

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Melissa DeWeese <mdeweese@beneflexsb.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 1, 2018 4:09 PM
To: Adam, Peter; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Williams, Das; Wolf, Janet
Cc: Nelson, Bob; Litten, Jefferson; Bantilan, Cory; Elliott, Darcel; O'Gorman, Mary; sbcob; Metzger, Jessica; Bozanich, Dennis; Ivan Van Wingerden
Subject: Public Comment on Cannabis Land Use

We support the county's ordinance which will allow responsible farmers to grow and process cannabis on Ag parcels.

The county's proposed draft includes extensive development standards to mitigate impacts identified in the EIR.

We support mandatory odor control on all cultivation. Currently, any remaining odors are due to bad actors. Most responsible growers already have installed best available technology.

There has already been an improvement in odor over the last few months. With odor being mandatory it will likely all be mitigated.

DO NOT adopt an increased setback. This will not mitigate impacts – or address odor. **We support a setback policy that will allow existing growers – who are operating in compliance with local and state law – to continue to operate and seek licensure.** (this point is huge for us. the opposition is using set-backs as a way of shutting people down. Its not putting out the bad-actors, its just an arbitrary distance, which is not a fair way to enforce compliance).

We commend the board of supervisors and staff for developing this ordinance – which will require operators to comply with a strict set of standards in order to continue to operate. Adopting this ordinance will give the county the tools to shut down bad actors, and require growers to renew compliance annually with local and state requirements.

We also support a reasonable cap that will allow existing, compliant operators, who have already obtained temporary state licenses, to continue to operate.

We recognize the contributions of this industry: economic growth, high paying jobs, etc. The tax revenue for the county will be tremendous from the cannabis industry. It is in our county's best interest to foster a sustainable industry.

We are confident that the county's policy is the best way to regulate this industry and ensure that responsible agriculture continues and can coexist with its neighbors.

Melissa Serenity DeWeese
Benefits Advisor
Beneflex Insurance Services, LLC

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Amir Eskandari <ameq805@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 1, 2018 4:46 PM
To: Adam, Peter; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Williams, Das; Wolf, Janet
Cc: Nelson, Bob; Litten, Jefferson; Bantilan, Cory; Elliott, Darcel; O'Gorman, Mary; sbcob; Metzger, Jessica; Bozanich, Dennis
Subject: Public comment: Cannabis land use

Dear Santa Barbara County Supervisors and Staff,

I am writing you today to express my support for the county's ordinance, which includes extensive requirements for all farmers to mitigate impacts identified by the EIR. I am a lifelong resident of Santa Barbara county, the son of a long-time SBCC professor and a local grower working and living in the Carpinteria Valley; I am also one of the responsible, local stewards of the cannabis crop. From the perspective of a farmer, I can tell you that cannabis is significantly less resource intensive than other field crops because we recycle and reuse our water. We use no pesticides, only predatory insects and with the use of a blackout shade systems, all light is blocked from leaving my greenhouse. I support this regulation and understand it is part of being a good neighbor.

I also absolutely support mandatory odor control on greenhouses in Carpinteria. I know this has been a huge source of complaints from the public, but this will be solved with the passing of your ordinance and an enforcement team in place. I'm proud to say that my farm is one of a growing number, that have already installed the Byers odor control system with great success. At this point any odor in Carpinteria is being created by a handful of bad actors.

With any outdoor cultivation or hoop structure cultivation, odor control becomes nearly impossible, and it is for this reason that I support prohibiting these structures.

I've heard a lot about "buffer zones" from sensitive receptors lately, ranging from a few hundred feet to a few thousand feet. With effective odor control, distance should not be a factor.

Like many others, I support a setback policy that is based on effectiveness and not an arbitrary distance. This will allow compliant, responsible, and high-quality growers to continue operating.

At the end of the day, the sooner we can get the county ordinance passed, the sooner all growers will be forced to act on odor control, and the sooner you will have the tools to enforce upon those that aren't compliant. I want to thank the board of supervisors, and your staff, for developing this ordinance and for all the work you have done thus far. This has been no small task, to say the least, and your efforts are greatly appreciated.

Warmly,

Amir Eskandari

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Tim O'Neil <tim@mentalitycreative.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 1, 2018 5:58 PM
To: Adam, Peter; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Williams, Das; Wolf, Janet
Cc: Nelson, Bob; Litten, Jefferson; Bantilan, Cory; Elliott, Darcel; O'Gorman, Mary; sbcob; Metzger, Jessica; Bozanich, Dennis
Subject: Cannabis Land Use/Public Comment

Dear County Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing as a local business owner here in Santa Barbara—originally from the agriculture rich territory of Kern County—to support our local farmers as they continue to grow and process cannabis, in accordance with the county's current ordinance. I am committed to supporting our local farmers at this particularly revolutionary time in our state's economy. The tax revenues, economic growth, and lucrative jobs, which will emerge from the cultivation of the cannabis industry are paramount to establishing a fiscally sound California, especially at a time of rapid population growth, where there exists an increased need for the multitude of state services to keep up with that growth.

Also, as for the setback policy that is up for much debate, I want to emphasize my and the community's support that existing growers who are in compliance with state and local law, should be allowed to continue their operations and seek licensure. This policy is not just good for the growers, but for the state's economy as a whole. As we support our local industry, we thrive as a state, city by city, county by county.

Thank you for your important work, and for your time,

Tim O'Neil

MENTALITY Tim O'Neil Founder+Creative Director
8 E. Figueroa Street, Suite 245, Santa Barbara, CA 93101
O 805-979-4095 | C 323-428-8581
mentalitycreative.com



Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Jennifer Taylor <jennifertaylor106@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 1, 2018 8:20 PM
To: Adam, Peter; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Williams, Das; Wolf, Janet
Cc: Nelson, Bob; Litten, Jefferson; Bantilan, Cory; Elliott, Darcel; O'Gorman, Mary; sbcob; Metzger, Jessica; Bozanich, Dennis
Subject: Public Comment on Cannabis Land Use DO NOT CLICK, Likely malicious content, contact your Departmental IT

Hello Board of Supervisors,

I write to you on a topic of much heated debate, to ensure that my voice (that represents SO MANY) is heard loud and clear.

I have watched and read from afar as a handful of community members have sent articles into our Coastal View and posted online about the disruption they 'have had to experience' about this topic. Most times I have even laughed as they falsify facts about the industry and the effects.

But enough is enough!

The number one thing to understand is that two thirds of our county voters support using our agriculture land for the growing and processing of cannabis. And we support this because we know that there are farmers who want nothing more than to coincide with regulations (that make sense) and be conscientious community members (even leaders). I know that there has been a development requiring operators to comply with a strict set of standards in order to operate- GREAT! All citizens should support this, especially to include the mandatory odor control.

Let's move on a setback policy that will allow existing growers who operate in compliance- to continue to operate and seek licensure. And then through routine checks on this compliance- let's get out any who will not comply.

It's time to make this vote a reality, and go with a decision based on facts and what the voters want- and I trust that this Board has the great ability to do so!

Thank you for your time, and thank you for making the right decision!

Best,
Jennifer Taylor

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Niels J.Lameijer <niels@nielsjl.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 1, 2018 8:26 PM
To: Adam, Peter; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Williams, Das; Wolf, Janet
Cc: Nelson, Bob; Bozanich, Dennis; sbcob; Metzger, Jessica; Litten, Jefferson; Elliott, Darcel; O'Gorman, Mary; Bantilan, Cory
Subject: Public Comment on Cannabis Land Use

Dear County Supervisors,

It's not often I voice my opinion beyond the ballot box. Today I feel this is needed regarding the Cannabis Land Use topic at hand.

Cannabis is a topic that stirs up a lot of emotions and I applaud the Board of Supervisors and staff for developing an ordinance that will require growers to comply with a strict set of standards in order to continue their business.

What most concerns me though is that the emotions of a small group of citizens is influencing a decision that is not in alignment with the larger interest of our county and 2/3rd's of our county's voters, and that is why I am speaking up.

I believe in adopting an ordinance that will give the county the tools to guide a sustainable industry that contributes to our community in powerful ways (tax revenue, good high paying jobs, philanthropy, and on) and require growers to renew compliance annually with local and state requirements.

I do not support adopting an increased setback, I believe this will not give YOU the tools to keep the responsible business owners and weed out the bad actors. It will only hurt the growers who are operating within the current local and state laws. I support a setback policy that allows existing farmers to continue to operate and seek licensure.

Living in our beautify county I have already noticed a significant improvement in odor control! Which went form a daily occurrence to non-existent most days! To me this shows that our responsible farmers do what makes them the good neighbors they are. And not only good neighbors regarding their own businesses, these farmers were the first on the scene (days before Caltrans) to clear the roads after the dramatic floods blocked so many of us going anywhere, just three weeks ago!

In short; I support the county creating an ordinance, which will allow conscientious farmers to grow, and process cannabis on Ag parcels in our community, has mandatory odor control on all cultivation and a setback policy that allows existing farmers to continue to operate and seek licensure.

Best,

Niels J. Lameijer

Carpinteria, CA
CEO Coach, Mentor

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: htjameson@verizon.net
Sent: Thursday, February 1, 2018 10:05 PM
To: sbcob; Williams, Das; Wolf, Janet; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve
Subject: Marijuana permits, licenses, and ballot measure -- comment for 2-6-18 meeting

Dear Chairman Williams and Supervisors Wolf, Hartmann, Adam, and Lavagnino, ,

Please accept the Planning Commission's recommendations for: 1) a 1000-foot buffer between marijuana businesses and sensitive receptors and 2) not allowing onsite consumption of marijuana at retailers. The buffer makes sense, and pot clubs are a clear and present danger to motorists.

The Planning Commission intended, I believe, to assure that any marijuana-related odor from cultivation or any business could not be detected on any neighboring property. I applaud this position. The commission suggested revised wording for Section C.7 to read: "The Odor Abatement Plan must reduce odors that are experienced within residential zones, as determined by the Director." Would it make the wording clearer to say instead: "The Odor Abatement Plan must prevent any odor from leaving the property where the authorized marijuana activity takes place" or some such wording?

I would ask that if retailing is allowed that it be limited to sales by delivery. Delivery services exist now and attempts to eliminate this customary channel of distribution will be futile. Some legitimate medical marijuana users may need a delivery service. The question is whether there will be regulated legal delivery services or unregulated illegal ones. In contrast, storefront dealers are not needed or beneficial. By their presence and advertising, they provide an additional pass-along source of marijuana for young people, who are especially vulnerable to marijuana's harmful effects. Please do not allow storefront sellers. If you must, please limit the number of storefront licenses to two or three.

I would suggest delaying the effective date of any land-use permits or licenses for marijuana businesses until and unless voters pass a marijuana tax. It would be very difficult to revoke licenses of already-existing businesses if the tax vote fails, even though from your comments revocation will seemingly be inescapable in such an event. I also suggest the tax be a special tax dedicated to marijuana legal administration and enforcement, so that the revenue is not siphoned off to other uses.

Sincerely yours,
Hunter Jameson

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Pat Hughes <ph@hughessg.com>
Sent: Friday, February 2, 2018 7:53 AM
To: Adam, Peter; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Williams, Das; Wolf, Janet
Cc: Nelson, Bob; Litten, Jefferson; Bantilan, Cory; Elliott, Darcel; O'Gorman, Mary; sbcob; Metzger, Jessica; Bozanich, Dennis
Subject: Responsible Cannabis Farming: opinions from a community / business perspective

Thank you for the opportunity to have my voice heard on this important issue. I normally don't take the time to write in on these things, but I feel strongly about the need to have the larger Santa Barbara county's business interests heard. I realize there is a very vocal minority of people that don't support the ordinance to allow responsible farmers to grow and process cannabis on Ag parcels, but I feel if it is done right, it can be a huge benefit to our community.

One of the issues has been odor control - we all understand and appreciate this important issue. We support the idea of mandatory odor control on all cultivation and feel the current problems are the result of irresponsible farmers that have resisted investing in and using available technology that will mitigate or eliminate this problem. Let's not let these irresponsible farmers continue - lets implement mandatory odor control as a part of the plan to support responsible farming of cannabis.

As a part of the issue of odor control: we encourage the idea of **not increasing setbacks**. In my opinion the idea of increasing setbacks will not get rid of the irresponsible farmers and it unfairly punishes those that are operating in compliance with local and state law. The growers that are operating within local and state laws should be able to continue to operate and seek licensure.

As a business owner in Santa Barbara, I recognize and value the economic contributions of this industry and want my voice to be heard - we need this engine of growth, and the community will benefit from it as a whole. The tax revenue for the county will be significant and sustainable - markets in general are feeling strong right now, but let's remember - there will be a time when things aren't as strong, and during those times we will be thankful for the decisions we made to support this growth industry.

Thank you so much for allowing me to share my perspective on this important issue.

Pat

Pat Hughes | Founder & CEO

Hughes Systems Group

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Metzger, Jessica
Sent: Friday, February 2, 2018 8:39 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: FW: Public Comment / Cannabis Land Use

From: Dan Cattaneo [mailto:dcattaneo@beneflexsb.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 2:37 PM
To: Adam, Peter <peter.adam@countyofsb.org>; Hartmann, Joan <jHartmann@countyofsb.org>; Lavagnino, Steve <steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org>; Williams, Das <DWilliams@countyofsb.org>; Wolf, Janet <jwolf@countyofsb.org>
Cc: Nelson, Bob <bob.nelson@countyofsb.org>; Litten, Jefferson <jlitten@countyofsb.org>; Bantilan, Cory <cory.bantilan@countyofsb.org>; Elliott, Darcel <delliott@countyofsb.org>; O'Gorman, Mary <mogorman@countyofsb.org>; sbcob <sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>; Metzger, Jessica <jmetzger@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>; Bozanich, Dennis <dBozanich@countyofsb.org>
Subject: Public Comment / Cannabis Land Use

Hello,

I have lived in Santa Barbara County for 25 years and I would like to give my opinion in this matter. Thank you for letting me do so.

We support the county's ordinance which will allow responsible farmers to grow and process cannabis on Ag parcels. The county's proposed draft includes extensive development standards to mitigate impacts identified in the EIR. We support mandatory odor control on all cultivation. Currently, any remaining odors are due to bad actors. Most responsible growers already have installed best available technology. There has already been an improvement in odor over the last few months. With odor being mandatory it will likely all be mitigated.

DO NOT adopt an increased setback. This will not mitigate impacts – or address odor. **We support a setback policy that will allow existing growers – who are operating in compliance with local and state law – to continue to operate and seek licensure.** We commend the board of supervisors and staff for developing this ordinance – which will require operators to comply with a strict set of standards in order to continue to operate. Adopting this ordinance will give the county the tools to shut down bad actors, and require growers to renew compliance annually with local and state requirements.

We also support a reasonable cap that will allow existing, compliant operators, who have already obtained temporary state licenses, to continue to operate.

We recognize the contributions of this industry: economic growth, high paying jobs, etc. The tax revenue for the county will be tremendous from the cannabis industry. It is in our county's best interest to foster a sustainable industry.

We are confident that the county's policy is the best way to regulate this industry and ensure that responsible agriculture continues and can coexist with its neighbors.

Thank you for your consideration for responsible growers that will contribute to the local economy.

Dan Cattaneo, CEO

Bene

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Clay Aurell (AIA, LEED AP) <caurell@abdesignstudioinc.com>
Sent: Friday, February 2, 2018 9:56 AM
To: Adam, Peter; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Williams, Das; Wolf, Janet
Cc: Nelson, Bob; Litten, Jefferson; Bantilan, Cory; Elliott, Darcel; O'Gorman, Mary; sbcob; Metzger, Jessica; Bozanich, Dennis
Subject: Public Comment on Cannabis Land Use

To: County Board of Supervisors

I am writing on behalf of many people that I know in the area of Carpinteria who have been legally growing Cannabis for the past 14 months and those who have helped grow this industry within our County. For the record, I am not someone who partakes in the use of Cannabis, but do believe in its healing abilities and homeopathic benefits for many who use non-THC based Cannabis to help them cope with severe diseases.

Last year, our State approved the use of Recreational Cannabis and over 2/3 of the population of our County supported Prop 64 in an Historic vote. From a business perspective, the agricultural industry of Carpinteria has seen a boom in this new crop. This revenue cannot be ignored and helps bring revenue to the County as well as to local business, sub-contractors, and the like. There should be some regulation however and the new County Ordinance hits on some key concepts.

First, the goal should be to allow Farmers to be Farmers. Growing Cannabis on AG parcels should be allowed and extra regulation that reduce the ability to do so, responsibly, should be removed. I don't think that additional setback requirements should be considered. If existing farmers/growers are operating in compliance with state and local laws, they should be able to continue to operate and seek the property license to continue doing so. Please do NOT further impact these growers with an increased setback.

Second, there are several growers who are being responsible about the smell. I support a Mandatory Odor control system for growers. It is my understanding that many responsible growers are already installing the best available technology for containing the odor and keeping the air from being overtaken by the smell.


Third, applying a reasonable cap on the number of growers is a fine idea, however it is important that existing, compliant operators that have obtained proper state licenses (temporary or not) should be allowed to continue to operate.

County Staff and the Board of Supervisors have done a fine job developing this ordinance. I believe that responsible growers should be able to continue and those not playing by the rules should not. This ordinance will give you the tools necessary to regulate the industry and make sure that the mitigation measures of the EIR are being addressed. It is important to help foster a sustainable industry as it will be a tremendous benefit to the County.

Please allow our local farmers to maintain their land and survive in an increasingly tough industry for our area. They are important to the fabric of this county.

Thank you,

CLAY AURELL | AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
principal architect | partner

 AB design studio, inc.
O | 805.963.2100 x 102 C | 805.452.7522 D | 805.288.6172
caurell@abdesignstudioinc.com | www.abdesignstudioinc.com

*This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, arrive late or incomplete, or contain viruses. The sender therefore does not accept liability for any errors or omissions in the contents of this message, which arise as a result of e-mail transmission. If verification is required please request a hard-copy version. Copyright: **AB design studio, inc.***

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Susan McCaw <srm@cominv.com>
Sent: Friday, February 2, 2018 11:51 AM
To: sbcob; Villalobos, David; Cannabis Info
Subject: Public Comment re Draft County Cannabis Land Use Ordinance to be considered on February 6, 2018

Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
Attention: Clerk of the Board
105 East Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101-2058

RE: Public Comment re Draft County Cannabis Land Use Ordinance to be considered on February 6, 2018

Dear Chair Williams and Members of the Board:

We are submitting this letter based on the Planning Commission's recommendation that the Board of Supervisors approve the Draft Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program as amended by the Planning Commission on January 24, 2018.

While we do not support the County's Cannabis Program, we recognize that the Board has an interest in approving an Ordinance that encourages commercial cannabis businesses to operate legally and safely. We also appreciate the amendments made by the Planning Commission this month. However, we are extremely disappointed that the Draft Ordinance continues to allow an unlimited number of commercial cannabis operations, including outdoor cultivation, distribution and manufacturing in Ag-1 zones without appropriate odor controls and despite numerous environmental studies that recognize this will result in significant impacts to prime agricultural soils, air quality (greenhouse gas emissions), noise, transportation and traffic.

The recent conversion of greenhouses from the cultivation of cut-flowers to cannabis in the Carpinteria Valley has already significantly impacted the adjacent landowners with its powerful odor which is present day and night. Numerous complaints have been filed with the County concerning the nuisance, quality of life, and health effects of excessive exposure to cannabis operations. If cannabis becomes more prevalent in this region, we strongly believe that the associated impacts, including odor, traffic, light pollution, distribution locations, criminal activity and potential health concerns will only increase.

The entire County is at risk if the Ordinance recommended by the Planning Commissioners on January 24 is approved by the Board on February 6, 2018. We sincerely ask that the Commissioners take a hard look at the Ordinance and conduct additional analysis.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan and Craig McCaw

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: anna bradley <annaberit@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 2, 2018 12:08 PM
To: Williams, Das; Wolf, Janet; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Subject: Cannabis in Carpinteria Valley

Dear SB County Board of Supervisors,

With reference to the upcoming meeting on Feb 6th, I wanted to write in advance to again point out the real life impacts on the residents of my area of La Mirada Estates just above foothill in Carpinteria. I have been involved in a number of the public venues for this discussion. I have attended work groups and have tried to stay abreast of what decisions are being considered.

Please take into consideration that my family lives at least 1/2 mile from current growing and we live with the odor in our home every day. The proposed 600 foot or 1000 foot set back would not realistically change a natural situation where air travels this distance with odor and other unknown affects. As many have said in our community, School and playgrounds are not the only sensitive receptors. Residents, tourists, employees, employers, pets and more are all sensitive receptors. My daughter who is 13 at this time spends more hours at home than at school, so the rational of only protecting our children by school location only does not add up.

There are financial costs to our community on a house to house basis. We have increased electric bills because we are forced to keep our windows closed and have had to buy air conditioning and filtration to mitigate smell. Unfortunately our home construction is not fully insulated so there appears to be a cannabis draw into our home where sometimes it even smells worse inside than in the open air. We have been promised that odor control will be put in place as soon as licenses are issued and that all will play out for the best. I understand that there are many compromises to be made, but there are people who will suffer if basic reasonable controls are not put in place. Health, Safety, and quality of life are my main concerns. Please take these as your top priority. Second to that - the culture of Carpinteria Valley will change.. and what it is known for. Residential property values are a whole other issue, I am not even sure where that has been addressed.

Thank You for your Consideration,
Anna Bradley
1934 Paquita Dr.
Carpinteria CA 93108

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Spencer Brandt <spencer@spencerbrandt.com>
Sent: Friday, February 2, 2018 12:14 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public Comment letter - Cannabis Land Use
Attachments: Cannabis Letter.pdf

Hello,

Attached is a public comment letter signed by myself, and a number of other residents of Isla Vista regarding the land use ordinance on Cannabis. Please include with board materials. Thank you.

Spencer J. Brandt
Director | Isla Vista Community Services District
Co-Chair | UCSB Lobby Corps
(559) 805-0733

Chair Williams and Board of Supervisors,

Since the passage of Proposition 64, Isla Vistas have followed the Board of Supervisors' actions to develop regulations and ordinances for the growth, sale, and usage of legal marijuana, or cannabis. In November 2016, nearly 85% of voters approved of the legalization of marijuana. Our community is a unique community, in both the geographic and demographic sense. A similar percentage of Isla Vistas are between the ages of 18 and 24, contributing to its easy-going college-town atmosphere.

Cannabis dispensaries in Isla Vista would allow residents that are of age to legally purchase marijuana, rather than buying unregulated, untested marijuana on the black market. Bringing these activities out from the underground, where they can be monitored and regulated, safely purchased, and responsibly used is a top priority for our community.

As residents of Isla Vista, we write to you today in support of adoption of the minimum, 600-foot buffer zone between "sensitive receptor" sites and commercial dispensaries. In Isla Vista, our commercial district sits very close to the boundaries of the university. The adoption of a larger buffer zone could preclude 40% of existing commercial retail space in Isla Vista that would otherwise be eligible for future retail cannabis operations. In addition, we see legal retail cannabis in Isla Vista as an opportunity to improve our community's tax revenue generation, which should be used to improve public services in IV.

We are cognizant that students are not the only group of people who call Isla Vista their home. Many seniors, parents, and children live here too. Any changes your Board is considering to the buffer zone would have no effect on the location of future dispensaries near Isla Vista Elementary School, which sits a substantial distance away from the commercial district.

Respectfully,

Ethan Bertrand

President, IVCSD

Spencer Brandt

Secretary of the Board, IVCSD

Pegeen Soutar

Director, IVRPD

Batsheva Stoll

EVPLA, Associated Students

Kristin Hsu

EVPSA, Associated Students

Andrea Reyes

Senator, Associated Students

Jonathan Abboud

Vice President, SBCC Board of Trustees

Grayson Hernandez

Senator, Associated Students

Dhishal Jayasinghe

Senator, Associated Students

Samuel Seibel

Chair, UCSB AS Public Safety Commission

Emily Murray

President, Campus Democrats

Adham Btadinni

Senator, Associated Students

Sophia Dyaico
Senator, Associated Students
Ilene Ochoa
Senator, Associated Students
Anthony Pimentel
Senator, Associated Students
Alexa Hernandez
Senator, Associated Students
Sami Kaayal
Senator, Associated Students
Sam Cook
Senator, Associated Students
Grayson Hernandez
Senator, Associated Students
Steven Ho
Senator, Associated Students
Alexandra Gessesse
Senator, Associated Students
Grecia Martinez
Senator, Associated Students
Jorge Santos
Senator, Associated Students
Sophia Uemura
Senator, Associated Students
Micah Almas
Senator, Associated Students
Kia Sadeghi
Senator, Associated Students
Kristen Armellini
Senator, Associated Students
Adnan Mansur
Senator, Associated Students

Adrian Olivas
Alexander Young
Andrew Kim
Andrew Yoon
Anthony Elevado
Ash Eiseman
Betty Belete
Ephraim Rodriguez
Fong Kuo
Gordon Hahn
Idalia Sanchez
Johanna Ramirez
Judy Joans
Kevin Sabellico
Kristan Milleza
Lea Toubian
Leilanie Rubinstein
Leili Golian
Maia Maia
Mark Lasa
Matthew Lightner
Max Keaton
Mayela Morales
Michelle Wagner
Noah Fleishman
Rose Le
Roxanne Sandoval
Sean Prager
Steven Martinez
Talia White
Thomas Aronson
Zoe Catz Johnson

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Bonnie Freeman <bonniegoleta@cox.net>
Sent: Friday, February 2, 2018 1:07 PM
To: sbcob; Metzger, Jessica
Cc: Wolf, Janet; Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Adam, Peter
Subject: Feb. 6th BOS Hearing on CANNABIS
Attachments: Cannabis Ordinance, BOS hearing Feb.6, 2018.rtf; ATT00001.txt

Please accept my public comments for the record. Thank you, Bonnie Freeman

FEBRUARY 6, 2018 - County Board of Supervisors Hearing on CANNABIS LAND USE ORDINANCES

Good Day Chair Hartmann and Fellow Supervisors,

While you are about to consider adoption of the Cannabis Ordinance under circumstances that have forced a faster process than normal, I am at least somewhat relieved to know that your same body can take a look, after time goes by and enforcement comes in place, to see if all of your decisions and standards are working as you hoped, and if not then changes can be made. With areas of the County that are so different it's hard to believe that everyone will be served to a same standard. Hopefully, the Community Plans will be the strong guiding force.

Since I served the Eastern Goleta Valley on the Advisory Committee for our Community Plan I feel especially concerned due to the open and mixed nature of the lands that have agriculture operations next to residential communities more than other districts. And why the Plan carefully preserves the sustainability of both as compatible with good land use policies. (POLICY LUA-EGV-1.1, and LUA-EGV-1.2)

That said, there's still room to consider outstanding concerns for our Residential, Agricultural, and Mixed Use communities. It seems there's good protection for the large AG 11 properties in the rural communities but work still needs to be considered for the inner rural where EDRNs are already faced with challenges particularly where the State listed the character, safety, health, visual and scenic characteristics to be held up, where agriculture interfaces with existing residential neighborhoods. Considerations for family life and keeping the commercial aspects of Cannabis operations away from sensitive receptors such as schools and day cares are good but there's room for expanding other protections, especially in zones that are basically residential but are zoned mixed use mostly to increase workforce availability and expand parking options.

Please consider amendments in the following areas:

1. Having a CUP requirement for all AG 11 zoning in the South Coast Planning Area to protect those areas that are considered residential in nature and in the zoning history.
2. Include a large buffer of 1,000 feet between residential properties adjacent to county Ag lands, especially in the Goleta and EGV community planning area.
3. Expand the sensitive receptors to include Parks and Trails and/or other facilities where official youth groups meet on a regular basis.

4. Prohibit Volatile Manufacturing on all AG 1 and AG 11 lands that are adjacent to existing residential communities, especially in the inner rural and urban areas.
5. Do not allow Cannabis businesses in the Mixed Use zoning or retail and manufacturing in the SC or CS zoning.
5. Establish an Enforcement Policy that includes standards for both residential and urban or inner rural agricultural conflicts and the oversight that will be put in place.
(right now there is a cannabis greenhouse operation adjacent to the coastal More Mesa Shores community and no one knows how to deal with this or who to go to)
6. Add a standard in the Personal Use allowances that the primary property owner must give written permission if a renter will be growing for personal use on/in a rented home/unit/condo/ADU (to avoid differing conflicts in existing and future housing situations)

While I am more concerned about cannabis activities in the urban and inner-rural areas of the Eastern Goleta Valley, I also support equal considerations for the residents of Carpinteria, as well for existing plant operations (mostly floral) in greenhouses, in order to make their community healthy and viable at the same time. The same for the EDRN communities. Each of our boundary districts should work together as a whole county for the prosperity of all of us.

Thank you to planners and staff for your time on this work-in-progress, for unknown successes, as well thanks to our Planning Commissioners before and now our County Supervisors to get us all through this new economy with our unique communities in tact.

Bonnie Freeman,
Concerned Citizen
EGV District 2