

Ramirez, Angelica

Public Comment: Public Safety
Group 5

From: Katherine Baviera <kgeorgalos@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 8, 2021 8:55 AM
To: clerk@santabarbaraca.gov; sbcob
Subject: I support diverting \$26.7 million from the Sheriff's Office



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 Clerk:

I am writing again to show my support for the demand brought forth by a collective of community members and organizations calling for \$26.7 million in funding to be diverted from the Sheriff's Office and invested into the following four areas:

- Community-based initiatives that support alternatives to incarceration, diversion programs that are entirely independent of law enforcement, and practical and effective transitional services for individuals in custody
- Affordable housing initiatives
- Public Defender's Office
- Behavioral Wellness

I'm looking forward to the hearing this morning. Thank you for your time and consideration! I am confident that Santa Barbara will be a leader in a lot of change in the near future - this diversion of funds would be a great way to keep change coming!

Sincerely,
Katherine Baviera
Santa Barbara resident

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Leslie Rugg <leslierugg@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 8, 2021 11:11 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: cannabis monitoring/public health/enforcement

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 husband and I are new to living in Carpinteria, just off Foothill Bl, in the midst of what used to be flower growing land and now has become the cannabis industry. We arrived not knowing about the economics that essentially forced previously successful flower growers to abandon that form of agriculture for the more lucrative, less competitive crop of marijuana. It became quickly apparent that the odor along parts of Foothill that drifted into the hills where we are was not the product of defensive skunks but the output of cannabis plants. We further realized that not every grower was conscientious enough to contain such output. Why was that? Because whatever agencies licensing former flower growers to switch over to cannabis were either ignorant of the difference between the crops or didn't care about the environmental effects to the surrounding areas. The smell of revenue to the city was more enticing.

We have nothing against cannabis, but we are deeply concerned that public agencies aren't looking out for the people they supposedly serve. We also question how licenses can be granted without full disclosure of environmental impact to land, humans, animals, etc. Further, as an agricultural industry, there must be legalities that insist on proper containment of offensive gases as a health hazard if nothing else. How is it that some growers know how to manage their operations appropriately and correctly while others ignore what is or should be the law? Yet both sets of growers get their licenses. Do we have standards or don't we? Shouldn't they apply to all potential licensees for the welfare of the community and their own reputations?

It's understandable that land previously used to grow flowers is naturally fit for similar crops. But cannabis isn't one of them. It has nothing to do with the uses or abuses of the plant. It has to do with the difference in air pollution, water usage, abatement control, and basic good relationships with the community and most especially the neighbors most affected by the odor. Cannabis requires different modes of operation.

Before licensing occurs, would-be cannabis growers must be mandated to present plans with deadlines met to properly house plants and contain their pollution to a degree that the public no longer has a need to protest licensees who care more for profit than following common sense procedures. Without proper follow through by those very agencies that grant licenses, nominal enforcement changes nothing. Those agencies that insist they are doing something about the very obvious problem but do nothing only enforce the current opinion that they are afraid to impose regulations that would actually improve the situation for everyone. We can't have agencies we depend on to do the right thing for us and our city and county if they refuse to use the power they have.

At least balance the interests of citizens along with the fraction of revenue the industry gives the city and county. The growers have the financial capability of cleaning up the pollution they cause every day. They are not going to pull up their plants and go elsewhere. Those growers are longtime citizens of the area as well, and if they need to be reminded of their civic duty to their fellow Carpinterians, then do so!

Leslie and Tom Rugg
1770 Ocean Oaks Rd.

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Rick Roney <rroney@me.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 8, 2021 1:41 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Comment re budgets

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.

As several Supervisors and CEO Miyasato mentioned, the County is making good progress in reforming the criminal justice system. However, as CEO Miyasato also mentioned, one of the big obstacles is lack of good data.

Given that, I would caution the Board to go slowly in realigning budgets around a "possibility". Diversion is good. But it's the easy part. Having individuals change their criminal thinking, overcome their addiction, etc. is the hard part. Do not assume because the jail is at such a low level that it will stay there. The last 16 months have been very special. You let people out of jail. You didn't arrest them as you normally would. Lots of unusual processes were implemented. Some will work. Some won't.

I've worked in reducing recidivism for over 15 years now and i can tell you one thing - it's not easy. Offenders need evidence-based programs to change. And that doesn't always work - maybe 2/3 of the time. Letting them loose without programming is delaying the inevitable.

I recommend you move forward as you're doing. Gather data. Learn as you go. But don't readjust budgets severely based on assumptions and "stories".

Rick Roney