

de la Guerra, Sheila

Public Comment Group 2

#2

From: Ted Fox <ted@profarms.farm>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 4:12 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public Comment for item 4 at tomorrow's Board of Supervisors meeting - Cadwell/CCA LUP appeal
Attachments: Ted Fox public comment for CCA-Tutti Fruitti LUP.docx



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 David,

Can you add the attached to the public comments portion for this item.

Thanks,

Ted Fox - Vice President of Compliance and Business Development
5756 Thornwood Dr., Goleta, CA 93117
email ted@profarms.farm
cell 517-974-1675





February 14, 2022

My name is Ted Fox and I am Vice President of Compliance with Pro Farms – a North County cannabis cultivator.

I am writing to support the Cadwell Family and John De Friel’s cannabis LUP project on Santa Rosa Rd. I have known Chris and John for over 4 years as we are neighbors just to the east of their facility. We have had an excellent relationship with both people and whole-heartedly support them in their land use permitting process.

When we first moved onto our property next door to Chris in 2015, he reached out to us with an offer of assistance – having accumulated decades of knowledge farming in the local area. Chris has been an agricultural mentor and friend. His inclusive nature has been greatly appreciated and a breath of fresh air in contrast to the anti-cannabis stance taken by some of our Santa Rita Hills neighbors.

As for John De Friel and CCA, they have consistently led our North County Farmers Guild with facts and figures in order to combat the NIMBY rantings and hyperbole from opponents to cannabis cultivation in North County.

John’s calm demeanor and fact-driven commentary at Santa Barbara County public meetings has helped to bring focus and a better understanding of the positive impacts cannabis farmers bring to bear in North County. For instance, during the height of the COVID lockdown in the spring of 2020, John spearheaded a North County Farmers Guild program to fill the coffers of local food banks.

I am proud to count Chris and John as friends and colleagues and request that the Board of Supervisors reject the Pence appeal and approve their LUP.

Sincerely,

Ted Fox

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Scott Smigel <scottsmigel@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 4:41 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public Comment on a non agenda matter
Attachments: SB Supervisor comments 2-15-22.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.

Gentlepeople,

Please find attached a letter / comment to the Supervisors regarding Caltrans and SBCAG eliminating sound walls from their Coastal Development Permit application. I would very much appreciate if you could include my attached comments as part of the public comments on non agenda matters for the Board's February 15 meeting.

Thank you,

Scott Smigel
t 805 886-5212
e scottsmigel@gmail.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This e-mail (including attachments) is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 2510-2521, is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under application law. If the reader of this email is not the intended recipient, or agent responsible for delivering or copying of this communication, you are hereby notified that any retention, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please reply to the sender that you have received the message in error, then please delete it.

Scott B. Smigel
115 Hixon Road
Santa Barbara, California 93108
t 805 886 5212, e scottsmigel@gmail.com

February 14, 2022

Board of Supervisors
County of Santa Barbara
105 E. Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, California

DELIVERED BY E-MAIL

RE: Public Comment: Caltrans / SBCAG decision to remove sound walls from Coastal Development Permit Application

Supervisors:

My name is Scott Smigel and I live at 115 Hixon Road in Montecito. Thank you for your time and the opportunity to keep this critical matter in front of you and the entire County.

As you know, the freeway noise in certain areas of Montecito is head banging loud. It has gotten worse over the years and Caltrans admits that the planned Highway 101 "improvements" will make it even worse.

Fifteen or so years ago, my County Supervisor, a representative from Caltrans, a representative from SBCAG representatives of other elected officials and concerned individuals from our community met in my dining room on Hixon Road to review the results of our self-funded neighborhood sound studies. All agreed that the results were indisputable and the tested sound levels far exceeded federal and other standards of safety. They agreed that the sound levels were dangerous and sound barriers were essential. All present, including Caltrans, committed to mitigating the unhealthy noise with sound walls *if* any significant work was done to the freeway.

We are well aware of the terrible 2018 flooding and debris flows in Montecito since that Caltrans promise was made. We are also aware of the position taken by Flood Control regarding projects within the Special Flood Hazard Areas of the Recovery Mapping and the "potential" to create a water rise.

There are many reasons why the project should not be allowed to proceed without meaningful noise mitigation. A few are highlighted below:

1. The project has proceeded to this point based, at least in part, on the inclusion of the sound barriers as an integral and necessary element of the project.

Scott B. Smigel
115 Hixon Road
Santa Barbara, California 93108
t 805 886 5212, e scottsmigel@gmail.com

2. Caltrans and SBCAG have not provide any data, nor details of their "modeling" of "water rise" of sound walls to the public.
3. Why were only 3 or 4 possible sound wall configurations being considered before Caltrans and SBCAG concluded it was impossible to mitigate the noise? We can't believe there aren't more possibilities to mitigate flood and / or sound issues.
4. What happens to the project's EIR which anticipated the inclusion of sound walls for the project? Shouldn't the EIR be revisited?
5. Isn't the ongoing 24/7 damage to public health from the existing and proposed highway project, worthy of a closer look at the rigid "no water rise" condition imposed by SB County Flood Control?
6. Is it fair and "legal" for Caltrans and SBCAG to proceed with their application by eliminating such an essential element with their full knowledge of the damage to the public health by existing and proposed project noise?

I believe that if Caltrans and SBCAG eliminate the promised sound barriers from the project's Coastal Development Permit application now, it will foreclose public comment on the issue in the future public hearings on the application. Given the prior representations made, and the about to worsen health impacts, proceeding with this project without full disclosure and public input is unacceptable.

Thank you again for this opportunity and for your valuable time.

Sincerely,



Scott Smigel

SBS:toao