

From: Anna Carrillo <Annacarp@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2020 12:36 PM
To: sbcob; Hart, Gregg; Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve
Subject: Retail Cannabis Criteria



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: Board of Sueprvisors
From: Anna Carrillo
March 16, 2020

As a 47 year resident of the Toro Canyon Community Plan and a very close neighbor of the Summerland Community Plan I take issue with only including 2 locations included for possible retail storefronts in the 1st District. As I have mentioned before and so has Lisa Plowman, Montecito should be included in the mix. I understand Montecito may have recently written into their community plans not wanting a retail cannabis location in their community plan, but because Summerland's and Toro Canyon's Community Plan were written so many years ago before the legalization of cannabis was even envisioned Montecito should be not be given a pass because their community plan may have been written more recently.

I also have serious concerns regarding the Cannabis Storefront Retail Criteria-based Scoresheet - Neighborhood Compatibility Proposal. Out of 100% possible, the Neighborhood community will only account for 30% of the total. The immediate neighbors need to have a larger say in what goes in in their community. The other 70% is outside the community control. This is not right! The local communities need to account for at least 51% of the score.

I see problems in both of the areas that I'm concerned about. Santa Claus has very limited parking and this is not appropriate with the beach activities, stores, and restaurants here geared toward families. Summerland needs a grocery store, not a cannabis retail location.

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Gary Boubel <gboubel@me.com>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2020 12:47 PM
To: sbcob; Hart, Gregg; Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Adam, Peter
Subject: Storefront Retail Cannabis Selection Procedures

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.

District Supervisors,

After reading through the documents associated with the above topic it appears that community input as to whether or not they support having a cannabis dispensary in their neighborhood is not given much weight. The Scoresheet for Neighborhood Compatibility Requirement only allows for 30% weighting for community involvement - ideas and suggestions from Neighborhood Compatibility requirements. The other 70% weighting is outside the community's control. So it appears a community could get saddled with a cannabis dispensary even if the majority of the community was against it.

I will go on record as adamantly opposed to a cannabis dispensary in Summerland. There is no ethically redeeming quality about having a dispensary in the neighborhood. It would not bring anything morally uplifting or positive to our children and teenagers, would not attract more family oriented businesses or restaurants, and would bring a higher risk of criminal activity than currently exists. I cannot see how any of this is beneficial to Summerland. The argument that a dispensary would bring in much needed tax receipts is weak. Most if not all of the taxes brought in by a dispensary would not go to Summerland. Studies show the promised taxes from the cannabis industry are not meeting projections anyway. So we would have to accept the dispensary with little to no benefit. Tell me how that makes sense for Summerland.

A number of concerned citizen groups have already resisted having a cannabis dispensary in their neighborhoods. Did you ever think to wonder why? They don't want one! We don't want one!

Gary Boubel
Summerland Resident