

Katherine Douglas

Public Comment - Group 1

7



From: Gail Herson <devesi@me.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 31, 2025 3:30 PM
To: sbcob; Laura Capps; Bob Nelson; Steve Lavagnino; Roy Lee; Joan Hartmann
Subject: June 3 Board of Supervisors meeting-please reduce the cannabis acreage and other cannabis issues

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,

With regard to your meeting Tuesday, June 3, regarding the problematic Cannabis industry and especially lowering the cap on cultivating cannabis in the Carpinteria Valley:

What a wonderful opportunity to reduce the number of foul smelling acres that create the very real greasy foul smelling nuisance we experience daily of odorous emissions from cannabis greenhouses. It is also your opportunity to reduce the harm that comes from toxic emissions of the processing businesses, by including their acres with the cultivation greenhouses in the acreage cap.

I ask that you do so by reducing the acreage to option 2, to 138 acres, and including the processing facilities in the 138 acres number. I think 138 is still far too many acres, considering that the offending sites are painfully close to schools and homes. Children in high school and younger still have developing brains. Breathing these cultivation and processing emissions may have a harmful effect on these developing intellects, our future community human resources. Imagine trying to focus on your schoolwork while breathing this.

There is no good reason the processing acres were removed from the cap; they are a giveaway to the growers. They are the most noxious of the acres. The processing acres must be included in the 138 acre cap.

Why is there no odor enforcement on the repeat violators; ie Brands nursery and G&H?
It is obvious to anyone who drives the 192 that there is an odor problem, daily.

I smelled the odor of cannabis cultivation at my home just 2 days ago. It has proven meaningless to use the current reporting system. Where is the new phone app for reporting odor and enhanced enforcement?

The public must be notified of new OAP's submitted.

The public must be notified when annual reviews are being conducted for business license renewal.

Regarding Item 6:

Take measures to fully recover fees, including initial application fees, annual compliance fees and annual renewal. Reduce the unacceptable shortfall of \$1.19 million between revenues and expenditures for the cannabis program. All costs of this program must be borne by the cannabis growers. What happened to the great cash cow the cannabis industrial complex was going to be for county coffers? Stop subsidizing the cannabis industry. They are not an entitlement and they have not lived up to their promise to be good neighbors.

Thank you for stepping up to reduce the nuisance.

Hopefully,
Gail Herson
Carpinteria

Katherine Douglas

From: jstassinosaol.com
Sent: Sunday, June 1, 2025 11:46 PM
To: sbcob; Laura Capps; Roy Lee; Joan Hartmann; Bob Nelson; Steve Lavagnino
Subject: 6/3/25 Agenda item #7; (SB Board of Supervisors Mtg.)

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

To the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors,

Please reduce the amount of cannabis cultivated in Carpinteria from 186 acres to a maximum of 138 acres including cannabis processing. Presently, most of the cannabis cultivation sites are too close to schools and residences. The skunk like stench from cannabis cultivation and processing continues to pollute our air and environment making it difficult to breathe clean fresh air.

Please put an end to the malodors by requiring the enforcement of the installation of carbon filter scrubbers PRIOR to the renewal or issuance of cannabis business licenses. And reduce the allowable maximum of 186 acres of cannabis cultivation to a maximum of 138 acres including processing.

Please help ease public frustration by notifying residents when cannabis growers submit new Odor Abatement Plans and when annual reviews for cannabis business license renewals are to take place.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jill Stassinosa

Tired, frustrated, and Concerned Carpinterian

Katherine Douglas

From: Anna Carrillo <annacarp@cox.net>
Sent: Sunday, June 1, 2025 7:17 PM
To: sbcob; Laura Capps; Roy Lee; Joan Hartmann; Bob Nelson; Steve Lavagnino
Subject: Agenda #7 Caps on Cannabis in Carpinteria

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: County Board of Supervisors
From: Anna Carrillo
Date: June 1, 2025

I would like to make some comments regarding Agenda Item #7.

1. The Board should **adopt Option 2** - limit the number of acres for cultivation and processing to **138 acres**. Processing acreage needs to be included in this total as it was in the original cap.
2. When the number of 186 acres was chosen as a cap on cultivation and processing in Carpinteria Valley, this was just a subjective number and has always been a number that was way too high for our very small valley, basically the length of 4 miles surrounded by residents and the city of Carpinteria.
3. Currently 120 acres of the projected 137.44 acres are being used for cultivation and processing which greatly impact the residents of Carpinteria. This is the number of cultivation sites which includes processing that are currently in production as listed on the Cultivation Cap and Eligible Business License Applicants List published 1/27/25. This **137.44 acres** includes 2 sites that are currently cultivating & processing but whose business licenses are still pending, 2 others that have never cultivated or processed yet, and 1 processing facility that is on appeal so using that number you should **change the cap at 138 acres**.
4. **The cap must include processing as when the cap was initially created both cultivation and processing were included.** It was only in 2022 when the Board felt it needed to encourage processing that there was a decision made to remove processing sites from the cap. At that time there was a list published that showed that Carpinteria had 8.69 acres in processing. Since then there were 5 sites that have either stopped cultivation and processing or have removed their applications so there will be 8.06 acres in processing including 2 sites not even included on that original list. This acreage is already included in the Cultivation Cap and Eligible Business License Applicants List.
5. The Cultivation Cap and Eligible Business License Applicants Business License List already includes the 3 sites that just do processing with no cultivation associated with these sites.
Maybe this list's name should be changed to Cultivation and Processing Cap & Eligible Business License Applicants Lists
6. Could you please ask for an update on the proposed phone app for reporting complaints? Residents in Carpinteria are so frustrated with the current Complaint form.
7. Again I urge the Board to add a requirement to Chapter 50 that odor complaints be considered during the annual business license review period.
8. There needs to be some sort of public notification when annual business licenses are being reviewed and when they're finally issued. The public has had no way of letting the county know of their concerns, except through the complaint form which doesn't even factor in during the review period for the annual license.

9. The Board needs to require that P&D provide public notification when there are new OAPs submitted for the “carbon scrubbers”. I recently did ask someone in P&D if there was a website where this information was available but the answer was NO!.

10. **Please lower the cap to 138 acres for cultivation and processing.**

Thank you for your consideration,

Anna Carrillo

Katherine Douglas

From: Theresa Reilly <tree101@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 8:42 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: D7 Chapter 50 Amendments re: Reducing Cannabis Acreage Cap

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 Board of Supervisors,

As you consider amendments to cannabis policies, I urge you to broaden the scope of the proposed acreage cap. I would like to see a reduction of outdoor cannabis grows adjacent to communities that suffer from the odors and volatile organic compound irritants such as Buellton, Lompoc, and Los Alamos. As a resident of Buellton, the outdoor grows up to three miles upwind make the lives of sensitive individuals miserable and undermine our community's quality of life for 6 months every year.

If the industry is not particularly profitable for the county and you plan to reduce oversight and enforcement to cut back on costs, then I recommend you greatly reduce the cap and narrow the growing areas to greenhouses with enforceable odor control requirements. For the current proposal, option B is preferable but does not even begin to address the problem of the impacts of odor and irritants spread by cultivation and processing.

Respectfully submitted,

Theresa Reilly
Buellton Resident

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

Katherine Douglas

From: Sally Eagle <sally.eagle@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 12:16 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Carpinteria cannabis cap

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.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Please vote to lower the amount of *both* cannabis cultivation *and* processing in Carpinteria Valley to a more reasonable 138 acres. We residents still are steeped in the impacts these make on our quality of life, breathing fresh air; Carp “odors” are notorious, no secret (in fact smelly signposts) to those driving through our city on the freeway.

Maybe the prevailing SW wind delivers the pungent so called “nuisance” odors to our homes from flowering, processing or harvesting the “product”; we smell it day and night and many experience it as an irritant that impacts their health.

We have been educated about the most impactful nuisance being the “processing” of cannabis. A question: Why degrade our air even more of an issue by allowing more cultivation and processing.

Too many hopes for the crop being a huge revenue bonus for the county (and the growers) has not exactly panned out, unless the rumors that the black market is flourishing under this current state of affairs.

It’s time to face the facts. We don’t need more cultivation or processing than we have right now! We await the promised, carbon filtration systems to be installed. We await the new odor reporting system. The growers must comply with established rules while doing business and be responsible for adhering to the rules and regs as we all have established together. We look to you to hold them to your and our highest standards.

Thank you for your attention to this serious impact on our environment here in the Carpinteria Valley.

Sincerely
Sally & Terry Eagle
48 year residents of the Valley
La Mirada neighborhood

Sent from my iPad

Katherine Douglas

From: Paul Ekstrom <paulekstrom@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 2:41 PM
To: sbcob; lcapps@countyofsb.org; Roy Lee; Joan Hartmann; Bob Nelson; Steve Lavagnino
Subject: File 25-00472 Item 7 Cannabis acreage caps.

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

Honorable Santa Barbara County Supervisors,

Thank you for considering the already too many acres of cannabis in the beautiful Carpinteria Valley. A maximum 138 acre cap will help protect our residents and schools from the odor from both cannabis growing and processing. This may also help the responsible growers from the already flooded market by limiting the supply. I recently heard a colab spokesperson criticizing either the BOS or the Planning Commission for permitting too many growers which resulted in lower prices for their crops. I found this interesting because a few years ago at a hearing this person criticized the county for making it too difficult to obtain permits.

Thank you,
Paul Ekstrom
1489 Manzanita St.
Carpinteria, CA 93013

Katherine Douglas

From: Dinah Calderon <calderondinah@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 3:50 PM
To: sbcob; Laura Capps; Roy Lee; Joan Hartmann; Bob Nelson; Steve Lavagnino
Subject: June 3 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.

Good afternoon,

I am writing to you as a homeowner in Carpinteria off Foothill.

It is imperative that we lower the cap on cannabis in Carpinteria. 138 acres is enough for both cultivation and processing. Acreage for processing must be included in this cap.

The cultivation sites in existence are too close to both residential housing and schools. As homeowners we have the right to be told when growers are submitting new OAPs. There should be public notification when new OAPs for the "carbon scrubbers" have been submitted as well as when annual reviews are being conducted for business license renewal.

My family has lived in Carpinteria for three generations and it is crucial that we preserve the integrity of our beach town and the varied agriculture that our valley supports.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Warmly

Dinah Calderon