

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Anna Carrillo <annacarp@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2018 4:37 PM
To: sbcob; Williams, Das; Wolf, Janet; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve
Subject: CVA's comments for Board of Supervisors Meeting March 20, 2018



PO Box 27
Carpinteria, CA 93014
March 6, 2018

It's shocking to see the chart that shows how permissive Santa Barbara County is when compared to the rest of the state (74% are completely banning commercial cultivation). Santa Barbara is one of 5 counties with unlimited cultivation. There are 9 counties having some sort of cap in place.

Since the Carpinteria Valley currently has the 2nd highest number of temporary medical cannabis licenses issued (by 10), CVA has continually asked for and supports Cate School and the city of Carpinteria's request for a limit to the number of land use permits, licenses, and/or acreage that will be permitted under the new regulations. As noted in previous letters, the city of Carpinteria, Carpinteria High School, Cate School and many residences are surrounded by greenhouses some within 50 feet. We support Option 2 that would distribute the impacts of cannabis cultivation throughout the County and the necessity of preventing excessive concentration in our area. There needs to be a cap on the number of parcels, greenhouses that will be permitted to cultivate cannabis.

Because of the proximity of sensitive receptors and residences, CVA would also like to recommend that there be no outdoor operations and hoop houses allowed in the Coastal Zone in the Carpinteria Valley, and/or the Carpinteria Greenhouse Overlay Boundary Area and the Toro Canyon Plan area. There are 7 Ag-1 20 parcels in this area. Right across the street from the EDNR of La Mirada there are 2 Ag-1-20 parcels (one 24 acres, and one 29 acres). There are 13 Ag-1 40 parcels, 10 in the Coastal Zone, 6 adjacent or fairly close to sensitive receptors, residential areas, and the Urban Rural boundary. Currently outdoor cultivation would be allowed on these parcels with the only protection a distance of 1500 feet to the cultivation site. Under outdoor cultivation for Ag-2, #8 states that cultivation on lots located adjacent to an EDNR and/or Urban Rural boundary shall require approval of a CUP. Why does this only apply to Ag-2 parcels, shouldn't this also apply to outdoor cultivation on Ag-1 parcels?

CVA supports Cate's request that the Odor Abatement Plan must prevent odors from being experienced within residential zones and sensitive receptors. This needs to be added to Cannabis Regulations 35-144U(C)(7). We believe this must have been an oversight.

It should be a requirement that cultivators purchase their own olfactometers or other appropriate measurement devices so they are proactive instead of reacting to neighbors' complaints.

CVA supports APAC's limitation of capping the amount of cannabis that will be allowed on a Williamson Act parcel especially in the Carpinteria Agriculture Greenhouse Overlay district. According to the DEIR there are 333 acres of greenhouses, 61 acres of hoop houses, and 58 acres of shade structures in the Carpinteria Valley. Our valley has mostly Ag 1-10 parcels of varying sizes and CVA doesn't feel that cannabis grown in our valley should be allowed to expand while providing tax relief. CVA also agrees with APAC that manufacturing, retail, testing and marketing should be prohibited. Cannabis must not be allowed to be included in the Right to Farm ordinance.

CVA supports Cate School's request that there should be an annual comprehensive survey and monitoring report presented to the Board of Supervisors. This would allow recommendations for future enforcement and staffing requirements.

Your board needs to protect Carpinteria's quality of life and the residents of this valley, not only the cultivators.