

Relis, Mia

Public Comment - Group 1

From: Cortney Hebert <cortney@goletachamber.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 10:07 AM
To: Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Cc: Kristen Miller
Subject: Letter from the Goleta Chamber of Commerce - Cannabis in Santa Barbara County
Attachments: BOS_Cannabis.pdf

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 Chair and members of the Board:

Please see the attached letter from the Goleta Chamber of Commerce regarding cannabis in Santa Barbara County.

Thank you,

Cortney Hebert Rintoul
Vice President

Goleta Chamber of Commerce
5662 Calle Real #204, Goleta, CA 93117
(805) 967-2500 ext. 4
cortney@goletachamber.com

2019 BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Chair:
William Macfadyen
Noozhawk

President & CEO:
Kristen Miller

Immediate Past Chair
Hallie Avolio
Latitude 34 Technologies

First Vice Chair:
Trevor Large
Buynak, Fauver, Archbald & Spray LLP

Vice Chairs:
Kirsten McLaughlin
Cox

Susan Rodriguez
Brown & Brown Insurance

Rich Antles
FLIR Systems

Anne Pazier
Santa Barbara Gift Baskets

Board Members:

Ryan Aeh
City Ventures

Alex Bauer
Sansum

Leslie Brickell
*Residence Inn by Marriott
Santa Barbara Goleta*

Ron Caird
Porlamar Nursery

Beth Collins
*Brownstein/Hyatt/Farber/
Schreck*

Francois DeJohn
Hayes Commercial Group

Arie Dejong
Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital

Barry Dorsey
The Kimpton Goodland Hotel

Dan Gabie
LogMeIn

Janet Garufis
Montecito Bank and Trust

Steve Greig
Plains All American Pipeline

Renee Grubb
Village Properties

Brian Larinan
Granite Construction

Donna Lewis
Goleta Union School District

Matt Long
Signature Flight Support

John Longbrake
UC Santa Barbara

Trish Miller
Spherion

Craig Minus
The Towbes Group

Rich Nahas
Glen Annie Golf Club

Tony Vallejo
CPA

Roberto van Geenen
The Ritz-Carlton Bacara

GOLETA

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

July 5, 2019

Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
105 East Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

RE: Cannabis in Santa Barbara County

Honorable Chair and members of the Board:

Cannabis in Santa Barbara County has become a major concern in our community, and therefore of the Goleta Chamber of Commerce.

The Chamber's Public Policy Committee met recently to discuss the issue, particularly the concerns over permit requests to grow cannabis on parcels in western Goleta — close to our residential neighborhoods and just downwind of The Ritz-Carlton Bacara.

Goleta and cannabis also have been in the news as a result of our historic South Patterson Avenue agricultural block and newly converted cannabis operations sprouting alongside our community's long-time, prized nurseries.

Our committee has observed Carpinteria struggle with the consequences of cannabis-related public policy decisions that are causing distress for many residents and businesses in that community. We want to learn from Carpinteria and help create a better future for Goleta as we face changes traced to California's legalization of marijuana.

Committee members studied data and documents, and heard from experts. Right now, it looks as if the effects of cannabis growing are detrimental to our quality of life, there do not seem to be enough safeguards to protect our neighborhoods from the inevitable odors of cannabis growing, and there are reputational risks of being known as a cannabis capital.

The Chamber's concerns are for Goleta's neighborhoods, our tourism economy, and the negative economic impacts of this new agricultural industry on our quality of life and economy.

Neighborhoods

The problem with outdoor cannabis growing is the smell. Scientific research is emerging on the noxious nature of the odor and its irritant effect on eyes, nose and skin. It also is a recognizable odor associated with marijuana smoking and the perception is extremely negative.

Goleta's neighborhoods are carefully designed to be outdoor-friendly, nature-centric places with an emphasis on the landscape. "The Goodland" is known for its environmental sensitivity.

What safeguards are in place to make sure that permits issued in the foothills and canyons outside Goleta city limits will prevent drifting odors into Goleta? How large should a buffer be to ensure the smell does not drift to our coast? What technology exists to eliminate the harmful odors from this newly legalized crop?

Currently, the City of Goleta and residents already are dealing with noxious odors from a western Goleta agricultural water well that periodically releases a gas-like smell.

Tourism

Goleta is heavily invested in our local tourism economy. Nearly 1,200 jobs are connected with the hospitality industry in Goleta, and the city relies on transient-occupancy taxes, or bed taxes, as its largest revenue source, before sales taxes and property taxes.

The Ritz-Carlton Bacara generates a large amount of bed, sales and property taxes, and employs more than 500 people. What mitigation should be required of a new industrial crop that inevitably will have a negative impact on the Goleta tourism industry?

In previous sphere of influence discussions, the neighboring Santa Barbara Airport and UC Santa Barbara have followed detailed plans to ensure their operations do not negatively affect the local Goleta economy. What is being studied at that county level to ensure Goleta is protected?

Economic Development

The committee is unclear if Santa Barbara County is pursuing, or allowing, permits for large amounts of cannabis grows as an economic development plan to fund the county's deficit.

Previous economic development plans related to the county have been rebuffed — development, events, oil and gas, and even entrepreneurial partnerships have not been embraced by the county as solutions to its revenue challenges. If cannabis is the county's solution to creating more revenue, it must not be at Goleta's expense.

A loss in revenue for Goleta, due to a decline in tourism and lower property values in residential neighborhoods, should be factored and incorporated into the county's revenue neutrality agreement with the City of Goleta.

Benchmarks

The committee cites two regions for examples — one to emulate and one to avoid.

Carpinteria is suffering from the effects of cannabis grows. Overall, that community's situation is different from Goleta's, but we are concerned that some of the circumstances and challenges are a harbinger for what Goleta can expect.

San Diego, however, seems to have a model program for enacting policies that address new state laws regarding cannabis while protecting neighborhoods and existing agriculture businesses.

What other jurisdictions have Santa Barbara County officials studied and benchmarked to define some best practices in this emerging industry?

Goleta has a long-held policy for protecting urban agriculture and preserving the rural nature outside its urban limit line. Consideration must be granted to existing avocado and lemon orchards, and the community's coffee farm, when approving new cannabis grows in the region. Are there Third District agriculture policies that need to be amended to keep a fair playing field for our existing agriculture businesses?

Are there community workshops and economic development meetings that can be convened to help shape a better future for Goleta residents' quality of life and the health of our business community? It may be that the policies the county has adopted so far are adequate for individual land use and permitting, but a larger scope of benefits and safeguards for our community is warranted.

We ask the County to work with the City, the public and the business community on a program that adds appropriate regulations to ensure the minimum impacts to our community from cannabis grown in the county.

Thank you,

Kristen Miller
President & CEO
Goleta Chamber of Commerce
Kristen@GoletaChamber.com
805-967-2500 ext. 8

Relis, Mia

From: Stacey Wooten <stacey@calcoastcompliance.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 3, 2019 3:44 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: July 9 BOS Hearing Public Comment Letter

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:

Cal Coast Compliance is a licensing and compliance firm that works with dozens of cannabis operators in Santa Barbara County. Our company is founded by life-long, born and raised Santa Barbara County residents. We understand how lucky we are to be residents of this wonderful County and so do our clients. Our goal is to allow the farmers to do what they do best, farm. Unfortunately, that is not the case these days. They are fighting for their rights as land and business owners in this legal industry. Your board has spent years and hundreds of thousands of dollars of professional and staff time to produce a comprehensive and robust ordinance. The operators in Santa Barbara County have spent millions of dollars getting their businesses in compliance with the regulations, often times spending the money two and three times over as many of the departments have changed their ways. The business men and women of the cannabis industry in this County have put their faith and life savings in your hands, please allow them to prove to you and everyone else that they are good operators!

We support the legal cannabis industry and what it offers to Santa Barbara County, new and high paying jobs!

We are concerned about the Board's consideration of additional restrictions and amendments to the Cannabis Ordinance. Cannabis is already the most highly regulated agricultural crop in Santa Barbara County.

We are troubled by the Board's disregard for the numerous restrictions the County has already placed on cannabis growers. Now, seeking further changes to the Ordinance, the Board is placing an even heavier burden on the shoulders of those who have relied on the County's regulations and invested their life and business by choosing to grow cannabis in Santa Barbara County, or start businesses that depends on local cannabis product.

Santa Barbara County has a unique opportunity to be the leader in sun grown, sustainable cannabis and expand its tourism industry. Polling demonstrates that the majority of our residents support the industry. We cannot allow a small group of vocal opponents to upend this unique opportunity.

For these reasons, we ask that you reject further restrictions on the industry and allow the cannabis growers time to comply with the well-crafted Ordinance already in place.

Stacey Wooten
stacey@calcoastcompliance.com
www.calcoastcompliance.com
O: 805-691-9095

CALCOAST COMPLIANCE

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient of this message or their agent, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply email and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, copying, or storage of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited.

Relis, Mia

From: SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis <coalition4responsiblecannabis@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 3, 2019 5:09 PM
To: sbcob; Lenzi, Chelsea
Subject: Fwd: PRESS RELEASE: Coalition presents Board of Supervisors with Draft Urgency Ordinances to Correct Non-conforming Cannabis Operations
Attachments: 7-1 Super FINAL Coastal ordinance .pdf; 6 30 Final FINAL Inland ordinance .pdf; final cover letter for B of S 7 2 2019.pdf; 7-1-19 Provisional SB CO.xlsx

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.

One of our members just reviewed the posted items for next Tuesday July 9 agenda and noted that our submission, hand delivered yesterday and referencing our request to have this material included for July 9, is not attached to the Board items. Please include all materials, as submitted either by email, or those handed to you July 2.

Thank you

Coalition for Responsible Cannabis

----- Forwarded message -----

From: SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis <coalition4responsiblecannabis@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Jul 2, 2019 at 11:57 AM
Subject: PRESS RELEASE: Coalition presents Board of Supervisors with Draft Urgency Ordinances to Correct Non-conforming Cannabis Operations
To: Coalition for Responsible Cannabis <coalition4responsiblecannabis@gmail.com>

PRESS RELEASE attached and below:

Santa Barbara County Coalition for Responsible Cannabis

For immediate release:

Contact: coalition4responsiblecannabis@gmail.com

Coalition presents Board of Supervisors with Draft Urgency Ordinances to Amend & Correct Non-conforming Cannabis Operations

Today, SB Coalition Board member Rob Solomon presented the Board of Supervisors with draft urgency ordinances designed to minimize many of the nuisance impacts of odor from ongoing, unpermitted cannabis operations, both in the Coastal Zone and in the inland areas. These ordinances are narrowly tailored to address the specific problem of marijuana cultivators who either lied on their affidavits to obtain County authorization for State licenses, or have unlawfully expanded their operation from January of 2016, and who do not have any controls on their operation which would mitigate odor impacts, either in the form of odor control technology, or in adequate setbacks from residences or pre-existing agricultural operations.

The County has continued to authorize state provisional licenses, despite the fact that to our knowledge, none of these operations has completed the local land use and licensing requirements. As of Monday July 2, 2019, almost 767 Provisional Licenses have been issued to Santa Barbara County marijuana growers, accounting for **37% of all Provisional Licenses issued statewide**. When presented with this information today, Supervisor Das Williams and County CEO staff Dennis Bozanich responded with some data about “temporary licenses”. However, our intent with these ordinance amendments is to halt the authorization of Provisional licenses absent the parameters set forth in the urgency ordinances.

Since March 2019, the SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis has repeatedly urged the Board of Supervisors to take immediate action to ameliorate the negative impacts caused by the multiple unpermitted cannabis operations that the Board has allowed to continue to operate. The existing Cannabis Ordinance is the subject of potential amendments to address a multitude of issues, to be discussed at the July 9, 2019 BOS hearing.

Board member Solomon stated: “Today, we are asking that County Counsel review these draft ordinances, and agendaize and adopt these ordinances at your July 9 meeting. It is past time for the BOS to take meaningful action to protect constituents.” We were gratified to hear County Counsel Michael Ghizzoni indicate that a response to our drafts would be available to the Supervisors and public at next Tuesday’s Board hearing.

END

Attachments: Cover letter and draft urgency ordinances

ORDINANCE NO.

AN URGENCY ORDINANCE OF THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA ESTABLISHING A PROHIBITION ON THE CONTINUED CULTIVATION OF CANNABIS (MARIJUANA) BY NONCONFORMING OPERATIONS IN THE COASTAL ZONE OF THE COUNTY WHICH ARE OPERATING WITHOUT ODOR CONTROLS AS REQUIRED BY THE COUNTY CANNABIS ORDINANCES, SUBJECT TO EXCEPTIONS

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara ordains as follows:

SECTION 1 Emergency Findings

Section 1. Findings and Declarations. The Board of Supervisors makes the following findings in support of the enactment of this interim zoning/urgency ordinance:

- A. Pursuant to Article XI, section 7 of the California Constitution, the County of Santa Barbara (“County”) may adopt and enforce ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws to protect and promote the public health, safety, and welfare of its citizens.
- B. Pursuant to Government Code section 65858, to protect the public safety, health, and welfare, the County may, as an urgency measure, adopt an interim ordinance prohibiting or limiting land uses that may be in conflict with contemplated land use regulations that the County is studying or considering or intends to study within a reasonable time. Government Code Section 65858(f) also provides:

Notwithstanding subdivision (e), upon termination of a prior interim ordinance, the legislative body may adopt another interim ordinance pursuant to this section provided that the new interim ordinance is adopted to protect the public safety, health, and welfare from an event, occurrence, or set of circumstances different from the event, occurrence, or set of circumstances that led to the adoption of the prior interim ordinance.

- C. Pursuant to County Code Section 35-1003 the County has the authority to seek to abate any land use which is operating in violation of the County’s Land Use ordinances, including but not limited to the County’s Coastal Zoning Ordinance, Article II of Chapter 35 of the County Code, and Article V Chapter 3 of the County Code, the “Right to Farm” ordinance.

Pursuant to Government Code section 25123, the County may enact an ordinance for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety, which contains a declaration of the facts constituting the urgency and which shall be effective immediately.

- D. The Board finds that there are numerous cannabis cultivation sites in the unincorporated areas of the County in the Coastal Zone which are operating under State of California temporary or provisional licenses as legal nonconforming uses, but which have not installed best available odor or emissions control technology, or which have unlawfully expanded in scope and volume of cultivation, or which have not entered the land use permit process, or which have not completed the land use permit process set forth in the County Code, Section 35-144U of Article II, or are operating beyond the deadlines for termination of nonconforming uses set forth in Section 35-1003 of the County Code. The most current list of sites with provisional licenses is attached and incorporated hereto as Exhibit 1.

- E. The County's Cannabis ordinance at 35-144(U)C.6 requires, as a standard for approval of any coastal development permit authorizing cannabis cultivation, an Odor Abatement Plan which "prevents odors from being experienced within residential zones, as determined by the Director. The Odor Abatement Plan shall be implemented prior to the issuance of final building and/or grading inspection and/or throughout operation of the project, as applicable." As a result of the fact that all or most of the operations described in Exhibit 1 have not obtained coastal development permits under Section 35-144U, they have not, as of the date of this ordinance, installed odor controls.
- F. Recent and contemplated amendments to State requirements through the legislative process may result in the further extension of the time during which nonconforming uses may claim a right under the Business Licensing Ordinance to continue to operate without installation of effective odor controls, contrary to the principle established in Proposition 64 that all cannabis cultivation shall be subject to local control and shall operate with mitigation measures in place. This ordinance is necessary to clarify that notwithstanding any inconsistent provisions in the Business Licensing Ordinance, or in State law, it is the Board's intention that the time limits in the County's zoning ordinance shall prevail to assure that nonconforming cultivators complete the permit process and install odor controls, or cease cultivation until they comply.
- G. The Board finds that the ongoing cultivation of cannabis in operations which are not in compliance with the County's adopted standards for mitigation of their impacts, including but not limited to odors and emissions, are causing ongoing and potentially irreparable harm to the health, safety and welfare of its residents, and the environment, including but not limited to impacts to children, schools, residents, visitors and other sensitive receptors. These cannabis operations are expressly excluded from the protections of the County's Right to Farm Ordinance, and are creating conflicts with agriculture which is protected by the County's Right to Farm Ordinance, including viticulture and avocado crops. Because of their nuisance odors, these operations are also creating conflicts with recreational and visitor serving uses, inconsistent with the priorities of the California Coastal Act, and if unabated, may do irreparable damage to the tourist economy in the City of Carpinteria and the unincorporated areas of the Carpinteria Valley; similar concerns have been expressed by the City of Goleta on behalf of residents and visitor-serving businesses in their City who are finding themselves subject to the noxious odors and fumes from outdoor cannabis cultivation.
- H. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 30005(a) and (b), an urgency ordinance may become effective immediately in the Coastal zone either to abate a nuisance, or because the ordinance does not change the uses allowed in the County's certified Local Coastal Plan (LCP). The County's certified LCP includes a requirement for all cannabis operations to mitigate for odor impacts from cultivation by requiring best available odor control technology to be installed prior to commencing operations. The County's certified LCP also provides that nonconforming uses may not be enlarged, extended or expanded without first complying with ordinance standards and obtaining a coastal development permit. This ordinance would implement existing requirements of the LCP without change.

- I. This Ordinance is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §21000, et seq.) (“CEQA”) because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that it will have a significant effect on the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)) and because it consists of regulations and restrictions on activities to assure the maintenance, restoration, or enhancement of natural resources and the environment by prohibiting environmentally destructive components of currently unregulated marijuana cultivation (Class 7 and Class 8, CEQA Guidelines §§15307, 15308).
- J. This Ordinance is also exempt from CEQA because it is an urgency measure necessary to protect the County from a current and immediate threat to the public health, safety, and welfare. (Public Resources Code §21080(b)(4); CEQA Guidelines §15269.)

Legislative Background

- K. On November 5, 1996, California voters approved Proposition 215, the Compassionate Use Act of 1996 (codified at Health & Safety Code §11362.5) (“CUA”), an initiative that exempted certain patients and their primary caregivers from criminal liability under state law for the possession and cultivation of marijuana for medical purposes. One of the stated purposes of the CUA is to ensure that seriously ill Californians have the right to obtain and use marijuana for medical purposes where that medical use has been recommended by a physician.
- L. On January 1, 2004, Senate Bill 420, the Medical Marijuana Program Act (Health & Safety Code §§11362.7-11362.83) (“MMPA”), became effective to clarify the scope of the CUA and to facilitate the prompt identification of qualified patients and their primary caregivers. Pursuant to the MMPA, a qualified patient or primary caregiver may possess no more than eight ounces of dried marijuana per patient and may maintain no more than six mature or twelve immature marijuana plants per patient unless a doctor authorizes an additional amount. The MMPA authorized the only cultivation of cannabis which was lawful under State law prior to January 1, 2016.
- M. On January 1, 2016, Assembly Bill 266, Assembly Bill 243, and Senate Bill 643, which together constitute the “Medical Marijuana Regulation and Safety Act (“MMRSA”), became effective and set forth a comprehensive, state-wide regulatory structure for the cultivation and distribution of medical cannabis.
- N. On November 8, 2016, the majority of California voters passed Proposition 64 – The Control, Regulate and Tax Adult Use of Marijuana Act. Proposition 64 permits adults 21 years of age and over to possess and grow specified amounts of marijuana for recreational use. Under Proposition 64, city and county governments may ban almost all cannabis activity except for personal cultivation of up to six plants in an enclosed structure and consumption, both by an adult at least 21 years old. Otherwise, local government in California is free to restrict cannabis businesses from operating within its jurisdiction, levy restrictions it determines to be appropriate on what cannabis businesses it does allow and prohibit outdoor personal cannabis cultivation.

- O. On or about February 27, 2018 the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors adopted a series of ordinances that regulate commercial cannabis operations within the County's unincorporated area. The ordinances categorize cannabis operations into eight permit types and allow each license type in certain zones throughout the County's unincorporated area. Those ordinances, including, but not limited to Section 35.42.075.C.6 of the Zoning Code, require best available odor control technology to be installed on all indoor cultivation operations.
- P. On or about May 1, 2018 the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors adopted the Cannabis Business License Ordinance, Chapter 50 of the County Code, which added a requirement for a local cannabis business license, added an acreage limit of 186 acres in the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District, and a limit of 8 retail licenses in the County. However, Chapter 50, Section 50-5.3 exempted legal nonconforming medical marijuana cultivation sites established under County Code Section 35-1003, until they are terminated, pursuant to County Code Section 35-1003.C. The Business License Ordinance allowed the County Executive Office to accept affidavits to support the approval of State licenses from persons or entities who claimed under penalty of perjury that their cultivation operation preceded January 2016 and that the cultivation was lawful under prior law. The business License ordinance was not certified as part of the Local Coastal Plan.

- Q. On April 9, 2019, the Board of Supervisors amended Chapter 50-17 to add, under grounds for denial of a license:

"b) The Applicant has knowingly, willfully or negligently made a false statement of material fact or omitted a material fact from: 1. The application for a cannabis business license; or 2. Any prior affidavit to the County concerning cannabis, whether medical marijuana or non-medical marijuana;"

However County staff has continued to authorize additional provisional licenses without first investigating whether any prior affidavit contained a material misrepresentation or omission of fact.

- R. According to the State of California CDFA website, since February 2019, 683 State provisional licenses have been issued to cultivators in the County, with 238 of those in the Carpinteria Valley. All of these licenses are assigned to operators who claim to have been in operation under the previous State temporary licensing program and who claim to be in compliance with the County's "Article X" legal nonconforming provisions. Only one of the operators in the Carpinteria Valley has completed the County permitting and licensing process. The County has continued to authorize provisional licenses, as shown in Exhibit 1. Additional growers who had temporary licenses but do not have Provisionals may also be continuing to grow.
- S. The County's expectation that the allowance of provisional licenses by the State would sunset by a date certain, and that any licensee who failed to enter and complete the permit process by a date certain would cease cultivation, has not been met. Instead, the State Legislature has taken action,

and continues to take action, over the County's objection, to extend existing licenses and to allow additional provisional licenses. Any extensions of deadlines by the State Legislature or State Licensing authority will unacceptably perpetuate the nuisance effects and unacceptable impacts of cannabis cultivation to the public health, safety, welfare, economy and environment. Under existing law, without Provisional Annual licenses, existing cannabis operators not in possession of a local land use entitlement, local cannabis business license, and a State Annual license should have ceased operations upon expiration of their State temporary cannabis licenses.

- T. Those nonconforming cultivation sites with no odor or emissions control are causing significant nuisance effects on the surrounding population in both the unincorporated and incorporated portions of the Carpinteria and Goleta Valleys. The continued operation of these cultivation sites without odor control also constitutes unfair competition against those prospective operators which are awaiting approval of land use and zoning permits to begin operations. The County has been advised that a few of the license holders in the Carpinteria Valley have voluntarily installed odor control technology pending the County's consideration of their land use permits, however, there has been no opportunity for testing or verification by the County, or the County Air Pollution Control District, of those technologies to demonstrate that they represent the best available technology, as required by the County's ordinance, and the County has been presented with recent expert information reflecting that its approach to the health impacts of breathing terpenes from cannabis plants needs to be revisited.

- U. The County's ordinance at Section 35-1003 provides for termination of Legal Nonconforming Uses as follows:

The legal nonconforming uses described in subsection B. shall terminate:

In the inland areas (i.e., the areas located outside of the coastal zone of Santa Barbara County), either (1) six months after the board of supervisors' action on February 6, 2018, regarding a county cannabis cultivation ordinance, or (2) 18 months from December 15, 2017, the effective date of Ordinance No. 5019, whichever is longer; and

In the coastal zone, either (1) six months after the coastal commission certifies the board-adopted amendments to the local coastal program regarding the cannabis cultivation ordinance, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 30514, or (2) if the board does not adopt a county cannabis cultivation ordinance on February 6, 2018, then 18 months from December 15, 2017, the effective date of Ordinance No. 5019, whichever is longer.

If the county cannabis ordinance referenced above allows for cultivation of medical cannabis but requires a zoning permit to do so, operators of nonconforming medical marijuana cultivation locations that have submitted a **complete application** to the Santa Barbara County Planning and Development Department to permit their nonconforming cultivation site by the termination date listed above may continue to operate their **same** existing nonconforming medical marijuana cultivation site while their permit application is being processed, as long as the operator continues to manage the cultivation location in compliance with the requirements of article X, state law, and the applicable provision of either the County Land Use and Development Code Section 35.101.020 (Nonconforming Uses of Land and Structures), the Montecito Land Use and Development Code Section 35.491.020 (Nonconforming Uses of Land and Structures), or article II,

the coastal zoning ordinance section 35-161 (Nonconforming Uses of Land, Buildings, and Structures). It is solely within the department's discretion to determine if it has received a complete permit application."

The "longer" amortization period provided in the ordinance expired on or about June 17, 2019. Nevertheless, the County staff has continued to approve provisional licenses after that date.

Members of the public have provided evidence that a number of the cultivators have failed to submit a complete application, within the meaning of the Permit Streamlining Act, prior to the deadline, or have changed or expanded their pre-existing operation so that it no longer qualifies as a legal nonconforming use under the County's ordinance. In addition, there has been no determination prior to the deadline that environmental review of each application has commenced, as required by State law. Because the County certified a Program EIR (PEIR) to support its cannabis ordinances, it must determine, as to each individual permit application, that the PEIR is adequate for that operation, before the expiration date of the nonconforming use provisions, and has not done so.

- V. Section 35-144U also specifically provides: **"the Board of Supervisors later may need to change the zoning of cannabis activities to being prohibited and may need to do so without cannabis activities receiving: 1) an amortization period; and/or 2) legal nonconforming use status."** It was not the intention of the Board of Supervisors to allow cannabis cultivation, whether legal nonconforming or not, to continue past the effective dates of Ordinance No. 5019 without mitigation for its impacts, including most significantly, its odor impacts.

Therefore, it is hereby ordained that:

1. **Notwithstanding the provisions of any previously adopted County ordinance regulating cannabis licensing or cultivation, the continued cultivation of cannabis as a legal nonconforming use is prohibited and subject to abatement as a public nuisance, unless within 30 days of the effective date of this ordinance, the owner, lessor, lessee and licensee of any cultivation site or premises on which cannabis cultivation is continuing to occur under the nonconforming use provisions of the licensing or zoning ordinance, jointly provide documentation to the County of Santa Barbara Planning and Development Department of the legal nonconforming use, and the Planning Director verifies that the cannabis plants are contained within a greenhouse which:**
 - (a) **qualifies as an 'indoor' structure (defined as a structure with a permanent roof, a permanent relatively impermeable floor (e.g., concrete or asphalt paved) and**
 - (b) **is compliance with all building and plumbing codes, and**
 - (c) **installation, testing and verification of Odor Control which is certified as Best Available Technology at the time of installation, consistent with the provisions of 35-144 is being employed.**

Installation of any particular Odor Control System under this section, including but not limited to the Byers system shall not vest a right to continue using that system if, upon

permit issuance or compliance review the County determines that another system would provide better odor control.

AND

- (d) The cultivator provides evidence that the operation is the same as it was on January 1, 2016 as required by Section 35-1003. Any operator who does not meet their burden to prove that they were in operation on January 1, 2016 and that they have not enlarged, expanded or otherwise increased the intensity of use of the site shall cease cultivation within 30 days of the effective date of this ordinance. For purposes of this determination, the scope of legal nonconforming use under prior law was limited to the number of plants allowed for medicinal purposes.
2. The Planning Director shall post all verifications provided under Section 1 above on the County's Cannabis Website within 24 hours of verification so that the public remains informed of which operations are authorized to continue.
 3. Notwithstanding that less than 186 acres of land in Carpinteria may be under cannabis cultivation as of the date of enactment of this urgency ordinance,
 - (1) the County will not accept any new applications for cannabis cultivation until one year after all applicants currently in permit review have begun operations, and have undergone compliance review to test and determine that odor impacts have been mitigated such that odors are not perceptible beyond the permitted parcel boundary;
 - (2) Until one year after all applicants currently in permit review have begun operations, and have undergone compliance review to test and determine that odor impacts have been mitigated such that odors are not perceptible beyond the permitted parcel boundary, the County will not approve or issue more than one coastal development permit or land use permit for a single cultivation site per legal parcel, to the first operation to receive final land use approvals.
 - (3) The County will not allow "license stacking". The County will not authorize provisional licenses or approve coastal development permits to allow cultivation on more than one acre per legal parcel for parcels in the AG-I zone district.
 4. Notwithstanding any change that the State Legislature has made or may make which has the effect of extending temporary or provisional State licenses, the County's provisions establishing deadlines for bringing existing nonconforming operations into conformance shall not be extended. To give meaning to these deadlines, any cultivator operating under a provisional use permit and who has applied for a coastal development permit shall cease cultivation unless, on or before June 17, 2019,

- (a) the Planning and Development department has found the application complete under the Permit Streamlining Act, and had all information necessary to approve or deny a permit; and
- (b) Environmental review is “underway”. For purposes of this provision, environmental review was “underway” only if the Planning and Development Department had completed an Initial Study to determine whether the Program EIR certified by the Board is adequate under CEQA to support the approval of the permit.

For any application in the process for which the conditions of 4(a) and 4(b) are not found to exist, the Planning and Development department shall summarily deny the permit application and direct the cultivator to cease operations.

Section 2. Applicability This Ordinance applies within all unincorporated areas of Santa Barbara County.

Section 3. Public Nuisance. A violation of any provision of this Ordinance shall be deemed to be a public nuisance and subject to the enforcement process as set forth .

Section 4. Severability. If any provision, word, phrase, section or subsection of this Ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Ordinance and the application of such provision, word, phrase, section or subsection to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby. To this end, provisions of this Ordinance are severable.

Section 5. No Vested Right To Be Established. The Board of Supervisors declares that this urgency ordinance is enacted for the limited purposes described above and for the time period allowed by law. No existing cultivation site or continuing cultivation site shall acquire any right to continue the cultivation of cannabis by virtue of the provisions of this Ordinance.

Section 6. Effective Date. The Board of Supervisors declares that this Ordinance is necessary as an urgency measure for preserving the public health, safety and welfare. This Ordinance shall take effect immediately upon its passage and shall remain in effect until _____.

ORDINANCE NO.

AN URGENCY ORDINANCE OF THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA ESTABLISHING A PROHIBITION ON THE CONTINUED CULTIVATION OF CANNABIS (MARIJUANA) BY NONCONFORMING OPERATIONS IN THE INLAND AREA OF THE COUNTY WHICH ARE OPERATING WITHOUT ODOR CONTROLS AS REQUIRED BY THE COUNTY CANNABIS ORDINANCES, SUBJECT TO EXCEPTIONS

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara ordains as follows:

SECTION 1 Emergency Findings

Section 1. Findings and Declarations. The Board of Supervisors makes the following findings in support of the enactment of this interim zoning/urgency ordinance:

- A. Pursuant to Article XI, section 7 of the California Constitution, the County of Santa Barbara (“County”) may adopt and enforce ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws to protect and promote the public health, safety, and welfare of its citizens.
- B. Pursuant to Government Code section 65858, to protect the public safety, health, and welfare, the County may, as an urgency measure, adopt an interim ordinance prohibiting or limiting land uses that may be in conflict with contemplated land use regulations that the County is studying or considering or intends to study within a reasonable time. Government Code Section 65858(f) also provides:

“ (f) Notwithstanding subdivision (e), upon termination of a prior interim ordinance, the legislative body may adopt another interim ordinance pursuant to this section provided that the new interim ordinance is adopted to protect the public safety, health, and welfare from an event, occurrence, or set of circumstances different from the event, occurrence, or set of circumstances that led to the adoption of the prior interim ordinance.”
- C. Pursuant to County Code Section 35-1003 the County has the authority to seek to abate any land use which is operating in violation of the County’s Land Use ordinances, including but not limited to the County’s Coastal Zoning Ordinance, Article II of Chapter 35 of the County Code, and Article V Chapter 3 of the County Code, the “Right to Farm” ordinance.
- D. Pursuant to Government Code section 25123, the County may enact an ordinance for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety, which contains a declaration of the facts constituting the urgency and which shall be effective immediately.
- E. The Board finds that there are numerous cannabis cultivation sites in the unincorporated areas of the County in the Coastal Zone which are operating under State of California temporary or provisional licenses as legal nonconforming uses, but which have not installed best available odor control technology, or which have unlawfully expanded in scope and volume of cultivation, or which have not entered the land use permit process, or which have not completed the land use permit process set forth in the County Code, Section 35.42.075 and are operating beyond the deadlines for termination of nonconforming uses set forth in Section 35-1003 of the County Code. The most current list of sites with provisional licenses is attached and incorporated hereto as Exhibit 1.

- F. The County's Cannabis ordinance at LUDC Section 35.42.075.C.6 requires, as a standard for approval of any land use permit authorizing cannabis cultivation on properties zoned Ag 1, and on Ag 2 properties requiring a CUP, an Odor Abatement Plan which "prevents odors from being experienced within residential zones, as determined by the Director. The Odor Abatement Plan shall be implemented prior to the issuance of final building and/or grading inspection and/or throughout operation of the project, as applicable." As a result of the fact that all or most of the operations described in Exhibit 1 have not obtained permits under Section 35.42.075.C.6 they have not, as of the date of this ordinance, installed odor controls. Since adoption of the ordinance in 2018, increasing concerns have arisen about the Volatile Organic Compounds [VOCs].
- G. Recent and contemplated amendments to State requirements through the legislative process may result in the further extension of the time during which nonconforming uses may claim a right under the County's Business Licensing Ordinance to continue to operate without installation of effective odor controls, contrary to the principle established in Proposition 64 that all cannabis cultivation shall be subject to local control and shall operate with mitigation measures in place. This ordinance is necessary to clarify that notwithstanding any inconsistent provisions in the Business Licensing Ordinance, or in State law, it is the Board's intention that the time limits in the County's zoning ordinance shall prevail to assure that nonconforming cultivators complete the permit process and install odor controls, or cease cultivation until they comply.
- H. The Board finds that the ongoing cultivation of cannabis in operations which are not in compliance with the County's adopted standards for mitigation of their impacts, including but not limited to odors and emissions, are causing ongoing and potentially irreparable harm to the health, safety and welfare of its residents, and the environment, including but not limited to impacts to children, schools, residents, visitors and other sensitive receptors. These cannabis operations are expressly excluded from the protections of the County's Right to Farm Ordinance, and are creating conflicts with agriculture which is protected by the County's Right to Farm Ordinance, including viticulture and avocado crops. Because of their nuisance odors in the release of the VOCs, these operations are also creating conflicts with recreational and visitor serving uses, and if unabated, may do irreparable damage to the tourist economy in unincorporated areas of the County.
- I. This Ordinance is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §21000, et seq.) ("CEQA") because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that it will have a significant effect on the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3)) and because it consists of regulations and restrictions on activities to assure the maintenance, restoration, or enhancement of natural resources and the environment by prohibiting environmentally destructive components of currently unregulated marijuana cultivation (Class 7 and Class 8, CEQA Guidelines §§15307, 15308).
- J. This Ordinance is also exempt from CEQA because it is an urgency measure necessary to protect the County from a current and immediate threat to the public health, safety, and welfare. (Public Resources Code §21080(b)(4); CEQA Guidelines §15269.)

Legislative Background

- K. On November 5, 1996, California voters approved Proposition 215, the Compassionate Use Act of 1996 (codified at Health & Safety Code §11362.5) (“CUA”), an initiative that exempted certain patients and their primary caregivers from criminal liability under state law for the possession and cultivation of marijuana for medical purposes. One of the stated purposes of the CUA is to ensure that seriously ill Californians have the right to obtain and use marijuana for medical purposes where that medical use has been recommended by a physician.
- L. On January 1, 2004, Senate Bill 420, the Medical Marijuana Program Act (Health & Safety Code §§11362.7-11362.83) (“MMPA”), became effective to clarify the scope of the CUA and to facilitate the prompt identification of qualified patients and their primary caregivers. Pursuant to the MMPA, a qualified patient or primary caregiver may possess no more than eight ounces of dried marijuana per patient and may maintain no more than six mature or twelve immature marijuana plants per patient unless a doctor authorizes an additional amount. The MMPA authorized the only cultivation of cannabis which was lawful under State law prior to January 1, 2016.
- M. On January 1, 2016, Assembly Bill 266, Assembly Bill 243, and Senate Bill 643, which together constitute the “Medical Marijuana Regulation and Safety Act (“MMRSA”), became effective and set forth a comprehensive, state-wide regulatory structure for the cultivation and distribution of medical cannabis.
- N. On November 8, 2016, the majority of California voters passed Proposition 64 – The Control, Regulate and Tax Adult Use of Marijuana Act. Prop 64 permits adults 21 years of age and over to possess and grow specified amounts of marijuana for recreational use. Under Prop 64, city and county governments may ban almost all cannabis activity except for personal cultivation of up to six plants in an enclosed structure and consumption, both by an adult at least 21 years old. Otherwise, local government in California is free to restrict cannabis businesses from operating within its jurisdiction, levy restrictions it determines to be appropriate on what cannabis businesses it does allow and prohibit outdoor personal cannabis cultivation.
- O. On or about February 27, 2018 the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors adopted a series of ordinances that regulate commercial cannabis operations within the County’s unincorporated area. The ordinances categorize cannabis operations into eight permit types and allow each license type in certain zones throughout the County’s unincorporated area. Those ordinances, including, but not limited to Section 35.42.075.C.6 of the Zoning Code, require best available odor control technology to be installed on all indoor cultivation operations.
- P. On or about May 1, 2018 the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors adopted the Cannabis Business License Ordinance, Chapter 50 of the County Code, which added a requirement for a local cannabis business license, added an acreage limit of 186 acres in the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District, and a limit of 8 retail licenses in the County. However, Chapter 50, Section 50-5.3 exempted legal nonconforming medical marijuana cultivation sites established under County Code Section 35-1003, until they are terminated, pursuant to County Code Section 35-1003.C. The Business License Ordinance allowed the County Executive Office to accept affidavits to support the approval of State licenses from

persons or entities who claimed under penalty of perjury that their cultivation operation preceded January 2016 and that the cultivation was lawful under prior law. The business License ordinance was not certified as part of the Local Coastal Plan.

- Q. On April 9, 2019, the Board of Supervisors amended Chapter 50-17 to add, under grounds for denial of a license:

“b) The Applicant has knowingly, willfully or negligently made a false statement of material fact or omitted a material fact from: 1. The application for a cannabis business license; or 2. Any prior affidavit to the County concerning cannabis, whether medical marijuana or non-medical marijuana;”

However, County staff has continued to authorize additional provisional licenses without first investigating whether any prior affidavit contained a material misrepresentation or omission of fact.

- R. The County has continued to authorize provisional licenses, as shown in Exhibit 1. As of June 29, 2019, the State had issued **683 Provisional licenses** to Santa Barbara County cannabis cultivators since February 2019, authorized by the County CEO.
- S. The County’s expectation that the allowance of provisional licenses by the State would sunset by a date certain, and that any licensee who failed to enter and complete the permit process by a date certain would cease cultivation, has not been met. Instead, the State Legislature has taken action, and continues to take action, to extend existing licenses and to allow additional provisional licenses. Any extensions of deadlines by the State Legislature or State Licensing authority will unacceptably perpetuate the nuisance effects and unacceptable impacts of cannabis cultivation to the public health, safety, welfare, economy and environment. Under existing law, without Provisional Annual licenses, existing cannabis operators not in possession of a local land use entitlement, local cannabis business license, and a State Annual license should have ceased operations upon expiration of their State temporary cannabis licenses.
- T. Those nonconforming cultivation sites with no odor control are causing significant nuisance effects on the surrounding population in both the unincorporated and incorporated areas of the County. The continued operation of these cultivation sites without odor control also constitutes unfair competition against those prospective operators which are awaiting approval of land use and zoning permits to begin operations. The County has been advised that a few of the license holders have voluntarily installed odor control technology pending the County’s consideration of their land use permits, however, there has been no opportunity for testing or verification by the County, or the County Air Pollution Control District, of those technologies to demonstrate that they represent the best available technology, as required by the County’s ordinance.
- U. The County’s ordinance at Section 35-1003 provides for termination of Legal Nonconforming Uses as follows:

The legal nonconforming uses described in subsection B. shall terminate:

In the inland areas (i.e., the areas located outside of the coastal zone of Santa Barbara County), either (1) six months after the board of supervisors' action on February 6, 2018, regarding a county cannabis cultivation ordinance, or (2) 18 months from December 15, 2017, the effective date of Ordinance No. 5019, whichever is longer; and

In the coastal zone, either (1) six months after the coastal commission certifies the board-adopted amendments to the local coastal program regarding the cannabis cultivation ordinance, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 30514, or (2) if the board does not adopt a county cannabis cultivation ordinance on February 6, 2018, then 18 months from December 15, 2017, the effective date of Ordinance No. 5019, whichever is longer.

If the county cannabis ordinance referenced above allows for cultivation of medical cannabis but requires a zoning permit to do so, operators of nonconforming medical marijuana cultivation locations that have submitted a **complete application** to the Santa Barbara County Planning and Development Department to permit their nonconforming cultivation site by the termination date listed above may continue to operate their **same** existing nonconforming medical marijuana cultivation site while their permit application is being processed, as long as the operator continues to manage the cultivation location in compliance with the requirements of article X, state law, and the applicable provision of either the County Land Use and Development Code Section 35.101.020 (Nonconforming Uses of Land and Structures), the Montecito Land Use and Development Code Section 35.491.020 (Nonconforming Uses of Land and Structures), or article II, the coastal zoning ordinance section 35-161 (Nonconforming Uses of Land, Buildings, and Structures). It is solely within the department's discretion to determine if it has received a complete permit application.

The "longer" amortization period provided in the ordinance expired on or about June 17, 2019. Nevertheless, the County staff has continued to authorize provisional licenses after that date.

Members of the public have provided evidence that a number of the cultivators have failed to submit a complete application, within the meaning of the Permit Streamlining Act, prior to the deadline, or have changed or expanded their pre-existing operation so that it no longer qualifies as a legal nonconforming use under the County's ordinance. In addition, there has been no determination prior to the deadline that environmental review of each application has commenced, as required by State law. Because the County certified a Program EIR (PEIR) to support its cannabis ordinances, it must determine, as to each individual permit application, that the PEIR is adequate for that operation, before the expiration date of the nonconforming use provisions, and has not done so.

- V. Section 35-144U also specifically provides: **"the Board of Supervisors later may need to change the zoning of cannabis activities to being prohibited and may need to do so without cannabis activities receiving: 1) an amortization period; and/or 2) legal nonconforming use status."** It was not the intention of the Board of Supervisors to allow cannabis cultivation, whether legal nonconforming or not, to continue past the effective dates of Ordinance No. 5019 without mitigation for its impacts, including most significantly, its odor impacts.

Therefore, it is hereby ordained that:

1. Notwithstanding the provisions of any previously adopted County ordinance regulating cannabis licensing or cultivation, the continued cultivation of cannabis as a legal nonconforming use is prohibited and subject to abatement as a public nuisance, unless within 30 days of the effective date of this ordinance,

- (a) the owner, lessor, lessee and licensee of any cultivation site or premises on which cannabis cultivation is continuing to occur under the nonconforming use provisions of the licensing or zoning ordinance, jointly provide documentation to the County of Santa Barbara Planning and Development Department of the legal nonconforming use, and the Planning Director verifies that the cannabis plants are limited in their location on each parcel such that there is a minimum 1500 feet setback from existing residences and other existing developed agriculture, including but not limited to avocados and vineyards.

AND

- (b) The owner, lessor, lessee and licensee of any cultivation site provides evidence that the operation is *the same* as it was on January 1, 2016 as required by Section 35-1003. Any operator who does not meet their burden to prove that they were in operation on January 1, 2016 and that they have not enlarged, expanded or otherwise increased the intensity of use of the site shall cease cultivation within 30 days of the effective date of this ordinance. For purposes of this determination, the scope of legal nonconforming use under prior law was limited to the number of plants allowed for medicinal purposes.

2. The Planning Director shall post all verifications provided under Section 1 above on the County's Cannabis Website within 24 hours of verification so that the public remains informed of which operations are authorized to continue.
3. The County will not accept any new applications for cannabis cultivation until one year after all applicants currently in permit review have begun operations, and have undergone compliance review to test and determine that odor impacts have been mitigated such that odors are not perceptible beyond the permitted parcel boundary;
4. Until one year after all applicants currently in permit review have begun operations, and have undergone compliance review to test and determine that odor impacts have been mitigated such that odors are not perceptible beyond the permitted parcel boundary, the County will not approve or issue more than one land use permit for a single cultivation site per legal parcel, to the first operation to receive final land use approvals.

In order to eliminate "license stacking" the County will not approve provisional licenses or development permits to allow cultivation on more than one acre per legal parcel for parcels in the AG-I zone district.

5. Notwithstanding any change that the State Legislature has made or may make which has the effect of extending temporary or provisional State licenses, the County's provisions

establishing deadlines for bringing existing nonconforming operations into conformance shall not be extended. To give meaning to these deadlines, any cultivator operating under a provisional permit and who has applied for a land use permit shall cease cultivation unless, on or before June 17, 2019,

- (a) the Planning and Development department has found the application complete under the Permit Streamlining Act, and has all information necessary to approve or deny a permit; and
- (b) Environmental review is “underway”. For purposes of this provision, environmental review is “underway” only if the Planning and Development Department had completed an Initial Study to determine whether the Program EIR certified by the Board is adequate under CEQA to support the approval of the permit.

For any application in the process for which the conditions of 5(a) and 5(b) are not found to exist, the Planning and Development department shall summarily deny the permit application and direct the cultivator to cease operations.

Section 2. Applicability This Ordinance applies within all unincorporated areas of Santa Barbara County.

Section 3. Public Nuisance. A violation of any provision of this Ordinance shall be deemed to be a public nuisance and subject to the enforcement process as set forth .

Section 4. Severability. If any provision, word, phrase, section or subsection of this Ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Ordinance and the application of such provision, word, phrase, section or subsection to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby. To this end, provisions of this Ordinance are severable.

Section 5. No Vested Right To Be Established. The Board of Supervisors declares that this urgency ordinance is enacted for the limited purposes described above and for the time period allowed by law. No existing cultivation site or continuing cultivation site shall acquire any right to continue the cultivation of cannabis by virtue of the provisions of this Ordinance.

Section 6. Effective Date. The Board of Supervisors declares that this Ordinance is necessary as an urgency measure for preserving the public health, safety and welfare. This Ordinance shall take effect immediately upon its passage and shall remain in effect until _____.

July 2, 2019

TO: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors

FROM: Santa Barbara County Coalition for Responsible Cannabis

Dear Supervisors:

We have reviewed the Board letter and most recent memo for your scheduled hearing of July 9, 2019. While we may support some or all of the items on the Agenda, we are very disappointed that in this process, and despite the public hearing at the Carpinteria City Council, the County has not included a single item on the Agenda which would ameliorate the *ongoing* nuisance impacts of cannabis cultivation. Over the past two months, we, and others, have implored you to address, in a systematic fashion, the source of most of those impacts: those cultivators who either never had a legal nonconforming operation prior to 2016, or who have increased the intensity of use on their properties contrary to the limitations set forth in the nonconforming use provisions of the County's ordinances. We do appreciate that your revised Board letter of June 28 provides provides you the opportunity to take additional action, now, to address deteriorating conditions, especially those expressed in recent Resolutions and letters to your Board from the City of Carpinteria and other jurisdictions. Your Board is specifically authorized to take such action by Government Code Section 65858(f) which states:

“(f) Notwithstanding subdivision (e), upon termination of a prior interim ordinance, the legislative body may adopt another interim ordinance pursuant to this section provided that the new interim ordinance is adopted to protect the public safety, health, and welfare from an event, occurrence, or set of circumstances different from the event, occurrence, or set of circumstances that led to the adoption of the prior interim ordinance.”

Despite the fact that Board members expressed their opposition to actions by the State Legislature to continue exemptions for projects in permit review, instead of taking action to protect local control, (which State law allows) your Executive Office has compounded the issues by continuing to authorize provisional licenses on non-conforming projects that have never been validated and whose land use applications are far from complete, *even after the end date in your ordinance for continuation of nonconforming uses has expired*. (See Exhibit 1) In addition, despite the fact that your Board adopted ordinance amendments in April to address cultivators who obtained their licenses through fraud, we are not aware of any systematic effort to identify those cultivators or direct them to abate.

In light of the above, we are providing draft urgency ordinances for your Board to consider which would have the effect of minimizing the nuisance impacts of odor from ongoing, unpermitted cannabis operations, both in the coastal zone and in the inland areas. These ordinances are narrowly tailored to address the specific problem: cultivators who either lied on their affidavits to obtain licenses, or have unlawfully expanded their operation from January of 2016, and who do not have any controls on their operation which would mitigate odor impacts, either in the form of odor control technology, or in adequate setbacks from existing residences or pre existing agricultural operations.

We are asking that County Counsel review these draft ordinances, make whatever changes he deems necessary, and that you agendize and adopt these ordinances at your July 9 meeting.

It is past time for your Board to take *meaningful* action to protect your constituents.

Very Truly Yours,

Coalition for Responsible Cannabis

Encl: Urgency Ordinances- coastal and inland; Exhibit 1, list of provisional licenses as of 7-1-19

PML18-0001817	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Jolly farms Inc.	Small Outdoor	06/21/2019	06/21/2020	Mariocopa - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0002641	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Twisted Roots Inc	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	06/19/2019	06/19/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0002639	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Twisted Roots Inc	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	06/19/2019	06/19/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0002638	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Twisted Roots Inc	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	06/19/2019	06/19/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0002500	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Flora Coast Inc.	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	06/19/2019	06/19/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0002498	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Flora Coast Inc.	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	06/19/2019	06/19/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0002497	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Flora Coast Inc.	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	06/19/2019	06/19/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0003754	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Flora Coast Inc.	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	06/19/2019	06/19/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0003752	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Ceres Farm, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	06/18/2019	06/18/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0002339	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Ceres Farm, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	06/18/2019	06/18/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001191	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Foxen Canyon Farms, LLC	Nursery	06/17/2019	06/17/2020	Santa Maria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0000696	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	805 Ag Holdings LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	06/13/2019	06/13/2020	Santa Maria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0000285	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Sunshine Organics Greens, Inc	Processor	06/12/2019	06/12/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0000283	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Sunshine Organics Greens, Inc	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	06/12/2019	06/12/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0000787	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Sunshine Organics Greens, Inc	Nursery	06/12/2019	06/12/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0003757	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Canna Rios LLC	Small Outdoor	06/12/2019	06/12/2020	Unincorporated - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0003751	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Ceres Farm, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	06/10/2019	06/10/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0003750	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Ceres Farm, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	06/10/2019	06/10/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0003764	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Ceres Farm, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	06/10/2019	06/10/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0003762	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Ceres Farm, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	06/10/2019	06/10/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0003759	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Ceres Farm, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	06/10/2019	06/10/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0003758	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Ceres Farm, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	06/10/2019	06/10/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0003756	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Ceres Farm, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	06/10/2019	06/10/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0000576	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Michael Nutik	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	06/07/2019	06/07/2020	Buellton - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001497	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Mixed-Light Tier 2	06/06/2019	06/06/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001496	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	06/06/2019	06/06/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001494	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	06/06/2019	06/06/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001493	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	06/06/2019	06/06/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001492	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	06/06/2019	06/06/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001491	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	06/06/2019	06/06/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001489	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	06/06/2019	06/06/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001468	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	06/06/2019	06/06/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001466	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	06/06/2019	06/06/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001462	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	06/06/2019	06/06/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001460	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	06/06/2019	06/06/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001458	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	06/06/2019	06/06/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001457	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	06/06/2019	06/06/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County

PML19-0001074	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Lily's Green Garden, Inc.	Processor	05/24/2019	05/24/2020	Santa Maria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0001283	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Lily's Green Garden, Inc.	Small Outdoor	05/24/2019	05/24/2020	Santa Maria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0001284	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Lily's Green Garden, Inc.	Small Outdoor	05/24/2019	05/24/2020	Santa Maria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0001286	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Lily's Green Garden, Inc.	Small Outdoor	05/24/2019	05/24/2020	Santa Maria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0001251	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Lily's Green Garden, Inc.	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	05/24/2019	05/24/2020	Santa Maria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0001252	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Lily's Green Garden, Inc.	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	05/24/2019	05/24/2020	Santa Maria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0001255	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Lily's Green Garden, Inc.	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	05/24/2019	05/24/2020	Santa Maria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0002745	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	California Cannabis Ventures, LLC	Specialty Mixed-Light Tier 2	05/24/2019	05/24/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0003136	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Blue Whale Agriculture	Nursery	05/24/2019	05/24/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0001257	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Lily's Green Garden, Inc.	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	05/24/2019	05/24/2020	Santa Maria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001675	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Ultra Flowers, Inc.	Medium Mixed-Light Tier 2	05/20/2019	05/20/2020	Unincorporated - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001445	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	jolly farms inc	Specialty Indoor	05/20/2019	05/20/2020	Mariocopa - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001447	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	jolly farms inc	Medium Outdoor	05/20/2019	05/20/2020	Mariocopa - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001446	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Jolly Farms, inc	Specialty Indoor	05/20/2019	05/20/2020	Mariocopa - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001974	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	jolly farms inc	Small Outdoor	05/16/2019	05/16/2020	Unincorporated - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001953	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	05/09/2019	05/09/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001920	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	05/09/2019	05/09/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001487	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	05/09/2019	05/09/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001486	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	05/09/2019	05/09/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001485	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	05/09/2019	05/09/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001481	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	05/09/2019	05/09/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001479	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	05/09/2019	05/09/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001439	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Gypsy Canyon Farms	Small Outdoor	05/09/2019	05/09/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001523	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Herbal Angels	Small Outdoor	05/09/2019	05/09/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001522	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Herbal Angels	Small Outdoor	05/09/2019	05/09/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001521	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Herbal Angels	Small Outdoor	05/09/2019	05/09/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0003138	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Herbal Angels	Small Outdoor	05/09/2019	05/09/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0000340	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Twisted Roots Inc	Nursery	05/09/2019	05/09/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0000339	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	CVW Organic Farms	Nursery	05/07/2019	05/07/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0000338	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	CVW Organic Farms	Processor	05/07/2019	05/07/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML19-0000337	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	CVW Organic Farms	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	05/07/2019	05/07/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001502	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	CVW Organic Farms	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	05/07/2019	05/07/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001501	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Herbal Angels	Small Outdoor	05/05/2019	05/05/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001529	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Herbal Angels	Small Outdoor	05/05/2019	05/05/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001500	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Herbal Angels	Small Outdoor	05/05/2019	05/05/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001528	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Herbal Angels	Medium Outdoor	05/05/2019	05/05/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001527	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Herbal Angels	Small Outdoor	05/05/2019	05/05/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001526	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Herbal Angels	Small Outdoor	05/05/2019	05/05/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County

PML18-0002990	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	THC Farms	Nursery	04/05/2019	04/05/2020	Unincorporated - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0005886	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Klona	Nursery	03/18/2019	03/18/2020	Santa Barbara - Santa Barbara County
PML18-000109	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Funny Farms	Specialty Mixed-Light Tier 1	03/12/2019	03/12/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-000108	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Funny Farms	Small Outdoor	03/12/2019	03/12/2020	Lompoc - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0002677	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Ednigma, Inc.	Nursery	03/11/2019	03/11/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001733	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Bosim 1628 Management Company, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 2	03/10/2019	03/10/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001656	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Bosim 1628 Management Company, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 2	03/07/2019	03/07/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001651	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Bosim 1628 Management Company, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 2	03/07/2019	03/07/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001648	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Bosim 1628 Management Company, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 2	03/07/2019	03/07/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001677	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Bosim 1628 Management Company, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 2	03/07/2019	03/07/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001640	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Bosim 1628 Management Company, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 2	03/07/2019	03/07/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001676	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Bosim 1628 Management Company, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 2	03/07/2019	03/07/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001672	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Bosim 1628 Management Company, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 2	03/06/2019	03/06/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001671	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Bosim 1628 Management Company, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 2	03/06/2019	03/06/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001669	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Bosim 1628 Management Company, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 2	03/06/2019	03/06/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001689	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Bosim 1628 Management Company, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 2	03/06/2019	03/06/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001716	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Bosim 1628 Management Company, LLC	Processor	03/06/2019	03/06/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001710	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Bosim 1628 Management Company, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 2	03/06/2019	03/06/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001735	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Bosim 1628 Management Company, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 2	03/06/2019	03/06/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001731	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Bosim 1628 Management, LLC	Nursery	03/06/2019	03/06/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001730	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Bosim 1628 Management Company, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 2	03/06/2019	03/06/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001728	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Bosim 1628 Management Company, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 2	03/06/2019	03/06/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0001748	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Bosim 1628 Management, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 2	03/06/2019	03/06/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0000865	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Bosim 1628 Management Company, LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 2	03/06/2019	03/06/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0000315	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Olivella, Inc.	Specialty Cottage Mixed-Light Tier 1	03/03/2019	03/03/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County
PML18-0000235	Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation Provisional License	Autumn Brands LLC	Small Mixed-Light Tier 1	02/27/2019	02/27/2020	Carpinteria - Santa Barbara County

Relis, Mia

From: Kristen <kristen@kristenwalker.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 4, 2019 8:49 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Don't regulate our cannabis farmers out of business

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:

I support the legal cannabis industry, which supports numerous new, high paying jobs in our County. I'm writing to request that no additional changes be made to the Cannabis Ordinance.

My name is Kristen Walker, founder of SBVerde.com, a locally based site that helps visitors explore cannabis in Santa Barbara County. I am also the co-founder of the 805 Cannabis Society, a group that supports networking as well as diversity within our local industry.

I am a mom with a dream of starting and growing a small business that supports my two girls and gives our family more economic stability and allows me the freedom to be there for my kids as they get older as well as help pay for their college educations, etc. You know, basically the American dream in a nutshell :)

I see our local industry getting painted in some very negative ways. Cannabis carries a lot of stigma with it, I am well aware, and I think that is really getting in the way of rational thinking. No other industry is as regulated, and putting the screws into our farmers who have jumped through hoop after hoop is not forward thinking. This is a new and burgeoning industry and will stand the test of time long after the naysayers have gotten used to the fact that cannabis is just as legitimate a crop as garlic or broccoli (two other very odoriferous crops).

The other way I see our industry getting painted locally is that it's full of well-healed fat cats preying on lax local laws to come in and make millions. Well, here I am, a local mom whose day job is at the Santa Barbara County Education Office. This new local industry has given me, and other local, small entrepreneurs like me, a new way to support ourselves and sustain our livelihoods on the Central Coast (not an easy feat for regular folks). I have seen all kinds of new local small businesses begin to emerge because of our county's new local cannabis industry—testing labs are coming to life (Delta Leaf Labs), a new "cannabus" for cannabis tourism has sprung up down south, and new CBD companies are taking shape locally (SB CBD, 101 CBD, etc.), not to mention local brands who are growing in our county (Bluebird, Autumn Brands, Raw Garden, etc).

I know you are under the gun from a small group of very loud opponents, but please try to stay strong in your resolve and support of this industry. The cannabis train has left the station and putting good local businesses out of business with heaps of suffocating regulations helps no one, including locals like me for whom this industry has provided new and much needed economic opportunities to.

I am hoping to make the meeting on July 9, or at least get to the Santa Barbara location to give a public comment. These meetings have been pretty much impossible for me to attend because I work full days Monday through Wednesday at my day job at the County Education Office and on Thursday and Friday I am with my girls (and I don't think a 2 year old and 6 year old would fair well at a BOS meeting, no offense :)).

And BTW, a fun fact I ran into while doing some research is that in the late 1800's the Spaniards decided to grow hemp as an export fiber crop.

They grew it at a handful of missions, including the one I live right down the street from, the Santa Barbara Mission. At that time in our history, Santa Barbara provided 40% of the State of California's hemp.

So everything old is new again. Let's keep to our agricultural roots and take part in this new economy.

I ask that you reject further restrictions on the industry and allow the cannabis growers time to comply with the well-crafted Ordinance already in place.

Thanks for hearing me out,

Kristen Walker

718 A Mission Canyon Road

Santa Barbara, CA 93105

(805) 450-3562

Relis, Mia

From: Patricia Saragosa <patricia.saragosa@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 4, 2019 11:08 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Marijuana odor & two Board of Supervisors.

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.

My wife and I both feel that prior to anyone getting a provisional Marijuana use permit, they should show that they have a proven odor control system that works and that has been verified by an independent source not just the manufacture.

There also should be set back from schools and residential neighborhoods. They should also have a fire sprinkler system. A fire friend of mine said if the marijuana nurseries had a fire the toxic smoke from the plastic green houses could be disastrous. Lastly both supervisors Williams and Lavagnino should recuse themselves as they are in the back pocket of the marijuana growers and not looking out for the peoples needs only their own.

Respectfully submitted Zave and Patricia Saragosa

Relis, Mia

From: Judy Pearce <jpearce41@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 4, 2019 11:10 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Board of Supervisors, cannabis issue meeting July 9th
Attachments: Supervisors.odt

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.

Please pass my letter, attached, to the members of our Board of Supervisors. Thank you, Judy Pearce

Supervisors

5528 Canalino Drive
Carpinteria, CA 93013
(805) 684-6556

Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
Santa Maria, CA

Dear Supervisors of Santa Barbara County,

Concerning the cannabis issue in Carpinteria I feel you did a creditable and thoughtful job deciding on rules and regulations. I can't imagine any more need to be added. The permitted growers have followed your rules and don't deserve added regulations, it would be like changing horses in midstream. The Dutch Van Wingerden family of Carpinteria have been growing flowers for over 50 years in our community but the influx of South American cheaper flowers have desimated their business. The Van Winderdens have contributed to non-profits in Carpinteria in many ways and deserve our thanks and support for their current business. To my mind their other option to growing cannabis is to sell property for housing development which would alter the argriculture nature of our area.

During Prohibition there were many agents to enforce the law against achohol and when it ended in 1933 the question was, "What to do with them?" I saw a documentry on PBS about this issue. Making marijuana illegal kept the agents employed and was instituted, not because it was dangerous in any way, but to get rid of Mexicans in the South West. The law was you had to prove you had marijuana to get a permit to legally have it and, of course, when they came in to show their marijuana they were told they "illegally" had it without a permit: "Out you go back to Mexico".

The current citizens against growing cannabis in Carpinteria use tatics like William R. Hearst did in his "yellow journalism" articles for his newspapers; tell fabricated "facts" to convince the public the devil weed has arrived. A docent at Hearst Castle said Hearst and his cronies owned forests and since hemp could be used to make paper they didn't want the competition for their trees. Hence, lies, lies, lies, the docent said, by Mr. Hearst.

I grew up in Montecito (4th generation), raised children there and moved to Carpinteria 43 years ago. The majority of Carpinterians don't resent the cannibas growers, after all we voted to legalize marijuana. Please don't let a small group of our neighbors cower you into adding regulations they have dreamt up to actually exclude local, legal growers from continuing with their businesses.

Thank you for considering both sides of this issue. Judy Pearce

Relis, Mia

From: Geiger Family <doddbeth@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 4, 2019 1:11 PM
To: Williams, Das
Subject: Cannabis

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 County Board of Supervisors,

I am writing this letter with concern about the cannabis regulations in Santa Barbara County. We commend the letters submitted by the cities of Carpinteria and Goleta, urging significant amendments to the County's regulatory framework for cannabis. We need to fix the Land Use Ordinance in order to address the issues surrounding the cannabis permits.

I believe that Das Williams and Steve Lavagnino should recuse themselves from voting on cannabis related items given the information revealed in the LA Times article. This may help restore the public trust.

We are very concerned the Coastal zone does not have strong enough protections; a ban on growing on smaller parcels in this zone or require a CUP for these land permits.

The county must stop its practice of authorizing state provisional licenses!

We support the draft Urgency Ordinance submitted to the County by the Santa Barbara Coalition for Responsible Cannabis. This draft ordinance would allow the County to minimize many of the nuisance impacts of odor from ongoing, un-permitted cannabis operations.

The setbacks for schools need to be extended to at least 1,000 feet from property line to property line! The odors and emissions can travel very long distances and our children should be protected from any possible harm this may cause. No amount of money generated by this industry is worth sacrificing the well being of our children!!

Do not allow permit stacking. The concentration and density of cannabis grows are unprecedented!

The County should require the clear best practices of other states who have dealt with this issue - carbon filtration and sealed, industrial greenhouses seem to be the safest way to deal with odor abatement.

As long time residents of Santa Barbara County, we are very disappointed that regulations to protect our health and well-being have been cast aside in order to line the pockets of a few individuals and companies who wish to make a profit from growing cannabis here. We have no problem with cannabis, only the way it is grown in and around our homes with insignificant regulations, for which our families will ultimately pay the price. Please do the right thing by the citizens of this County.

Sincerely,

Beth and Dodd Geiger

Relis, Mia

From: George Zwerdling <geehzee@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 4, 2019 3:32 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Marijuana 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.

To: SB COUNTY SUPERVISORS

Please give careful consideration to the issues raised by Concerned Carpinterians. As we're finding out more about the downside of cannabis, many of us have come to share their concerns. Of particular concern is the stench. We are very fortunate to live in a place like S B County. We should not allow a few to pollute the environment of the many. In a community in which most things are carefully regulated, it would seem that cannabis is getting a free pass. I hope you will rectify this unfortunate situation.

Thank you.
George Zwerdling
3138 Serena Ave
Carpinteria

Relis, Mia

From: Miyasato, Mona
Sent: Thursday, July 4, 2019 8:22 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Fwd: Marijuana Meeting

Begin forwarded message:

From: George Zwerdling <geehzee@gmail.com>
Date: July 4, 2019 at 4:41:30 PM PDT
To: "A.L. Bardach" <abardach@aol.com>, "mmyasato@countyofsb.org"
<mmyasato@countyofsb.org>, Michael@igsb.com
Cc: dvillalo@co.santa-barbara.ca.us
Subject: Fwd: Marijuana 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.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: George Zwerdling <geehzee@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Jul 4, 2019 at 3:32 PM
Subject: Marijuana Meeting
To: <sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>

To: SB COUNTY SUPERVISORS

Please give careful consideration to the issues raised by Concerned Carpenterians. As we're finding out more about the downside of cannabis, many of us have come to share their concerns. Of particular concern is the stench. We are very fortunate to live in a place like S B County. We should not allow a few to pollute the environment of the many. In a community in which most things are carefully regulated, it would seem that cannabis is getting a free pass. I hope you will rectify this unfortunate situation.

Thank you.

George Zwerdling
3138 Serena Ave
Carpinteria

Relis, Mia

From: Tina Fanucchi-Frontado <tina-f@cox.net>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 6:59 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: County Board of Supervisors Meeting – July 9, 2019

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 Santa Barbara County Supervisors:

Carpinteria “Carp” has one **High School**, a **Boy’s & Girl’s Club** and a **Girls Inc.** These establishments are within a few blocks of each other, and are filled to capacity resulting in lots and lots of kids.

All these kids’ equal lots and lots of parents, “*Carp Parents*,” the most protective, organized, vocal and powerful group in our community. *Carp Parents* are loud and proud about everything relating to critical district matters; just ask a Carp Superintendent, School Board Member, Principal, or Teacher...

The local anti-cannabis message advertises “impacts” these establishments and surrounding areas endure because of cannabis farming-- They tout “hazardous odor” have and continue to cause large scale debilitating impacts to all who attend and live in this area. This ad has been running for almost two years now, asking community members to take action against our local farmers. So you have to ask yourself, with impacts so devastating and widespread where are the parents? the *Carp Parents* who don’t put up with any form of threats to their children, **Carp Parents** who regularly flood school board meetings and pen opinions in Coastal View News, why aren’t **Carp Parents** shouting with concern over cannabis farming? Where’s the Superintendent? High School Principal? Teachers? Directors of: Boys and Girls Club? Girls Inc., the neighbors?????.....

As a lifelong resident of Carpinteria, I feel pretty confident in stating that if **Carp Parents** haven’t come out in mass to join the anti-cannabis group, following two years of fear messaging, that the message has proven to be an ad and not a reality. Plus, at our last City Council meeting, hundreds and hundreds of local parents, business owners, and community leaders came out In Support of our local cannabis farmers.

As a resident of La Mirada off of Foothill, I have found a similar reality. Out of nearly 40+ homes in the neighborhood, there’s a tiny handful who claim they’re impacted by odor, however the remaining 97+% of the neighborhood reports not being impacted at all.


I live at 3678 Foothill Road (I invite you to a beverage on my porch and walk around the neighborhood) with cannabis farmers to the right and left of me. There’s absolutely no odor nuisance and as a Carpinterian born and raised, I too speak my truth and wouldn’t stand for any neighbor degrading my quality of life. I support our local cannabis farmers because they are proven respectable, conscientious, professional neighbors. And I love the fact cannabis is the cleanest, most environmentally friendly product ever grown in these greenhouses. I Love that an occasional sprinter van has replaced the relentless, battering semi-trucks, I love the conservation of water through closed-loop irrigations, I love the use of beneficial pesticides and that workers are paid a living wage- And I love seeing dilapidated greenhouse restored. Without a doubt, the pros of this new crop are incredible wins for our community.

Last year, I and two other Carpinterians felt the need to pool our resources, skills and launch KopSun-a Cannabis Information & Education Resource. Our only goal was/is to provide resources so the public could

learn about the medical, health and wellness offerings of this plant. We developed a program named **Leaf Learning**. Our venue is filled to capacity monthly with mostly 60-80 year olds all wanting to learn how to use cannabis for what ails them. Our over 7,000 followers and members support cannabis education and the benefits of knowing exactly where and how their cannabis is grown.

Our cannabis farmers are dedicated and community focused people, proven, trusted business owners and vastly committed to holding the Gold Star in licensing and compliance. I encourage you to allow all the hard work required in creating this ordinance to do its job. Please know the majority of our community supports and stands with our local cannabis growers and they will continue to use their voice and vote to reflect such.

Tina L. Fanucchi-Frontado
3678 Foothill Road, Carpinteria

 Virus-free. www.avast.com

Relis, Mia

From: Janet Malone <hiteach805@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 8:15 AM
To: Williams, Das
Cc: sbcob
Subject: Cannabis regulation in Carpinteria 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.

County of Santa Barbara supervisors:

I am a current resident property owner in the city of Carpinteria and have enjoyed the quality of life this agricultural community has provided for the past 50 years. The quality of life is in jeopardy due to the county of Santa Barbara's decisions regarding the newly arrived cannabis industry.

The legalizing and regulation of cannabis is an excuse for compromising the health and reputation of an entire community. Air pollution is not stopped at the boundary line between a city and a county. I live on the boundary between Carpinteria and Santa Barbara County. There is no protection against air pollution, increased traffic and the infamous odor. Allowing the large quantity of licenses for cannabis in such a community is unconscionable!

Citizens and current agriculture (avocados etc) should not be forced to adapt to a new industry solely to give a few businesses more profit. The flower industry may not be as profitable as it was but Carpinteria should not lose its quality of life for hundreds of people to allow a few people to make more money!

Please protect hundreds of people by doing the right thing to protect Carpinteria Valley from being controlled and abused by a new cannabis industry. The county has the responsibility and power to maintain a high quality of life for its residents.

Janet Malone
4961 Foothill Rd.
Carpinteria, California 93013
805 684 5983

Relis, Mia

From: Sarah Trigueiro <sarah.trigueiro@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 8:46 AM
To: Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Subject: Public Comment Letter - 7/9 Meeting on Cannabis Regs

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 hope everyone had a wonderful 4th of July! I wanted to write in advance of the 7/9 meeting to express my views on the cannabis regulations and where I believe significant amendments are necessary in order to protect residents, schoolchildren, tourism and existing Right to Farm agricultural interests. First off, I commend the letters submitted to you by the Cities of Carpinteria and Goleta, urging changes to the County's regulatory and enforcement framework for cannabis. The cannabis regulatory framework has failed, and it is time to go back to the drawing board. Fixing the Land Use Ordinance (regulations) is the only way to do this well. Amending only the Business License is "lipstick on a pig" - we need to fix the land use and permitting aspects since they are much stronger controls.

No Differential Zoning Treatment for Coastal Zone:

The Coastal Zone deserves equal if not stronger protections than inland. Having stronger controls for inland Ag parcels vs coastal Ag parcels would be unacceptable (and legally fraught) differential zoning treatment. Please consider a commercial cannabis ban on AG-1-20 acre or under parcels in the Coastal Zone (given clearly demonstrated incompatible use issues), or, at minimum require CUPs (Conditional Use Permits) for any commercial cannabis grows in the Coastal Zone.

Provisional Licenses, Land Use Permits & CDPs:

--The County must stop its practice of authorizing state provisional licenses. The state keeps extending provisional license timetables, but the County does not have to be complicit in this by authorizing these at the county level (which is required in order for them to be valid).

--The County should not issue any more land use permits or CDP approvals until there is an independent investigation and clean up of the County's affidavit mess (which allowed cannabis cultivation to proliferate under the guise of "legal non-conforming use"). Many growers lied on their affidavits in claiming they were growing medical marijuana prior to the cutoff date in 2016. Others illegally expanded their operations when under legal non-conforming status, which is not legal. The County did nothing to validate the truthfulness of the grower affidavits. There should be an investigation into how this gross negligence occurred, as well as a County review of each affidavit to demand proof of the growers' claims (eg that they were growing medical marijuana and how many plants). Such proof should be publicly posted to restore public trust in the County's process. Any grower who cannot prove the veracity of the affidavit needs to be shut down by the County, since it is not a valid legal non-conforming use. The County should also not approve such growers in the future (including any entities wholly or partially owned by such person or entity, including a beneficial ownership test).

--I wholeheartedly support for the draft Urgency Ordinance submitted to the County by the Santa Barbara Coalition for Responsible Cannabis. This draft ordinance would allow the County to minimize many of the nuisance impacts of odor from ongoing, unpermitted cannabis operations and is aimed at growers who lied on affidavits or expanded operations unlawfully after becoming a "legal non conforming use," and who do not have odor control or adequate setbacks in place.

Environmental and Health - EIR and APCD Concerns:

--Under applicable laws, cannabis is not considered a "crop" under the Right to Farm Act. Manufacturing is not an "Agricultural Operation". APCD also has clear jurisdiction here, which they have essentially abdicated by referring to cannabis as a "crop". The County and APCD have not evaluated the significant air pollution environmental issues caused by commercial cannabis grows. Other areas (Denver and Vancouver) are grappling with this - we need to care about the environment and air quality and adjust the regulations accordingly.

--Reopen CEQA review since the County's EIR did not address the impact of cannabis terpenes/VOCs on ozone and smog air pollution, which is a significant issue in Denver and Vancouver. Air pollution (ozone/smog formation due to cannabis cultivation in sunny, high-traffic, inversion-layer-prone areas) was not covered in the County's EIR and is a very material environmental impact that needs to be evaluated. The EIR focused on odor, when there is a much deeper air pollution issue that needs to be reckoned with. Ozone and smog affect respiratory and cardiovascular health.

Nuisance Protections for Impacted Groups:

--We need a date certain for 100% odor control and shutdown of non-compliant operations. This date cannot be dependent on first completing land use approvals, as growers should have to prove odor abatement before being eligible for a land use permit. The County's regulatory framework of requiring a land use permit prior to enforcement is nonsensical and risks providing an undeserved entitlement to an operator who has not earned it. It makes residents guinea pigs and is skewed shamelessly toward growers. Other counties have not taken such a backwards approach.

--We need much more significant setbacks for schools, at least 1000' property line to property line. Cannabis odors and emissions can travel very long distances. Carpinteria High School and Foothill Road reek of marijuana, and this and other air quality aspects are having health impacts.

--Residents are sensitive receptors. Please include them in the definition as such.

--Odor abatement is the County's responsibility and should not rely on residents for enforcement. The County should require the clear best practices of other states that have tread deeper into this space - carbon filtration and sealed, industrial greenhouses. Realistically, commercial cannabis growing, when done right, is an industrial, not an agricultural use, given the air pollution/emissions issues and need for sealed, closed-loop, HVAC-heavy buildings to prevent externalities. Require independent, county-funded review of odor control technologies for effectiveness and impact on public health (long-term, cumulative exposure across multiple grows) prior to allowing use.

--The County should supplement police presence in Carpinteria Valley and other grow areas, given that this is a cash business and unfortunately has involved human trafficking and other criminal risks (robberies of greenhouses, etc).

Reduce Density and Concentration of Use:

--Do not allow permit stacking. The concentration and density of grows are unprecedented. The County now has the largest planned cannabis grows in the world. This is shocking. We also have inappropriate density of cannabis grows in heavily populated areas surrounding residences, EDRNs and schools.

--Revisit acreage caps for Carpinteria Valley. 186 acres is way too much and was clearly not an informed decision when it was taken.

Ask Yourself, Is It Really Worth It, Internalizing the Full Costs?

We need an Economic Impact Study that more holistically addresses the realistic revenues and extensive costs of our cannabis regulations (enforcement, residential property value declines, decreases in tourism revenue, damage to existing businesses and genuine Right to Farm agricultural uses, etc). Revenues are far below hyped-up initial estimates, and the County should consider and estimate the full all-in cost of what it is doing, which impacts many constituents.

Recusal Request and Restoration of Public Trust in the Political Process:

I believe that Das Williams and Steve Lavagnino should voluntarily recuse themselves from voting on cannabis-related items at this point, given the revelations in the recent [LA Times article](#) that show troubling coziness with the cannabis lobby. Recusal is imperative to restore public trust. I also think it is important that the Board of Supervisors request an independent investigation into the process surrounding the creation of the cannabis regulations.

Respectfully,
Sarah Trigueiro
Carpinteria, CA

Relis, Mia

From: Lion Eye Farms <lioneyefarms@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 9:15 AM
To: sbcob
Cc: Beth Long
Subject: Public Comment letter for July 9th BOS Cannabis Hearing

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.

My name is Elizabeth Long and I am the President of Lion Eye Farms in The Lompoc Valley. I was born in 1972 at Cottage Hospital in Santa Barbara and have lived in the County my entire life. I take great pride in our local, family style farm. 90 percent of our farm is from Santa Barbara County or has lived here most of their lives. I love Santa Barbara County and feel extremely lucky to have been born and raised in such a magnificent area.

We are a low water usage, organic-vegan sustainable farm. We grow in coco in above grounds pots that we re-use for 3 1/2 years to 4 years. We do not add perlite, vermiculite or animal products to our medium. We produce very clean, healthy cannabis.

I love to be able to provide good paying jobs to my local employees. Each one has a great opportunity working here at the farm with a future in the Cannabis Farming Industry. I'm very proud of how much they have learned here at the farm. It has also taught them to respect the land with clean farming and the beauty of this county.

We are great neighbors and have built amazing friendships with the people around us. We are quiet, clean and we enjoy and respect our neighborhood!

Elizabeth Long
President, Lion Eye Farms
beth@lioneyefarms.com

Relis, Mia

From: Lion Eye Farms <lioneyefarms@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 9:19 AM
To: sbcob
Cc: Lion Eye Farms
Subject: Public Comment July 9th BOS Cannabis Hearing

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.

My name is Manuel Mendoza, I am from Lompoc, CA. I was born in Santa Barbara. I've been at the farm for 9 months now and my role at the farm is to grow and take proper care of the plants, to make sure we get the best possible results out of them. I really love it here, I have learned so much about the importance of what it is we do here. It's such a great opportunity to work on a sustainable farm. Great environment all around.

Manuel Mendoza
Employee-Lion Eye Farms

Relis, Mia

From: Wendy Spencer <wendyhspencer@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 9:41 AM
To: Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; Hart, Gregg; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Subject: 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.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live across from Memorial Park off of Santa Ynez on the west end of town and the smell has become worse lately. It seemed like it had come to a point where we were going maybe weeks between bad smells. However, for a week or two now, it smells every night between 9-10pm. I fill out the complaint form on Survey Monkey most every time. I do wonder if anyone else is? Some mornings, if I leave the house and come back,

I discover that the smell is still lingering inside the house from the previous night. The same goes for our car. We may drive it somewhere in the morning, and when we get back in the car, it smells like skunk.

We have friends moving to the area from San Francisco. It's very likely that the cannabis growing/problems will keep them from choosing Carpinteria. I know that if I had known what the air was going to smell like in my own home, I would have chosen somewhere else to live, as I moved here right before all this madness started.

This is horrible and disgusting and has gone on WAY too long. I accept that the wheels of government are slow, but YEARS?

I have another meeting on July 9th that I am not able to miss so I am unable to attend the county meeting in support of affected residents of our dear city.

Wendy Spencer

Relis, Mia

From: Sharyne Merritt <professormerritt@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 9:42 AM
To: Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Subject: Cannabis July 9 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.

Dear Supervisors,

I urge you to do the following to protect our county.

1. The non-public meetings of the ad hoc committee has created, at minimum, the appearance of impropriety. In order to restore trust, the Board must make public a list of participants in all meetings and notes from the meetings
2. The County should not issue any land use permits or CDP approvals until there is an audit of veracity of affidavits and whether there have been expansions of legal-nonconforming uses.
3. Growers/owners/lessors who fail to verify affidavits, expanded operations after becoming a legal-nonconforming use, or have been subject to enforcement for illegal grows must be shut down and denied any permits - ever.
4. To protect the ability of farmers of agricultural crops to use pest control sprays, implement caps on number of acres of any parcel for cannabis. 5 acres or 10 percent of parcel not to exceed 20 acres premises situated as close to center of property as possible
5. Reopen CEQA review since the County's EIR did grossly underestimate the number of acres that would apply for permits – this was raised before the Supervisors certified the EIR
6. Make it clear to APCD that cannabis is not an agricultural crop and APCD does have jurisdiction over it.
7. Implement the draft Urgency Ordinance submitted to the County by the Santa Barbara Coalition for Responsible Cannabis

Thank you,
Sharyne Merritt, farmer

Relis, Mia

From: Secretary LVCA <secretary@lvca.info>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 9:52 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: July 9th BOS Public Comment-Cannabis

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:

The LVCA is in full support of the legal cannabis industry in Santa Barbara County. Over half of our members are located within the unincorporated areas of SB County. We strive to help educate the positive effects of cannabis, Advocate for those who use it or do business by it, and bring the community together through leadership and positive example.

We have seen the positive impacts the legal cannabis industry has already brought to the City of Lompoc and we looking forward to the future of doing business with Santa Barbara County Cannabis Farmers.

We support the legal cannabis industry and what it offers to Santa Barbara County, new and high paying jobs!

We are concerned about the Board's consideration of additional restrictions and amendments to the Cannabis Ordinance. Cannabis is already the most highly regulated agricultural crop in Santa Barbara County.

We are troubled by the Board's disregard for the numerous restrictions the County has already placed on cannabis growers. Now, seeking further changes to the Ordinance, the Board is placing an even heavier burden on the shoulders of those who have relied on the County's regulations and invested their life and business by choosing to grow cannabis in Santa Barbara County, or start businesses that depends on local cannabis product.

Santa Barbara County has a unique opportunity to be the leader in sun grown, sustainable cannabis and expand its tourism industry. Polling demonstrates that the majority of our residents support the industry. We cannot allow a small group of vocal opponents to upend this unique opportunity.

For these reasons, we ask that you reject further restrictions on the industry and allow the cannabis growers time to comply with the well-crafted Ordinance already in place.

We encourage you to not make any changes to the current ordinance and allow these operators the chance to show you and the residents of Santa Barbara County that they are Good Farmers and Great Neighbors!!

LVCA



Relis, Mia

From: Lion Eye Farms <lioneeyefarms@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 10:02 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public comment letter- July 9th BOS Cannabis

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,

My name is Todd Schirmer and I have worked at Urban Pulse dba Lion Eye Farms since 2012. I moved to the Mesa in Santa Barbara in 1992 and then bought a house in Solvang in 2005. I'd like to think of myself as a local after 27 years. I am 52 years old and love cannabis farming. The farm is an amazing place to work every day. The area is beautiful and the neighbors are great! Going to work in the morning and driving a tractor to work the land is so gratifying. Santa Barbara County is a wonderful place and I love that I have the opportunity to farm in the Lompoc Valley!

Please do not make any more changes to the ordinance, we have already endured years of costly changes.

Thank you,

Todd Schirmer
Employee- Lion Eye farms