

de la Guerra, Sheila

Group 4 #1

From: Pamela Baczuk <pambaczuk@fastmail.fm>
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 9:10 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public comment on Cannabis regulations for Board of Supervisors meeting January 29, 2019
Attachments: Dear Board of Supervisors.doc

LATE
DIST

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 writing in regard to the proposed Cannabis Ordinance that will be discussed January 29, 2019

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.

The Cuyama Valley has not yet experienced the effects of permitted commercial cannabis agriculture on the ecosystem and the environment in the Valley. We support our neighbors in Santa Barbara County who have expressed concerns about health and environment due to recent increased cannabis agriculture in their close environs. We are in agreement with their suggestions for revisions in the current regulations. This includes areas of Land Use, Size Limitation, Water, Odor Control Abatement, and Enforcement.

The Cuyama Valley has been designated one of the most critically water over drafted basins in California.

Most of the Valley receives little recharge. The amount of rainfall is considerably less than our coastal neighbors, less than 10 inches. We are dependent on groundwater and have serious concerns about the future of the Valley if the usage is not controlled.

Large and smaller farmers, ranchers, residents of the town of New Cuyama, and representatives of 3 other counties, are currently engaged in ongoing discussions and negotiations to formulate a Groundwater Sustainability Plan by 2020, which is required by the State of California due to the critical status of water in the basin. Water extraction has never been regulated in the past. The area has been using far more than is replenished.

Since 2014 the Cuyama Valley has seen over 800 acres of what was once ranchland, using only minimal amounts of water for grazing cattle, turned into a vast irrigated vineyard. We will not know the real effects groundwater and the environment from this project for several years.

I have noticed 4 permit applications for commercial cannabis agriculture projects in the Cuyama Valley.

Allowing more new agriculture of any kind seems counterproductive to the attempt to reduce water usage due to the water status of the basin.

I would highly suggest that if cannabis agriculture is to be permitted in the Cuyama Valley that requirements for water conservation are mandatory. There are six suggested water conservation methods listed on pages 47 and 48 of the Land Use Development Code, Attachment B, Ordinance 5027. If these conditions were made mandatory for approval of the permits in the Cuyama Valley, it would mitigate impacts of any new agricultural projects in the basin.

- 1) Evaporative barriers on exposed soils and pots.
- 2) Rainwater capture and reuse.
- 3) Re-circulated irrigation water (zero waste).
- 4) Timed drip irrigation.
- 5) Soil moisture monitors.
- 6) Use of recycled water

In addition, I would ask the board to limit the size (1 acre per parcel) and number, (no more than 4 growers) to further reduce the impact.

I would further add that most of the agriculture in the Cuyama Valley is farmed by organic methods and would ask that it be required of the cannabis farmers to protect the health of our residents and air quality in general.

Limiting the parcel size, and number of growers, mandating water conservation, and organic farming methods will also protect the beautiful scenic quality of the area. Preserving the natural beauty is important to the residents and visitors.

The Cuyama Basin is also a Designated Disadvantaged Community. We would like to see benefits from the revenue acquired from taxation of growers in the area returned to fund more library hours, for instance, and other services beneficial to the whole community.

We have only 2 law enforcement officers to patrol the entire area. Monitoring Cannabis growers would further strain their work load. If cannabis is permitted, we would need more law enforcement.

Please consider the unique needs of the Cuyama Valley in the revisions to the regulations.

Thank you.
Pamela Baczuk
Resident of New Cuyama

Em Johnson
Resident of New Cuyama

Dear Board of Supervisors

I am writing in regard to the proposed Cannabis Ordinance that will be discussed January 29, 2019

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.

The Cuyama Valley has not yet experienced the effects of permitted commercial cannabis agriculture on the ecosystem and the environment in the Valley. We support our neighbors in Santa Barbara County who have expressed concerns about health and environment due to recent increased cannabis agriculture in their close environs. We are in agreement with their suggestions for revisions in the current regulations. This includes areas of Land Use, Size Limitation, Water, Odor Control Abatement, and Enforcement.

The Cuyama Valley has been designated one of the most critically water over drafted basins in California. Most of the Valley receives little recharge. The amount of rainfall is considerably less than our coastal neighbors, less than 10 inches. We are dependent on groundwater and have serious concerns about the future of the Valley if the usage is not controlled.

Large and smaller farmers, ranchers, residents of the town of New Cuyama, and representatives of 3 other counties, are currently engaged in ongoing discussions and negotiations to formulate a Groundwater Sustainability Plan by 2020, which is required by the State of California due to the critical status of water in the basin. Water extraction has never been regulated in the past. The area has been using far more than is replenished.

Since 2014 the Cuyama Valley has seen over 800 acres of what was once ranchland, using only minimal amounts of water for grazing cattle, turned into a vast irrigated vineyard. We will not know the real effects groundwater and the environment from this project for several years.

I have noticed 4 permit applications for commercial cannabis agriculture projects in the Cuyama Valley. Allowing more new agriculture of any kind seems counter productive to the attempt to reduce water usage due to the water status of the basin.

I would highly suggest that if cannabis agriculture is to be permitted in the Cuyama Valley that requirements for water conservation are mandatory. There are six suggested water conservation methods listed on pages 47 and 48 of the Land Use Development Code, Attachment B, Ordinance 5027. If these conditions were made mandatory for approval of the permits in the Cuyama Valley, it would mitigate impacts of any new agricultural projects in the basin.

- 1) Evaporative barriers on exposed soils and pots.
- 2) Rainwater capture and reuse.
- 3) Re-circulated irrigation water (zero waste).
- 4) Timed drip irrigation.
- 5) Soil moisture monitors.
- 6) Use of recycled water

In addition, I would ask the board to limit the size (1 acre per parcel) and number, (no more than 4 growers) to further reduce the impact.

I would further add that most of the agriculture in the Cuyama Valley is farmed by organic methods and would ask that it be required of the cannabis farmers to protect the health of our residents and air quality in general.

Limiting the parcel size, and number of growers, mandating water conservation, and organic farming methods will also protect the beautiful scenic quality of the area. Preserving the natural beauty is important to the residents and visitors.

The Cuyama Basin is also a Designated Disadvantaged Community. We would like to see benefits from the revenue acquired from taxation of growers in the area returned to fund more library hours, for instance, and other services beneficial to the whole community.

We have only 2 law enforcement officers to patrol the entire area. Monitoring Cannabis growers would further strain their work load. If cannabis is permitted, we would need more law enforcement.

Please consider the unique needs of the Cuyama Valley in the revisions to the regulations.

Thank you.

Pamela Baczuk

Resident of New Cuyama

Em Johnson

Resident of New Cuyama

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Kathleen Ricci <kannricci@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 9:20 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Letter to Board of Supervisors concerning Cannabis Ordinances in the Cuyama Valley

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 writing this note in support of a letter written by Pamela Baczuk and Em Johnson and their recommendations for Cannabis growing in the Cuyama Valley. Please carefully consider the recommendations.

Thank you,
Kathleen Ricci
Town site resident and land owner

January 29, 2019

County of Santa Barbara
Board of Supervisors
123 E. Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Agenda Item: 1/29/19 ~ 19-00085
Case No: 1800LUP – 00000-00458 Opposition
Re: Decker Cannabis Operation
Address: 988 Fredensborg Canyon Road ~ Solvang, CA

Dear Board Members,

We are writing to protest the possible permitting of a commercial cannabis operation at 988 Fredensborg Canyon Road. We are a group of directly affected neighbors who have already experienced negative impacts by the actions of this applicant. We wish to point out the applicant's disregard for county regulations and the health and safety of his direct neighbors.

We have 7 specific areas to address which have already directly and negatively affected some, or all, of us.

- 1) The first was a severed gas line that occurred at the end of February of 2018. We were notified by the Southern California Gas Company that our gas was being cut off because there was a broken line in the area and that we would not be able to turn it back on without being recertified. Adrian Kays observed Steven Decker and his son digging, likely unpermitted, with a backhoe; when the Southern California Gas Company arrived to shut the gas off, they confirmed that the backhoe had caused the break. Owners Dreyfuss, Kays, Mazur, Quinn, and Norcott, were without gas for periods up to one week. Significant costs were incurred by each owner to get their gas service restored.
- 2) Steven Decker, designated well master, for a four party shared well, proceeded with well reconstruction without giving the other three parties an estimate or keeping them updated on the costs. Had they known the bills would mount from an initial approximately \$6,000 per owner, to another more than \$15,000 per owner, the other parties would likely have requested another opinion and estimate from a well contractor. Though recognizing the improved water quality, the other parties had been given no reason to expect bills so high as the ones received from Steven Decker. Some or all of the work was performed and billed by Steven Decker and his son. It is doubtful that permits were pulled. The water well owners are Decker, Hobgood, Lugli, and Norcott. The Langes are tenants of the Norcotts.

- 3) Some of the neighbors have already had periods of time when they have had no water when they turned their spigots on, with no prior notice. There now appears to be additional work being done at the well site, without prior notice to the fellow owners.
- 4) We own adjacent parcels that have wells on the same aquifer. We are concerned that Steven Decker's actions will affect aquifer capacity and quality.
- 5) The grow lights on the current operation that Steven Decker now has on this property are already causing discomfort to the neighbors, specifically some direct intrusion into neighboring homes and overall night light pollution.
- 6) The odor on the current operation that Steven Decker now has on this property is already causing disturbance to some of the neighbors.
- 7) The noise from the current operation that Steven Decker now has on his property is already causing discomfort and disturbance to some of the neighbors. The noise sounds like generators and/or pumps. The noise wakes the neighbors as early as 5:00 am.

Sincerely,

Elaine U. Dreyfuss, on behalf of

Elaine U. (Maidy) Dreyfuss
1132 Fredensborg Canyon Road

Adrian Kays
1124 Fredensborg Canyon Road

Jane & Rob Hobgood
990 Fredensborg Canyon Road

Susan & Julian Lange
996 Fredensborg Canyon Road

Stefan & Diane Mazur
1128 Fredensborg Canyon Road

David & Mary Ann Norcott
996 Fredensborg Canyon Road

Patrick & Cyndee Quinn
1120 Fredensborg Canyon Road

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Miyasato, Mona
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 10:44 AM
To: sbcob
Cc: Bozanich, Dennis
Subject: Fwd: Speech for BOS
Attachments: Speech to BOS, 1-29-19.docx; ATT00001.htm

Begin forwarded message:

From: Renee ONeill <chasingstar2701@yahoo.com>
Date: January 29, 2019 at 9:57:36 AM PST
To: Steve Lavagnino <steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org>, Das Williams <dwilliams@countyofsb.org>, Joan Hartmann <jhartmann@countyofsb.org>, Peter Adam <peter.adam@countyofsb.org>, Gregg Hart <ghart@countyofsb.org>
Cc: "mmiyasato@countyofsb.org" <mmiyasato@countyofsb.org>
Subject: Speech for BOS
Reply-To: Renee ONeill <chasingstar2701@yahoo.com>

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.

Attached, please find my 'planned speech,' for today's meeting.
Warmest Regards,

Renée O'Neill

Dear Supervisors,

January 29, 2019

As we are rarely given three-minutes or time to express our opinions, I felt it would serve my purposes, better, to write a letter expressing what I would say, if I had time to speak:

The members of our board support and *highly* encourage the commercial cannabis industry. Tepusquet Canyon residents have been involved in opposing commercial cannabis in our county, for five years, when the first 'commercial operator' moved into our rural, isolated neighborhood. It has been a long, ill-fated process, because our county government supports industry growers, instead of rural communities, like Tepusquet.

Last year, Staff made recommendations to the County, re Land Use Ordinances, based on the comprehensive, Environmental Impact Report - (17EIR-00000-00003).

The Tepusquet Canyon Crisis Committee (TCCC) read the entire report. We felt the recommendations were developed with forethought and wisdom. They were designed to protect our county and agricultural communities.

Re: testing on agricultural lands:

The EIR Report recommended the following:

Alternative 1 - Exclusion of Cannabis Activities from the AG-I Zone District

"Under Alternative 1 - the Exclusion of Cannabis Activities from the AG-1 Zone District, cannabis-related activities **would not be allowed within the AG-I zone districts throughout the County. This would reduce the areas of eligibility in the County, particularly within the Carpinteria Valley and the Santa Ynez Valley."**

"The classification of all impacts under Alternative 1 would be similar to those under the proposed Project, including significant and unavoidable impacts to aesthetics and visual resources; agricultural resources; air quality and GHG emissions; noise; and transportation and traffic."

We advocated for this and advised permitting it on 'urban farmlands' where it could be easily accessed, monitored, regulated, enforced and taxed. Authorities are unaware of the numerous violations that occur on rural, isolated properties that are located in "The Hinterlands."

"Any permits for manufacturing or distribution of commercial cannabis activities will be reviewed to ensure that **prime soils are avoided to the maximum extent feasible. In addition, these uses are similar to other allowed uses in the zones like "agricultural processing" and "wineries." **Testing is not a use which is comparable to any of the uses that are currently allowed in agricultural zones; therefore, the proposed ordinance would not allow testing.** Thus, the proposed changes are consistent with the LUDC's stated purposes for AG-I and AG-II zones."**

"Cannabis cultivation, manufacturing, testing, distribution, and retail could result in adverse quality of life effects to existing communities due to increases in traffic, odors, noise, ...etc."

"LUDC Ordinance Compliance with C-3, M-RP, M-1, and M-2 Zoning Districts.

As commercial uses, **retail store fronts for cannabis** are appropriate in the C-3 and M-1 zones...

It also allows **for testing, distribution,** and indoor cultivation and non-volatile manufacturing in the C-3, M-RP, M-1, and M-2 zones... These uses **meet the intent of the industrial zones to provide for industry while protecting the nearby areas with additional development standards.**

Did you read the EIR report? If so, then why are we here today? ***Why do you delay this process and continually amend regulations, to support industry growers?***

If you had followed the wisdom of Staff's recommendations to begin with, you wouldn't be in this mess, facing a growing number of infuriated, county residents!

This industry is having negative impacts on all our communities! More regions are contributing their voices to the 'greater cause.'

You turn a blind eye and allow them to develop in areas where you have little, *if any*, control over them.

You have a handful of people on the Enforcement Team who are expected to oversee all critical operations in our county, not just cannabis! Remember the Montecito Debris Flow? Well! Guess where our Sheriffs were!!!

You continually put all our communities at great risk!

If you're not willing to reverse the damage you've caused, you may very well find yourselves unemployed.

How do you plan to monitor, regulate and enforce regulations for Testing Facilities when you haven't demonstrated that you can monitor, regulate or enforce on the number of growers in this county, now?

"Sacramento marijuana lab forfeits license after discovering director forged test results"

<https://www.sacbee.com/news/state/california/california-weed/article222666355.html>

Last December, a Sacramento marijuana testing lab surrendered its license after a state inspection found it was ***failing to correctly test for 22 different pesticides.***

We're talking, potentially, MAJOR LAW SUITS here, folks! Two years ago, I wrote to our BOS about suspected chemicals and pesticides being used on Tepusquet grow sites. I wrote to and advised our Board and Planning Commissioners to be diligent in monitoring and regulating growers' products. I expressed that County could be held liable for 'Contaminated Cannabis' if toxic chemicals are sold to Medicinal Patients and/or Cannabis Clients.

Ethical growers? Trustworthy Lab Managers? HA! Good luck with THAT! Not in Tepusquet...

This is just another Pandora's Box waiting to be sprung wide open!

... And the definition of insanity is...?

"The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result."

Albert Einstein

I guess you might include me in that definition because, after all, here I am, once again. *I continue to oppose* the commercial cannabis industry 'Players,' in our rural communities; *I continue to attend* and speak at cannabis and related meetings; *I continue to write letters* to the Board and Planning Commissioners, regarding our ordinance concerns and/or absence of strict regulations and enforcement. Or, like today, *I continue respond* to proposed changes to existing ordinances..., *expecting a different outcome.* Will it be to no avail, again? ***Will YOU continue to support the commercial cannabis moguls and have them dictate what you do?***
Are you insane?

'Nuf said!

Renée O'Neill – Tepusquet Canyon Crisis Committee (TCCC)