**de la Guerra, Sheila** Public Comment A-17

**From:** Renee ONeill <chasingstar2701@yahoo.com>
**Sent:** Monday, December 13, 2021 4:29 PM
**To:** sbcob
**Subject:** Public Comment for A-17, D-2 and D-4

LATE DIST



Dear Supervisors and Supporting Staff,

**This portion is *NOT* for Public Comment:** As some of you may know, I am still recovering from 14-weeks of Shingles and Postherpetic Neuralgia. I refer to this debilitating virus and nerve pain as the "Shinga-Linga-Ding-Dongs". Gotta keep my sense of humor. Ha!
Also, I would encourage anyone over the age of 50 to consider getting the "ShinGrix" shots. I wouldn't wish this virus on my worst enemy.

With that said, I am going to do my best to attend the meeting tomorrow and speak to the following items:

A-17 re Tepusquet VMP - Public Comment:
There are no words that can adequately express my appreciation to Cal Fire and Santa Barbara County Fire for their support of Tepusquet Community. SBCF did an outstanding job in developing and obtaining this multi-million-dollar grant that will go far in protecting Tepusquet residents from massive wildland fires. I look forward to working with SBCF, as community liaison, in implementing this grant.
I also want to thank our Board of Supervisors for supporting our ongoing, countywide efforts to make all of Santa Barbara County more fire resilient.
My Plaudits to Everyone!!!

Item D-2: Please add my voice in support of Lil Clary's letter well-stated, comprehensive letter for Public Comment, as follows:

"There is so much that is objectionable or questionable in this staff report that I'm not quite sure where to start or what to leave out.

That said, let me begin with the recommendation from "Objectives for the Upcoming Quarters" that states that staff intend to propose that they "transition the cannabis quarterly update to an appendix in the quarterly budget update".

**If this is county-speak for 'let's bury this' then this proposal is absolutely inappropriate.** We need more, not less transparency about the status of cannabis issues. It is incredibly premature to remove this reporting from public scrutiny.

From the Acreage Cap section: staff state that an applicant's position on the Eligibility List is "non-transferable". What does this mean? Since residents of Tepusquet have noted that the original application for a CUP filed by Dayspring *et al* is being processed despite the changeover in the named agent (his girlfriend), just how non-transferable are we talking about? And is non-transferable differently defined whether it applies to a permit application or the eligibility list?

Removing processing from the cap raises a number of issues. The staff report euphemistically states that applicants removed processing from their LUP and CUP permits in order to "expedite approval". I think this really means that they felt that by removing the most odiferous of the on-site operations they'd have a better chance of getting approved. In fact, that is exactly what happened as Planning Commissioners approved one after another LUP.

Further, what are the guidelines for filing "new permit applications" for processing? Will these be ministerial? I noted that elsewhere in the staff report there have been hundreds of odor complaints filed. Guess what, this number is about to increase geometrically.

I am extremely skeptical of the statement that staff propose to develop amendments to the ordinance that address "changes in ownership". I've watched as some permit applicants have clearly used ownership via LLC as a way to obfuscate. An LLC is a legal entity with specific responsibilities yet some applicants have changed LLC names, agents, etc. yet claimed that these changes were meaningless and that the latest version is worthy of being allowed to use all application documents filed by the original (scofflaw).

Lil Clary
Tepusquet Canyon

PS: **I note that cannabis revenues are down because of a decrease in demand as stated in the staff presentation."**

My Public Comment for Item D-4 re Bien Nacido Appeal:
As always, I continue to oppose large cannabis projects that are an considered an incompatible use with surrounding vineyards and neighboring residents. Folks in Tepusquet have already complained about the odors emanating from these cannabis farms or hemp fields. Our canyon literally draws the offshore breezes right up our 'skirts' every afternoon. Please deny the project that will not only impact historical Bien Nacido Vineyard but other nearby wineries, as well. The proposed project will also increase traffic to our very overburdened and abused substandard roadways, which are already impacted by excessive farm traffic on Betteravia, Philbric, Foxen Cyn and the Santa Maria Mesa Rd. Thank you for taking these serious impacts into consideration.

*Respectfully Submitted,*

*Renée O'Neill*