

From: County Executive Office
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2020 4:07 PM
To: Lenzi, Chelsea
Subject: FW: Support Busy Bees Organics Right to Farm



From: County Executive Office
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2020 9:57 AM
To: Melekian, Barney ; Miyasato, Mona
Subject: FW: Support Busy Bees Organics Right to Farm

From: Good Farmers Great Neighbors <noreply@123formbuilder.io>
Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2020 10:47 PM
To: County Executive Office <caoemail@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>
Subject: Support Busy Bees Organics Right to Farm

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	Alan Benson
Email Address	alanbenson@gmail.com
Address	1208 East Lemon Ave Lompoc Ca 93436 United States
Subject	Support Busy Bee's Organics' Right to Farm
Message	<p>To the Honorable Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors:</p> <p>Sara Rotman and her husband Nate Diaz are a shining model for our county’s budding cannabis industry. As local Buellton residents, farmers and owners of Busy Bee’s Organics, they care deeply about the land they live and farm on and their investment to the community. Their tireless efforts to innovate best practice farming standards, including odor control and drip irrigation, is evidence of their commitment to running a sustainable, organic farm.</p> <p>This commitment to going above and beyond compliance regulations earned them unanimous approval from the Santa Barbara County Planning Commissioners with a 5-0 vote, which included a strong recommendation of support from County Planning Department staff and consultants.</p> <p>As dedicated farmers, Sara and Nate are passionate about Santa Barbara</p>

County's proud tradition of agriculture. Busy Bee's Organics has exceeded the demands of regulators as pioneers of sustainable farming practices in the county and the state. Their best practices include adopting and implementing the highest management standards in pesticide-free organic cannabis cultivation, fair wages, odor prevention, and environmental stewardship.

Busy Bee's Organics takes every opportunity to educate and learn with the community, providing educational tours and organized meetings with local civic, business, and community leaders. This collaboration has promoted innovation in ecotourism strategies and growth in our local economy that benefit all residents.

As a community member, I ask you to join us in support of Busy Bee's Organic's Right to Farm. The Planning Commission has made it clear with their unanimous vote: Sara and Nate's commitment to our heritage of sustainable and safe farming is unwavering.

I thank you for your consideration, and urge you to protect Sara and Nate's home and livelihood.

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Wendy Spencer <wendyhspencer@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 15, 2020 3:14 PM
To: Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Adam, Peter; Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; sbcob
Subject: Cannabis odor

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.

Whenever we have a lovely rain, like we've had this past week, some cannabis growers decide that if they vent the odor we won't smell it. Well, we do! It smells just as bad as always and ruins a pleasant rainy day.

Wed morning at 10:15am or Sunday at 8:15am, for example, not the "usual times" they release odors.

Our house/garage/cars are sometimes filled with the stench in the morning, when we get up. It's obvious they've released the odors during the night. Again. As if.

I fill out the Survey Monkey complaint form as I always do. Day after week after month after year. My efforts feel futile. This problem needs to STOP.

How long has this been going on now? Three years? I wish I knew who the culprits are, but I don't.

Thank you for your time,

Wendy Spencer
Catlin Circle
Carpinteria

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Villalobos, David
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2020 7:14 AM
To: sbcob
Cc: Peterson, Stephen; Leyva, Petra; Lehr, Kathryn
Subject: FW: Letter to Board re: Busy Bee for Meeting 3/17/20
Attachments: Busy Bee Letter

From: Jan Davidson <winemath@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 15, 2020 6:09 PM
To: Villalobos, David <dvillalo@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>
Subject: Letter to Board re: Busy Bee for Meeting 3/17/20

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 see attached for Supervisors.
Thanks David :)

--

Cheers!



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'JD' with a stylized flourish.

Jan Davidson
805-736-3354
Jan@LaughLinesCo.com
Laugh Lines
85 West Highway 246
Buellton, CA 93427

March 15, 2020

Re: Busy Bee

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please deny the Busy Bee Cannabis Project. It is too large in scale and not in line with what our community supports.

Our beautiful rural lifestyle will be forever polluted by irresponsibly allowing the proliferation of industrial cannabis production operations like Busy Bee to line the scenic rural corridor along Hwy 246 called out in the Santa Ynez Valley Plan, and in close proximity to NINETEEN ADDITIONAL huge cannabis cultivation projects threatening to engulf our pristine neighborhoods. Please consider the **Cumulative Impacts of Project Clusters**.

There will be glaring visual and olfactory impacts that will permanently destroy the unique character of our community. How will odors be contained?

Carpenteria residents have filed a Class Action Lawsuit because of the lack of proper Odor controls. Is this what we need?

I strongly urge you to responsibly limit the amount of cannabis allowed per parcel in Santa Barbara County, and not allow hundreds of acres to be concentrated among properties in such a small area. Why are we not in line with other California counties on this issue? For perspective, Sonoma County has capped cannabis cultivation projects at one acre. The laxity of Santa Barbara County cannabis acreage limits is obscene. The impact cannabis crops are having on neighboring Vineyards and other crops that have been here for decades should be strictly controlled.

We already produce more Cannabis than California can consume. Where is all this Pot going to go?

Or are you letting Santa Barbara County go to Pot?

Respectfully,



Jan Davidson
Santa Rita Hills Landowner
30 Year Resident

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Dave Clary <templeclary@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2020 9:22 AM
To: sbcob
Cc: Dave Clary
Subject: Letter for Board of Supervisors re Busy Bee Organics appeals, hearing Tuesday, March 17, 2020
Attachments: 200314 - BUSY BEES - DTC LETTER FOR 3 17 20 BOS HEARING.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.

To: the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Please distribute the attached letter in support of Appellant Blair Pence and opposing Applicant Busy Bee Organics. The hearing is set for tomorrow, March 17, 2020.

In addition to distributing it to the members of the board and their staff, please distribute it to the planning and development key staff for tomorrow's hearing.

Also, please post it for public viewing on the BOS website for this hearing.

Thank you very much,

Dave and Lil Clary

To:
The Santa Barbara County
Board of Supervisors

Re: Appellant's and Applicant's appeals of the land use permit authorized to Busy
Bee Organics on APN 099-240-072

Hearing Date: Currently scheduled for hearing on Tuesday, March 17, 2020

My name is Dave Clary. My wife Lillian and I have lived in Santa Barbara
County for 40 years and Tepusquet Canyon for 24 years. This is our joint letter.

Regrettably we are both in the vulnerable population (ages 76 and 73
respectively) with respect to Covid-19 and will not be attending the hearing on
March 17, 2020.

We wish the best to the Board, County Staff and participants on all sides of
this debate in view of the earth-shaking impact of Covid-19. May no one be a victim
of Covid-19, and if you are may your immune system be strong and fully protect you.

Reliance on the PEIR

In preparation for the hearing on the appeal to the Board of Supervisors by
of the Santa Rita Hills LUP by vintner Blair Pence and of the hearing on this matter, I
found one issue I have yet to see discussed (which is rare). It is that though the
County Planning and Development staff is relying heavily on the PEIR as the
foundational document that resolves so many issues, that is really not the case.
I understand that the concept is that if the issue was dealt with in the PEIR, then no
further (read time consuming and expensive) site specific EIR need be prepared.
What I find interesting, however, is that over and over again, findings of "significant
and unavoidable." impacts in the PEIR, are simply dismissed. The board regarding
issue after issue in the PEIR nullifies the PEIR determination by making a finding of
"overriding considerations." In my view, this means that it is not the PEIR that
allows so many of the impacts that citizens of the County have been complaining
about for the last few years, but the decision of the Board to go ahead despite these
"significant and unavoidable" impacts.

This is a hearing *de novo*. That means the Board can look at the "significant
and unavoidable" impacts found in the PEIR, dismiss the determination of
"overriding considerations" the Board made and start to restructure the disaster
that is facing us ... enormous commercial growth of cannabis which is basically
incompatible with most everything else so many of us hold dear in this County.
Given the complexity of CEQA, expert legal counsel will be necessary in detaching
the "statements of overriding considerations." However, the fact that these are not
part of the PEIR may be the key factor that allows this process to take place.

I view it as the Board anticipating opening a treasure chest with cannabis to help offset the unforeseen expenses of the Thomas Fire, the resultant flooding and other expenses, has instead found that it opened Pandora's Box. Is it too late to close it?

It takes recognition of a mistake and a will to correct it in face of what is likely to be vociferous objections from those who are making a fortune now from cannabis cultivation, often illegally with out-of-state sales, but under the color of law, or anticipate making a fortune from cannabis cultivation. They are a small minority of people, many not even residents of this County. The only interest in this County for many of them is maximizing profits.

The Applicant in this case and all others were on notice from the outset that any investment they made would not provide them with a vested interest in their projects. Sensitive to the possibility of regulatory changes at the state or federal level, the Board of Supervisors retained its right to make changes to zoning ordinances without amortization or nonconforming status to any Applicant. This retention was only in part due to the possibility of regulatory changes, and certainly could apply to the circumstances at hand. *Santa Barbara County Code, Chapter 35, County Land Use Development Code, Cannabis Regulations, Section 35.42.075.A.3*

I suspect that most Applicants, and specifically Busy Bee Organics, have garnered so much income from the amorphous laws in effect re Title X eligibility and enforcement thereof that any amortization would be superfluous and not due them in any event (*Id.*, above).

Do we conclusively know, without relying on any representations by Applicant, that they have paid any County cannabis taxes? If they have, is the amount commensurate with the expanded cultivation acreage?

Please reverse the decision of the Planning Commission and revoke Busy Bee Organics' LUP.

Expansion of cultivation footprint beyond that in existence under legal non-conforming status pursuant to Title X on January 19, 2016

Attorneys Marc Chytilo, and Ana Citron and Courtney Cox, on behalf of Appellant Blair Pence have set forth an excellent detailed analysis of the ordinances and laws and court cases that deal with illegal expansion of non-conforming land usages, whether cannabis-related or otherwise. It is found in ***Document Number 9 "Appellant Appeal Form and Letter"*** in the list of documents set forth on the Board of Supervisors Agenda website for this hearing. The page number listed on my PDF copy starts at page 22. The page number printed on the document itself is page 30.

It is clear that any expansion of a Title X cultivation site beyond that in existence on January 19, 2016 is completely illegal. Also, it is clear that Busy Bee Organics has expanded its cultivation beyond that date so much that it dwarfs the original non-conforming cultivation site. Also its initial claim of legal non-conforming (by affidavit) has not been investigated by the County.

Yet despite all of this, the position of the Planning and Development department is that this failure, though in violation of the ordinance is eliminated as a consideration with the approval of the LUP, which they advocated for and still

advocate for. To someone not in the Planning and Development Department, this is bizarre thinking. It is an enormous reward for substantial illegal activity.

This is a terrible precedent. We have sites in Tepusquet Canyon that, even if they can establish initial legitimacy as non-conforming cannabis cultivation sites (which is doubtful in all but one case), most have expanded so much that one site alone has over 50 extensive row houses. The enormity of this cultivation footprint was not even contemplated or in existence as a legal non-conforming medical marijuana grow site prior to January 19, 2016

Photographic evidence clearly establishes the expansion in these cases.

The violation of this ordinance by the owners of these sites over the years provided them with an opportunity to expand their cultivation footprint and open a door to enormous profits. How much of the cannabis grown has been sold out of state in contravention of California law and federal law and the Cole Letter (revoked, but I understand informally used in practice still)? Have they paid any taxes to the County? If so, has the amount been reasonably related to a good faith estimate by the County of the profits made over the years?

The burden should be on the Applicant to substantiate the claim of legal non-conforming as per Title X, and State law at the time, January 19, 2016. Also the burden should be on the Applicant to establish that it has not expanded in any way since then. These burdens, to be effective, should be by the legal standard of clear and convincing evidence. We ought to be able to rely on the truthfulness of the representations. If they are lying now and/or violating the law, let's not let them continue to do so.

It is time to end the coddling of the cannabis industry and force the Applicants to comply.

Not only should this grant of an LUP be reversed and denied, but if the Applicant cannot establish by clear and convincing evidence that it has 1) a legitimate claim to legal non-conforming status as of January 19, 2016, and 2) that it has not expanded its cultivation footprint since that date, and 3) that it has paid a reasonable amount of taxes to the County in view of this expansion, then following should occur:

The Applicant should not receive an LUP or CUP or Cannabis Business License on this parcel or any other in the County in its name or the name of any entity in which the individual persons involved have a role. This should be a permanent ban.

This would help set matters straight in this industry where the black market temptations have overwhelmed effective regulation.

Dave and Lillian Clary

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: PAUL EKSTROM <paulekstrom@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2020 9:42 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Busy Bee Organics, Inc appeal

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.

I am a 50 year resident of Santa Barbara County. I urge you to support the appeal put forth by the Santa Barbara Coalition for Responsible Cannabis. Our county is known world wide for avocados, grapes and wine, berries, etc. Why allow one specific crop to alter the success of so many crops? In addition our schools, homes, and tourist destinations are adversely impacted by the out of control cannabis odor.

I believe it was the mayor of Goleta who stated Goleta does not want to be like Carpinteria with the odor of cannabis. Well, Solvang, Bulleton, Santa Rita, Tepusquet don't want to smell like Carpinteria. Please support the Coalition's appeal. Thank you, Paul and Linda Ekstrom 805-886-6712

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Rob Salomon <robb.salomon@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2020 11:44 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Attached letter for submission re Busy Bee Appeal on March 17, 2020
Attachments: RS letter re Busy Bee Appeal.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.

Attached please find, submit & circulate my letter in support of the Santa Barbara Coalition for Responsible Cannabis appeal 19APL-000000-00031.

Thank you.

Rob Salomon

To: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors

March 15, 2020

Re: Busy Bee's Organics Cannabis Cultivation Project

19APL-000000-00031, March 17, 2020

transmitted via email on March 16, 2020

Honorable Supervisors:

I am writing to urge the Board of Supervisors to uphold the appeal of the Santa Barbara Coalition for Responsible Cannabis & deny the issuance of the Land Use Permit requested by Busy Bee Organics. The lawyers arguing on behalf of the Coalition will rely on complex & detailed legalities. I will rely on a more general principle of law which all of us, lawyers & laypersons alike, can appreciate. I refer to the principle of due process, governmental transparency & the relevant rules, laws & judicial precedents that are in place to ensure it.

ASSUMPTIONS

1. Cannabis cultivators have a right to legally establish their businesses & to do their best to make them thrive.
2. Santa Barbara County has a right to encourage the growth of legal businesses, including cannabis cultivation, & to take appropriate & lawful steps to develop & maintain a sufficient tax base to fund legitimate County operations.
3. The general public has a right to demand that the County, in the context of its enabling objective 1 & its pursuit of objective 2 (listed above), involve, respect & recognize the disparate community interests, respect, listen to, speak to & confer openly with all of those interests, protect & enhance the property, safety, health & quality of life of its citizenry & its established & legacy businesses. It best accomplishes this through transparency.

THE EVOLUTION OF CANNABIS REGULATION IN SANTA BARBARA COUNTY

1. 2016: ban on cannabis cultivation, except for those currently cultivating legally who may continue to do so as legal nonconforming users. There was no requirement to identify or to produce evidence of legal nonconforming status. They could grow in **SECRET**.
2. February, 2017: creation of a 2-supervisor ad hoc committee, exempt from public meeting requirements, to expedite the creation of an effective cannabis regulatory ordinance. They could meet **SECRETLY**.
3. April, 2017: creation of a cannabis "registry" in which cannabis growers were encouraged to enter data on current & planned future cultivation; CEO staff member Bozanich promised the registry would be kept confidential, no evidence would be demanded & the claims would not be verified. They could register an unconfirmed reality & a dreamed of future **SECRETLY**.
4. December, 2017: creation of the "Affidavits under Penalty of Perjury" in which cannabis growers "swore, certified & affirmed" that they were growing cannabis legally prior to January 19, 2016 & continuously thereafter &, as a result, were legal nonconforming users. The County assured

them they would not have to produce any evidence of their claims. CEO staff member, with the apparent support of the County, kept the identity & locale of such affiants secret until March, 2019, on the grounds that such secrecy was necessary for the safety of the public. Mr. Bozanich released them at that time only because, he said, they were no longer relevant. **SECRET** until at least Mr Bozanich thought them no longer important to the process.

5. December, 2017: creation of “Letters of Authorization”, through which the County certified to the State that based on the unverified, uninvestigated affidavit(s) of legal nonconforming use, the applicant was qualified for a State cannabis license. The “letters” stated that there had been no verification attempted of the claimed legal nonconforming status. These licenses are currently being renewed automatically by the State absent affirmative County action revoking the certification. Such County action is, in turn, dependent upon the County being convinced by the public that the claimant(s) are not legal nonconforming users or have unlawfully expanded. They obtain State “certification” **SECRETLY**.

STATE LAW & JUDICIAL PRECEDENT UNDERLYING LEGAL NONCONFORMING USE

Legal nonconforming use is a judicially created concept that has been created to be fair to **both** the nonconforming user & to the community in which the newly nonconforming use exists.

Legal nonconforming use was never intended to be the vehicle to bestow new entitlements on the claimants.

As such, legal nonconforming use is deemed a “disfavored status” that is only to be officially bestowed on a claimant pursuant to a strictly enforced & interpreted process, essentially as follows:

1. The burden of proof rests with the party claiming legal nonconforming use status;
2. The evidence presented must meet the burden of proof as to actual, not contemplated, pre-existing, legal use & the expense of such use;
3. The community is entitled to hear such evidence, challenge its veracity & present its own evidence to the contrary;
4. Findings of fact to support the eventual decision must be made;
5. **The process, itself, is deemed to be sufficiently critical to due process that a local government entity is denied the power to waive adherence to the process.**

Because legal nonconforming status is a disfavored status, courts & quasi-judicial forums are to be strict in enforcing the no-expansion requirement. Attaching a State license does not modify the requirements & limitations of the status.

Speaking simply, if there is not convincing evidence demonstrating entitlement to the claimed status, even if there is no evidence to the contrary, the claimed status **DOES NOT LEGALLY EXIST.**

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY CANNABIS ORDINANCE & THE LAW OF LEGAL NONCONFORMING USE

The Santa Barbara County cannabis ordinance & regulations have relied overwhelmingly on the existence of the status of legal nonconforming use. The vast majority of County permits & State licenses

that exist in the County are based on the status. Yet, not only were the claimants not required to produce convincing evidence of entitlement to the status, **THE COMMUNITY WAS TOTALLY BLIND TO THE ENTIRE PROCESS, FROM THE FIRST BESTOWAL OF THE STATUS THROUGH THE FINAL CERTIFICATION OF QUALIFICATION TO THE STATE.**

THE COMMUNITY WAS TOTALLY BLIND TO WHO WAS CULTIVATING, WHO WAS CLAIMING LEGAL NONCONFORMING STATUS & WHERE THEY WERE CLAIMING IT. Ironically, kept blind to protect the public!

The community has submitted formal petitions, with picture evidence, for review of what it has learned to be legal nonconforming uses. The County has not even responded to the petitions. It has ignored the petitions. **The County first blinded the community & then muted it.**

The appeal remedy available to the community is expensive. But it is the only forum the community can speak beyond allotted two-minute periods.

The cost of protecting our interests is one thing. More demanding, please consider:

THE COUNTY REGULATIONS & ORDINANCE HAVE SWITCHED THE BURDEN OF PROOF FROM THE LEGAL NONCONFORMING USE CLAIMANT TO THE COMMUNITY. THE COMMUNITY NOW MUST PROVE THAT THE CLAIMANT WAS NOT DOING SOMETHING IN 2015 OR PROVE THAT WHATEVER THE CLAIMANT WAS DOING HAS EXPANDED BEYOND AN ORIGINAL SIZE THAT WAS NEVER DEFINED IN THE FIRST PLACE.

Please consider what the switch of burden of proof means. Imagine the difficulty of proving that your neighbor did NOT go to the market in 2015, or even yesterday, &/or that when your neighbor was at the market that your neighbor bought only one loaf of bread, not two. The community's task is made more difficult because there are no specific factual findings to dispute.

It is hard to imagine a clearer, more thorough denial of due process, of any semblance of basic fairness, of any meaningful consideration of legitimate community interests, than what the County cannabis ordinance has accomplished.

Based upon the foregoing, I ask that you uphold the Coalition's appeal & deny the issuance of the requested land use permit to Busy Bee Organics.

Respectfully,

Rob Salomon

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Anna Carrillo <Annacarp@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2020 11:59 AM
To: sbcob; Hart, Gregg; Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve
Subject: Busy Bee Organics

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Anna Carrillo
March 16, 2020

Please reject the appeal from Busy Bee Organics of Planning Commission's recommendations at their Planning Commission meeting. You have selected your Planning Commissioners to help make planning decisions and you need to uphold their recommendations. Much of the difficulty the community is having with cannabis cultivators is that Planning Staff and Planning Commissioners have spent time trying to come up with regulations, but often your Board overturns them.

1. Busy Bee's reasons for expansion from Planning Commissions recommendations have to do with the Board's decisions in proposing changes regarding Williamson Act Parcels requiring 50% of a property to be in cannabis to qualify for inclusion. The California Farm Bureau's letter of 1/17/20 informed both the Planning Commission and Agricultural Preserve Advisory Committee that the current Santa Barbara County "Uniform Rules for Agricultural Preserves and Farmland Security Zones" are not compliant with existing law. Government Code 51231(b) only authorizes the County to identify commercial cannabis cultivation as a "compatible use" on contracted lands. The Board needs to rectify this error immediately.

2. Again, the odor abatement changes appealed for in this appeal can not be substantiated. Dr. Kenneth Underwood, reviewed the odor testing done by Bosarge Environmental LLC and found it to be not sufficient because of the time of day when the testing was done and the very unique wind patterns in the Santa Ynez Valley. Bosarge did their testing during the afternoon when there are strong afternoon winds, whereas earlier and later in the day the odor is much more detectable. "Stagnation patterns occur 15-25% of the time". The Board needs to reject the Applicant's modification of Planning Commission's recommendations re: Odor Abatement Plan changes.

3. Not only is there terpene drift from the cultivation of cannabis plants on grapes in neighboring vineyards, there is also the new understanding about the taint from the vaporized essential oils from the use of odor phase systems.

4. It is not accurate to say that because the Business License requires annual review, the Director of Planning does not need to re-evaluate. If this appeal is not rejected, then the land use permit/entitlement becomes permanent regardless of who is the operator.

5. If nothing else, please heed the directions of your Ag Advisory who asked in their March 6 letter to encourage you to continue this appeal and upcoming other ones until the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors resolve amendments to the Cannabis Zoning Ordinance. If this is not possible please 1. Require release from liability for legally applied crop management materials, tools, and practices

2. Prohibit detectable offsite odor - not leave the property
3. Apply limits on term on the land use permits

Please support the appeal of the Coalition for the following reasons:

6. A CUP should have been required. This is currently one of the measures the Planning Commission is discussing upon your Board's recommendation from 8 months ago.
7. The PEIR has not taken into account the Santa Ynez Community Plan stressing the importance of protecting the visual resources in this area which hoops will significantly change the visual character and the beauty of this scenic gateway into Santa Ynez Valley and its tourism industry.
8. There is a very serious risk of liability to legacy farmers due to pesticide migration. See note #5 above and terpene and vaporized essential oil taint mentioned in #3 above.
9. There is a real serious harm done to the County's vineyards which have taken years of time and investment to provide income to the county coffers from sales and tourism to the Santa Ynez Valley.
10. Land use permits must not be permanent entitlements - even if a operator loses his business license or it's not renewed or the CDFRA license isn't renewed, the land use permit must be re-examined before a new operator can just take over. See letter mentioned above in #1 regarding "compatible use" not "principal use".
11. There needs to be term limits on permanent land use permits.
12. The Odor Abatement Plan isn't working: There needs to be a sensor on the property measuring the odor. Relying on neighbors to make complaints and/or the Director isn't working and isn't feasible. Odors must not leave the property. The Odor Abatement Policy needs to be changed. In fact the Planning Commission at their March 4th meeting wants to tackle this immediately, but they need the Board to authorize this bifurcation from the rest of the possible ordinance changes so as to look at this IMMEDIATELY and provide funding to the Planning Staff to look at this.
13. Please don't reject this appeal while changes to the ordinance are being discussed.

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: andrewrice.com <andrew@andrewrice.com>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2020 2:21 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Letter in Support of Busy Bee's Organics Board of Supervisors Appeal

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 Chair Hart and all the Supervisors,

First, thank you for your service through this difficult time. Thank you for rising to the occasion and providing good leadership.

Quickly, I urge you to DENY the appeal brought by Blair Pence and his astroturf group the SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis. I have read their lengthy letter and all their issues are based in a general opposition to legalized cannabis, none unique or specific to the Busy Bee's project. They are attempting to take second and third bite at the apple because they do not like the board's decisions of overriding consideration when adopting the original ordinance.

I know Sara Rotman and Nate Diaz personally. I have toured their farm several times. They are the model for exactly the kind of people and the type of project that Santa Barbara County should support. They provide good jobs for everyone who works for their farm and their business. They are thoughtful neighbors who really work with everyone around them. They give back to the community in both deeds and, not insignificantly, by paying huge amounts of cannabis taxes that support your board's priorities of libraries, law enforcement, education and health care for the county as a whole. Please do not undermine that.

I also urge you, the board, to vote in favor of the modifications to the four conditions that were requested by Busy Bee's. Those four minor adjustments to the conditions ensure the future viability of this farm and the ongoing support it brings to the Santa Barbara County community.

thank you again for your hard work and service.

Best,

Andrew Rice

495 Alan Road, Santa Barbara.

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: merrily peebles <merpeebles@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2020 2:27 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Busy Bee appeal March 17, 2020

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 know my letter is two hours late, but I assumed the meeting would be postponed due to the Covid 19 virus news. So I hope you will take this into consideration when noting the time of delivery of my comments.

Busy Bee is in the wrong location and is the wrong size. Why have a Community Plan for the SY Valley and note "gateway parcels" to maintain the visual character of the Valley? By approving this project you are ruining the neighborhood. Furthermore you are risking the viability of the existing grape crops.

This project should be denied for so many reasons, it would be unbelievable to approve it. I will be utterly surprised if this is approved.

Sincerely,
Merrily Peebles