people of Fukushima.

I have farmed lettuce and built organic sustainable gardens for the daycare I was head teacher of for 13 years and worked in construction. While working with children and talking to parents I met a family who was heartbroken there kid who had unconditional seizures was not aloud in California to use the only drug (CBD's) that cured their child's condition. Multiple stories along this vein made me do research on cannabis and From what I learned it seems like a miracle drug for numerous conditions. I am happy the people of California legalized Cannabis .

I now live in Buellton and now work on the Lion Eye Farms for around 7 months. I love And respect the people who work there along with the owners. The work environment is healthy every one is friendly and works hard to make a great clean organic and sustainable crop for people to use and enjoy. I've heard Numerous doctors from Santa Barbara county up to Washington talk about the benenefits of Organic cannabis and the problems of non organic cannabis so I'm glad to be creating a product that Drs agree is the healthiest to use.

My job at the farm is to propagate cultivate / plant / water / trim the plants and build out structures to code if needed. Also part of the interior and exterior beautification so the farm looks nice year round. I hope you can find it in your heart to work with Lion eye farms and the cannabis industry to progress the good work they do with as much help as you can give and minimize hoops and roadblocks .

Sincerely Jason Friedmann.

Relis, Mia

From: Jo Ellen Watson <jewatson2@cox.net>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 3:02 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: BOS July 9th meeting, Agenda item D3
Attachments: BOS July 9th meeting .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.

Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
c/o Clerk of the Board

I live in Park Highlands, 77 homes in the Eastern Goleta Valley. Our neighborhood forms a portion of the urban boundary, as designated by Santa Barbara County, just east of Old San Marcos Road. We appreciate the Board of Supervisors willingness to revisit some provisions of Chapter 50 of the County Code (Licensing of Commercial Cannabis Operations) for possible amendments. Like other neighborhoods bordering the Santa Barbara foothills, we have concerns about the potential impact of cannabis being grown so close to our homes.


There are currently applications pending for cultivation along the south coast foothills that are very close to our neighborhoods. Review of the standards for these AG-II parcels needs to happen soon and include:

1. More stringent requirements for AG-II parcels abutting the urban boundary. There are no AG-1 parcels providing a buffer between the urban areas and the numerous Ag-II parcels scattered throughout the Santa Barbara foothills. An amendment requiring there be a significant set distance of at least 1, if not 2, miles between the urban boundary and any cannabis operations is necessary.
2. An odor abatement plan must become part of the application process.
3. Requiring a CUP for all AG-II parcels.
4. Taking into consideration possible negative impacts on the neighborhoods on, and near, the urban boundary.

The review of revised standards must be agendized as soon as possible. The foothill neighborhoods of Santa Barbara and Goleta must be protected.

Sincerely,
Jo Ellen Watson
Park Highlands

AG-II land in green



June 30th, 2019

Concerning: Cannabis Operation Near Residential Neighborhoods

2019 JUL -5 PM 3:18

To: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors

COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
CLERK OF THE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

We are long time home owners in Rancho Del Ciervo which is surrounded by Avocado and Citrus Orchards. We are extremely concerned about the applications for permits to grow Cannabis extremely close to our residential neighborhoods on AG2 parcels.

We are sure that you have been made aware of the recent valid objections in Carpenteria by the residents whom have been negatively affected by the close proximity to Cannabis growers.

Our concerns include the following: The Horrible Smell, (the yearly winds which blow down our neighborhood streets in April or May often last for 4-5 weeks). The devaluation of property values on homes which will also decrease the amount of money collected by the county for property taxes. Other objections are to the increase in traffic, light and noise pollution, and increase in crime.

The existing orchards which surround Rancho Del Ciervo are mostly on steep hillsides which also border Freemont Creek, (a bird sanctuary), as well as our homes. If some of the orchards were denuded for Cannabis growing, the denuded slopes could be in jeopardy of mudslides during heavy rains and we don't want anyone to experience another tragedy like Montecito!!!

Another major concern is that Mountain View Grammar School is a block away from the entrance to Rancho Del Ciervo. Many of the families who live in Rancho Del Ciervo have children who ride their bikes or walk to Mountain View School. Cannabis growing so close to a residential area could very well attract persons who may have criminal intent.

We would urge the Board to please consider a 2-mile buffer between the Urban Rural boundary and require a CUP for all AG2 parcels within 2 miles of a residential area.

Please keep our neighborhoods safe and ask yourselves if this Cannabis application were to be applied to your neighborhood, how would you vote?

Dr. William M. Campbell
Alice I. Campbell

*Dr. William M. Campbell
Alice I. Campbell*