

#3

Ramirez, Angelica

Public Comment

**From:** Reece Duca <Reece@igsb.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2020 12:47 PM  
**To:** Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; sbcob  
**Subject:** Reece Duca - Cannabis Growers Comment for June 9, 2020 Meeting  
**Attachments:** Cannabis Growers Follow Up - Reece Duca Comment.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.**

To The Board of Supervisors and Clerk of the Board,

Please see attached letter for distribution to the Board of Supervisors. I request that this comment be read into the record at the June 9, 2020 meeting.

Best Regards,

Reece Duca

June 8, 2020

To: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors  
1st District Das Williams; [dwilliams@countyofsb.org](mailto:dwilliams@countyofsb.org)  
2nd District Gregg Hart; [ghart@countyofsb.org](mailto:ghart@countyofsb.org)  
3rd District Joan Hartmann; [jhartmann@countyofsb.org](mailto:jhartmann@countyofsb.org)

*RE: Additional thoughts on Cannabis grower revenues to the County - good revenues and bad revenues*

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

After reading many of the transcripts from Cannabis growers and supporters of the argument that the County should not require CUPs, I think one key argument is unfortunately lost. In business many books have been written about the concept that there are good revenues and bad revenues and good profits and bad profits. From the lens of the County of Santa Barbara, and for the Carpinteria Valley and the 1st Supervisorial District, the decision of whether or not to require a CUP is a generational decision. We do not want to make a poor decision in the interest of speeding up the permit process.

With Cannabis, we are in the learning phase. If Cannabis Growers have permits, which are land use monopolies, to operate in perpetuity without a CUP, we will never be able to remedy these inevitable problems we learn about. Today, we know the applicant. And the permit will generate revenues for the County. But in 10, 20, 30 years from now when the family run owner, who supports local schools is gone and the 2nd, 3rd or 4th owner is a Cannabis Conglomerate owned by a Private Equity firm from NYC, how does that symbiosis work. Are they good revenues? That's already happening in Colorado and Washington. What began as a mutually attractive relationship with the grower now needs a fresh set of eyes and regulation. Yes, a CUP may take an extra 3, 6, 9 months but because it is a generational decision, it's worth the time.

Requiring a CUP is wise. The Cannabis industry will still thrive. The community will co-exist with Cannabis. But, there will be reasonable guidelines and regulations for today's operators and future owners of these businesses. You won't be creating bad revenues by granting a monopoly that can never be fixed.

Thank you,  
Reece and Christine Duca  
Carpinteria Valley Residents for 49 years  
[reece@igsb.com](mailto:reece@igsb.com)

## Ramirez, Angelica

---

**From:** Good Farmers Great Neighbors <noreply@123formbuilder.io>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2020 5:25 PM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Subject:** Supporting County Cannabis Farmers

**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.**

**Name** Adelia Emerson  
**Email Address** adelia@hoghoney.com  
**Address** 3075 Avena Rd  
Lompoc Ca 93436  
United States  
**Subject** County Cannabis Farmers Standing With Our Community  
**Message** To: Honorable Supervisors of Santa Barbara County  
Supervisor Greg Hart, Chair  
Supervisor Das Williams, District 1  
Supervisor Joan Hartmann, District 3  
Supervisor Peter Adams, District 4  
Supervisor Steve Lavagnino, District 5

Our community has been hit hard by the COVID-19 crisis. Many of our local communities are experiencing double-digit unemployment. As Santa Barbara County continues to practice social distancing and under Governor Newsom's shelter mandate, the future of many local industries and jobs remain uncertain, in particular those in the hospitality and restaurant sectors.

I am writing to acknowledge the work of the county's cannabis industry, which was given an essential business determination by the Governor at the start of this pandemic. Our cannabis farmers have risen to the occasion, not only to bolster the local economy during this time, but additionally taking action to reach across industries in solidarity. As allies in our business community, we intend to continue finding new ways to collaborate and ensure our local independent businesses emerge from this crisis stronger than before.

The North County cannabis farms are working with beloved local eateries and restaurants to ensure they can weather this crisis together. Beloved local establishments such as Industrial Eats, Pattibakes, Floriano's, Herb Home, Los Arroyos, and California Tacos, are part of an effort to provide meals to our workforce through a food delivery service for all cannabis employees located at both farms and other facilities.

As our county looks ahead to potential budget cuts in the not so distant future, given the economic impact of the necessary COVID-19 response, the

importance of tax revenue provided by the cannabis industry becomes increasingly apparent. The tax revenues our county receives will be critical in the coming months to help off-set potential budget cuts to vital government services for communities of color, seniors and other vulnerable populations.

The cannabis farmers of Santa Barbara County are job creators, industry leaders, and valued community members. I urge the Board of Supervisors to recognize their actions to support us during these difficult times.

## Ramirez, Angelica

---

**From:** Miyasato, Mona  
**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2020 6:40 PM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Subject:** FW: From Mark Brickley

For Thursday hearing – public comment

---

**From:** County Executive Office <caoemail@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2020 10:05 AM  
**To:** Melekian, Barney <bMelekian@countyofsb.org>  
**Cc:** Miyasato, Mona <mmiyasato@countyofsb.org>  
**Subject:** FW: From Mark Brickley

---

**From:** Mark Brickley <[mpaulsb3@gmail.com](mailto:mpaulsb3@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2020 9:58 AM  
**To:** Williams, Das <[DWilliams@countyofsb.org](mailto:DWilliams@countyofsb.org)>; Hart, Gregg <[gHart@countyofsb.org](mailto:gHart@countyofsb.org)>; Adam, Peter <[peter.adam@countyofsb.org](mailto:peter.adam@countyofsb.org)>; Lavagnino, Steve <[steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org](mailto:steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org)>; Hartmann, Joan <[jHartmann@countyofsb.org](mailto:jHartmann@countyofsb.org)>  
**Cc:** County Executive Office <caoemail@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>  
**Subject:** From Mark Brickley

**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 Members of the Board of Supervisors;

### **Conditional Use Permits:**

I am writing to request the Board to adopt conditional use permits for both inland and coastal cannabis growing and processing operations. By adopting the CUP process the BOS will confirm new policy recommendations from the Santa Barbara County Planning Commission. To date, the County's cannabis policy hasn't accurately reflected citizen input or supported specific community priorities. The CUP process may provide this needed remedy.

### **Proposed Retail Cannabis Regulations:**

Regarding Santa Barbara County's proposed Cannabis Store-Front Criteria based Score Sheet/Neighborhood Compatibility Proposal:

This proposed form clearly under weighs its **Community Involvement Plan** component, which receives only 30% of the score sheet's maximum total. The scoring sheet shows a **Site Visit** to the proposed retail location receives 20% of the total, which seems unfairly over weighted. It separates **Customer and Community education plans** for another 10%. Amazingly, the score sheet's **On-site Parking** is also separated from the **Business Operation Plan** for 20% of the total. In summary, the cannabis scoring sheet awards 70% of its total score outside of community input.

It appears that the Cannabis Storefront Criteria Based Score sheet was designed to override community input. It needs to be revised before it will be a credible planning tool. I believe the Community Involvement

Plan/Neighborhood Compatibility Plan constitute 65% of the total score. Should the BOS be allowed to impose a retail cannabis store on a community that rejects it through this planning process?

Thanks for your consideration. Please read this letter in to the BOS record at its next meeting.

Sincerely yours,

Mark Brickley

Carpinteria Valley, Homeowner

Attachment: Storefront Scoring Sheet

## Ramirez, Angelica

---

**From:** Valerie Bentz <valeriebentz@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 9, 2020 10:28 AM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Subject:** Fwd: WE CAN'T BREATHE: PLEASE READ INTO THE RECORD

**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 use the slightly edited message below. Thank you.  
Valerie Bentz

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Valerie Bentz <valeriebentz@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** WE CAN'T BREATHE: PLEASE READ INTO THE RECORD  
**Date:** June 9, 2020 at 10:23:18 AM PDT  
**To:** [sbcob@countyofsb.org](mailto:sbcob@countyofsb.org)  
**Cc:** [dwilliams@countyofsb.org](mailto:dwilliams@countyofsb.org), [peter.adam@sountyofsb.org](mailto:peter.adam@sountyofsb.org),  
[steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org](mailto:steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org), [jhartmann@countyofsb.org](mailto:jhartmann@countyofsb.org), [ghart@countyofsb.org](mailto:ghart@countyofsb.org)

Dear County Board of Supervisors,

The phrase “We Can’t Breathe” echoes the recent events involving abuse of authority leading to the death of a young man.

I don’t mean to equate our situation with that one. But there are parallels.

Citizens of Carpinteria and elsewhere in the county are subjected to continual air pollution from a powerful governmental force and corporate power that “needs to be defunded.”

We already know some of the effects of the intense exposure to cannabis growing and we know that the “odor reduction systems” do not work and make it even harder to breathe.

We are slowly exposed to air pollution surrounding our homes, and schools. **We Can’t Breathe.**

Sincerely,  
Valerie Bentz

## Ramirez, Angelica

---

**From:** S G <sasha477m@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 9, 2020 10:38 AM  
**To:** sbcob; Hart, Gregg; Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; peter.adam@sountyofofsb.org; Lavagnino, Steve  
**Cc:** Patty  
**Subject:** Re: Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for Cannabis – PLEASE READ INTO THE RECORD

**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,

As an addendum to our email communication of June 1, we wanted to provide you a brief update on the impact cannabis cultivation is having on our community in Carpinteria. From the time of a change in wind direction on Sunday afternoon, June 7, from onshore to offshore, our home was inundated with cannabis emissions (evidenced by strong pungent odor) starting that evening and lasting all night and into Monday morning. In spite of keeping our windows closed during an unusually warm evening, cannabis odor once again permeated our home.

The following morning, June 8, we walked in Carpinteria in the Heath Ranch area and to the salt marsh park. From the start of our walk (approximately 8:45 AM), strong cannabis odor was evident in the neighborhoods on the mountain side of the freeway.

We bring these facts to your attention for this reason: any claim made that cannabis odor incidents are simply "occasional releases" (implying they are the exception) is simply false.

As evidenced as recently as this week, cannabis odor in Carpinteria is a present and continuous hazard; industrial cannabis production is clearly impacting air quality in the valley (and in our homes), which may well have long term health consequences for residents and taxpayers. The fact that we have a freeway in the area that also impacts air quality is no excuse to be dismissive about the need to manage air quality impacts of cannabis production - in fact, all the more reason we need to be vigilant about how we introduce and manage any kind of new industrial activity that will worsen air quality for residents.

We ask that you acknowledge that the cannabis cultivation permitting process to date has been deeply flawed, resulting in significant negative impacts to local residents in Carpinteria and other areas in the County and urge you approve the Conditional Use Permit process so that decisions on industrial cannabis production can be done on a more informed basis with proper safeguards for County residents.

Thank you,



Alexander and Patricia Globa

1483 Anita St.  
Carpinteria, CA 93013

Mobile: 818-419-2360

On Mon, Jun 1, 2020 at 10:19 AM S G <[sasha477m@gmail.com](mailto:sasha477m@gmail.com)> wrote:

Dear Board of Supervisors:

We are reaching out to you regarding the proposed Conditional Use Permit requirement for cannabis cultivation. Your decision on this proposal represents a critical crossroads for Santa Barbara County and our community.

When we chose to live in Carpinteria over 22 years ago, it was for the same reasons other families made this area home: a love for natural beauty and the outdoors, a high quality of life and being part of a community that is rich in culture and diversity. Santa Barbara's recognized leadership and emphasis on protection of the environment has been a point of pride for us.

Most unfortunately, however, unconstrained, minimally regulated commercial cannabis production taking hold in Carpinteria and the County over the past 3 years has turned our community upside down. We live adjacent to an active cannabis production facility. Cannabis odor routinely invades our home – though we continue to report violations to the county, the county's standard response is that they can only "recommend" mitigation but not strictly enforce it. We have been precluded from keeping our windows open or spending evenings in our back yard, and are concerned about the long-term health impacts of such intensive production in close proximity. Our local schools (we live near Carpinteria High School) have been inundated with cannabis odor, which is simply unacceptable. Large scale cannabis production was allowed to proliferate without a proper level of review, oversight and enforcement, which has hurt the community and called into question the legitimacy of the approval process.

We therefore urge you to institute a Conditional Use Permit process for all cannabis cultivation, for the following reasons:

- Commercial cannabis cultivation is industrial production, with many potential impacts to the community – consideration of mitigation measures is essential
- Health, safety, environmental and quality of life concerns of county residents must be respected and integrated into the decision process
- Density of cannabis production and proximity to homes and schools dictates an even higher level of care and due diligence
- Other economic impacts need to be formally understood and considered, for example, impacts to our avocado and wine industries, as well as economic impacts to homeowners
- Transparency of the decision process is fundamental and is a critical foundation for effective and responsible governance.

Putting in place the Conditional Use Permit process for cannabis cultivation is the right step for the county, as recommended by the County's own planning commission. Please exercise good governance and approve this measure.

Should you have questions, please don't hesitate to contact us.

Thank you,

Alexander and Patricia Globa

1483 Anita St.  
Carpinteria, CA 93013

Mobile: 818-419-2360

## Ramirez, Angelica

---

**From:** Harmon, Nereyda  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 10, 2020 10:22 AM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Subject:** FW: Objection to expansion of marijuana cultivations

FYI below.

Thanks,  
Rey

---

**From:** Carrie Miles <CarrieM@fastmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2020 4:15 PM  
**To:** Williams, Das <DWilliams@countyofsb.org>; Hart, Gregg <gHart@countyofsb.org>; Hartmann, Joan <jHartmann@countyofsb.org>; Adam, Peter <peter.adam@countyofsb.org>; Lavagnino, Steve <steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org>; Harmon, Nereyda <nmontano@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>; concernedcarpinterians@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Objection to expansion of marijuana cultivations

**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.**

Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors  
105 East Anapamu St., Rm 407  
Santa Barbara, California

Nereyda Harmon  
123 East Anapamu Street  
Santa Barbara

Dear madams and sirs,

While I am a relatively new resident of The Meadow, in Carpinteria, I have been visiting my mother here for the last several years. A few years ago, I began to wonder where that skunk I was smelling lived, and how we could persuade it to go somewhere else. Of course, I soon learned that the foul odor was not from a skunk, but from the cannabis growing in the greenhouses surrounding this area.

At certain times of year, the dirty, skunky smell is overwhelming. I smell it even in my bedroom with all the windows shut. In talking with my neighbors, I learned that I am not the only one who objects to this nuisance being imposed on us in our own homes.

This is a public nuisance, which I strongly request that you as county supervisors and representative of the planning and development department to do everything possible to contain. It makes no sense to allow additional cannabis production here until there is a more effective odor amelioration system available. I am also concerned about the health effects of the system currently in use, which just seems to replace the foul odor of cannabis with a different chemical, this time an artificial one. Has there been an environmental and health impact study undertaken on the effects of the "Byer's system"? I understand that this system was developed to contain landfill odors. Most landfills,

however, are much farther away from residences than are these greenhouse. I strongly urge the board, to the extent that you can, to require an impact study before allowing any further permits for cannabis production.

I also question why, if growers cannot be controlled because they do not have the requisite permits, they are allowed to continue growing without permit a substance which, while it might be legal, is still a psychotropic drug which should not be imposed on people who have not chosen to imbibe it?

Aso, I would like to point out that many of the people in my neighborhood are retired. There is currently a building permit pending that, if approved, will allow even more cannabis production in our already-smelly neighborhood. Can we get the definition of "sensitive receptors" (a rather inhuman label I must say) expanded to include us? I think anyone will agree that people over 60 have more health issues than those under 18. As we protect our children, please protect the rest of us as well.

Whatever you think of my complaint, at the least, know that one citizen of Carpinteria (actually, not just me but everyone I have talked to) is strongly opposed to more marijuana production here or in the parts of the country adjacent to us. Please keep our beautiful little city a healthy, pleasant, and odor-free place to live.

Thank you,

*Carrie A. Miles, Ph.D.*

1567 Meadow Circle

Carpinteria

## Ramirez, Angelica

---

**From:** fnemerson <fnemerson@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 10, 2020 11:52 AM  
**To:** Hartmann, Joan; Williams, Das; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; Hart, Gregg; sbcob  
**Subject:** Vesting and cannabis applicants

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.

Good morning,

WE Watch supports only allowing vesting after an applicant actually has his or her permit, where current and proposed cannabis regulations are concerned.

A big issue has been lack of tools to prevent applications from being approved that are not compatible with their surroundings. Some of these projects are very close to actually receiving their permits and vesting for them needs to be avoided, if at all possible.

Nancy Emerson, President  
WE Watch

## Ramirez, Angelica

---

**From:** de la Guerra, Sheila  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 10, 2020 3:09 PM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Subject:** FW: statement to be read  
**Attachments:** 6-2-2020 CUP Hearing BOS^.pdf

Sheila de la Guerra  
Deputy Clerk  
Clerk of the Board  
County of Santa Barbara  
700 E. 500 2244



[www.countyofsb.org](http://www.countyofsb.org)

READY SBC.org   
SIGN UP - PLAN - UNDERSTAND

One County. One Future.

*The content of this email is confidential and intended for the recipient specified in the message only. It is strictly forbidden to share any part of this message with any third party, without a written consent of the sender. Any views, opinions or conclusions expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and do not necessarily reflect the views of the County of Santa Barbara, its subsidiaries or affiliates. If you received this message by mistake, please reply to this message and follow with its deletion, so that we can ensure such a mistake does not occur in the future.*

---

**From:** Leigh Johnson <rlj.leigh@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 10, 2020 2:51 PM  
**To:** de la Guerra, Sheila <sdelaguerra@countyofsb.org>  
**Subject:** statement to be read

**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.**

Hi Sheila,

Can I try turning in my Statement to be read for tomorrow. It was for last week but I missed deadline. Thank you for letting me know the deadline now.

Hope you are having a nice day and safe and well.

Thank you

Leigh

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Thank you for your consideration of CUP's on all cannabis permits.

Having CUP's will afford the county with information needed to determine what is acceptable or not. The CUP process would give the County mitigation power over projects to fit the surroundings and limit industrial/commercial grows in incompatible areas. The projects inundated in shell companies with revolving door applicants are a security issue. The CUP for all projects current and future would not negatively affect the County as stated in chapter 35 that-the BOS retains all of its statutory planning and zoning authority concerning cannabis activities..." and that the BOS "...still may take actions(s) later to change the zoning of cannabis activities to being prohibited." The BOS "...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." zoning may be adapted with the applicants without harm to the County. Thus projects that are acceptable and wouldn't negatively impact neighboring properties shouldn't be alarmed if becoming a CUP.

My grandma once told me "This is God's country; we live in paradise". She turned 91 last week. She lived on Santa Rosa road in her 20's; a few years later moved down the road on Hwy 1; where she still resides. She knows "God's Country" and farmed/ranched on it for 50 plus years. She said..."Hang onto it; it's becoming fewer and farther between."

We urge the Board to require all cannabis to be a CUP and ban all cannabis in EDRNs zoned Ag 1-20.

Please help us protect the few and far between.

Sincerely,

Leigh Johnson—Cebada Canyon