Ramirez, Angelica Public Comment Group 1 #3

From: Heidi Swan <heidiaswan@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 13, 2022 11:15 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: No tourism because of SMELL

LATE DIST

Dear Clerk of the Board,

I live in the South Bay. I would not let my 18 year old son go to college in SB because of how your community has embraced pot. I won't spend any vacation time in SB because it reeks of weed.

I hope it's worth it to you. Santa Barbara used to be a wonderful place to visit.

Sincerely,

Heidi A. Swan

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Sarah Trigueiro <sarah.trigueiro@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 13, 2022 6:37 PM
To: sbcob; Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; Hart, Gregg; Lavagnino, Steve; Nelson, Bob
Subject: Please Do Not Exempt Processing from Cannabis Cap

Board of Supervisors,

I am writing in advance of Tuesday's meeting in opposition to the proposed Business License changes that would exempt processing from the cannabis acreage cap. We are suffering enough in Santa Barbara County due to the negative impacts of cannabis. There is already far too much and it is not well controlled or enforced by the County. The negative impacts are disproportionately borne by Carpinteria and the North County. To add to the already egregious situation by exempting processing, the most smelly and air-implicative part of the production cycle, from the cap would be a terrible error, resulting in more cultivation and processing in areas where cannabis activities are already intense and excessive.

It is apparent that this is an industry end run around the acreage cap, under the guise of supposedly minor changes to the Business License (Chapter 50). It is clearly designed to obfuscate so that the public doesn't understand that it is a proposal to gut the acreage cap. Carpinteria Valley's 186 acre cap should not be expanded, through direct or indirect means such as this.

Please think of the residents and schoolchildren who are already suffering, in a situation where the County is unable to enforce air quality and odor complaints effectively to protect us, and vote against these changes.

Kind regards,
Sarah Trigueiro
Carpinteria

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Elaine Dietsch <epd1950@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 13, 2022 7:04 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: 2/15/22 Board of Supervisors mtg - Lifting of 186 acre Cannabis limit - from Elaine Dietsch

To: Board of Supervisors

It would be totally unconscionable to exempt cannabis processing - ***the most smelly, noxious activity in cannabis production -***
from the 186 acre cannabis limit!

Is there no line that you would not cross to please the Cannabis entrepreneurs?
Are there no concerns that the community could present that you would listen to and address?

I believe that the answer to both is a resounding NO.

Elaine Dietsch

Ramirez, Angelica

From: jstassinos@aol.com
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 12:10 AM
To: sbcob; Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Nelson, Bob
Subject: Business License proposed changes Item # 3 on the 2/15/22 agenda.

To the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors,

Please listen to the numerous voices of your constituents who Do Not Want the Business License changed to exempt Cannabis Processing from the 186 acre Cap of Cannabis being grown in Carpinteria. Also, Please Do Not Increase the Cap of 186 acres of cannabis being grown in Carpinteria. Many residents, including myself, believe 186 acres of cannabis being allowed to be grown in Carpinteria is too much!

Thank you,
Jill Stassinos
Carpinteria Resident

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Bobbie Offen <bobbieo@cox.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 13, 2022 6:16 PM
To: sbcob; Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Nelson, Bob
Subject: ITEM 3 ON TUESDAY'S AGENDA

Dear Board of Supervisors,
It has been almost 6 years since the residents of the Carpinteria Valley feel they have ABSOLUTELY NO REPRESENTATION ON THE SANTA BARBARA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS and THE SANTA BARBARA PLANNING COMMISSION. We have been lied to, literally "slapped in the face", and treated like collateral damage on your quest to improve the financial coffers of the County. We pay taxes too!!! Now, you are making an attempt to continue that disgraceful treatment of your constituents with your sneaky, rear guard attack - once again led by the compromised Das Williams. This bow to the Cannabis Lobby's demands for more acreage for processing and cultivation in Carpinteria with a raise in the cap of cannabis production, the processing phase, **the most smelly, noxious activity in cannabis production, is the latest action that proves you have NO INTEREST in serving the residents of your respective districts**. Approving this "back-door attack" on the residents, students and children of Carpinteria would be a gross intensification of use, contrary to Article II and the Coastal Act, and to the detriment of our quality of life, which is already severely impacted by the current acreage, AND WHICH YOU HAVE DONE NOTHING TO ALLEVIATE. Enough is enough! We see this sneaky change for what it is - another devastating blow and a dereliction of your oath of office.

PLEASE READ THIS LETTER INTO THE MINUTES OF YOUR MEETING ON TUESDAY.
Bobbie Offen
36 year resident of Carpinteria and former teacher at Carpinteria High School

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Dave Clary <templeclary@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 6:24 AM
To: sbcob
Cc: Dave Clary
Subject: letter for 2/15/2022 public comment - cannabis amendments
Attachments: DTC LETTER TO BOS RE CANNABIS BUS LIC PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.pdf

Attached is a one page document. Please include it in the public comment section regarding the cannabis amendment issue before the BOS tomorrow, 2/15/2022.
Also, please circulate it to all the members of the BOS.

Thank you.

To the Clerk of the Board
For Distribution to the
Members of the Santa Barbara
County Board of Supervisors
for the County of Santa Barbara

Re: Proposed Amendments to Chapter
50 of the County Code – Licensing of
Cannabis Operations
Hearing date: February 15, 2022
Filed by: David T. Clary
Attorney at Law (Retired)
Dated: February 13, 2022

Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors

My wife and I have been residents of Tepusquet Canyon for 25 years and Santa Barbara County for 41 years.

There are many aspects of the proposed amendments to Chapter 50 that are of concern. However, I plan to deal with only one here.

On page 4 of the Board of Supervisors Agenda Letter for the hearing on Tuesday, February 15, 2022, there are two paragraphs that discuss a plan to allow cannabis business licenses for processing only operations. It states that the definition of cultivation in the LUDC includes drying, curing, or trimming of cannabis. (No citation is provided, but the definition is found at Section 35.110.020 of the LUDC.) Then it states this definition means that growing of cannabis on site is not necessary to qualify for cultivation. Then it cites a specific provision that completely negates that statement. LUDC Section 35.42.075.D.1.H and Article II Section 35-144U.C.1.i state that "post-processing and packaging of cannabis shall be considered accessory uses to the cultivation operation(s) when processed on the same lot." This requirement must be complied with as per Section 35.42.075.D of the LUDC.

The logical interpretation of this last section is that drying, curing, or trimming (supposedly included in post-processing) must be on the same lot where actual growing of cannabis occurs. That appears to be the intent of the section. The interpretation given in the board letter appears to be that since cultivation can include drying, curing or trimming of cannabis, then that means drying, curing, or trimming are deemed to be on the same lot as cultivation. This makes no sense. It is a circular argument to interpret the LUDC in this fashion. Otherwise, there is no reason to require post-processing (drying, curing, or trimming) to be on the same lot.

This requires full vetting and a proposed amendment to the LUDC, with complete analysis and full public exposure rather than this bizarre interpretation.

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Villalobos, David
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 8:03 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: FW: URGENT: Stop SB County from Secretly Boosting Cannabis Acreage Cap on Tuesday!

From: Concerned Carpinterians <concernedcarpinterians@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 13, 2022 2:57 PM
To: Villalobos, David <dvillalo@countyofsb.org>
Cc: Hartmann, Joan <jHartmann@countyofsb.org>; Hart, Gregg <gHart@countyofsb.org>; Nelson, Bob <bnelson@countyofsb.org>; Williams, Das <DWilliams@countyofsb.org>; Burns Melinda <melindaburns@cox.net>; Roberts Jerry <jerryroberts_sb@yahoo.com>; Welsh Nick <nick@independent.com>; Partridge Marianne <marianne@independent.com>; Mozingo Joe <joe.mozingo@latimes.com>; Palminteri John <johnp1250@aol.com>; Lehr Tracy <tracylehr@gmail.com>; Coastal View <editor@coastalview.com>; Lurie-Firestein Gwyn <gwyn@montecitojournal.net>; Martinez Alys <alys.martinez@keyt.com>; Van Stry Michael <news@coastalview.com>; Yamamura Jean <jean@independent.com>; Sneddon Kristen <ksnedi@gmail.com>; Capps Laura <lauraburtoncapps@gmail.com>; Harmon Meagan <MHarmon@SantaBarbaraCA.gov>; Nagourney Adam <adamnag@nytimes.com>; Fernandez Manny <mannyf@nytimes.com>; mhodgson@santamariatimes.com; gmagnoli@noozhawk.com; Hayden Tyler <tyler@independent.com>; Frapwell, Jeff <jFrapwell@countyofsb.org>; Al Clark <al.clark2@verizon.net>; Nick Bobroff <nickb@ci.carpinteria.ca.us>; D, Dave <daved@ci.carpinteria.ca.us>; Wilson Scott <scott.wilson@washpost.com>; matt@independent.com; Cooney Mike <Michael@IGSB.com>; Bridley Laura <laurabridley@gmail.com>; Alarcon Natalia <nataliaalarcon@ci.carpinteria.ca.us>
Subject: Fwd: URGENT: Stop SB County from Secretly Boosting Cannabis Acreage Cap on Tuesday!

CONCERNED CARPINTERIANS

Protecting Our Community, Schools, Residents & Agriculture

concernedcarpinterians.com

Dear Concerned Carpinterians,

Red Alert: We are facing an existential threat to Carpinteria's 186 acre cannabis cap. On Tuesday (2/15/22), the Board of Supervisors, under the guise of purportedly "minor" changes to the cannabis Business License, is planning to exempt processing - ***the most smelly, noxious activity in cannabis production*** - from our current (already unacceptable) 186 acre cannabis cap. This is a rear guard, sneak attack in which the Supervisors - once again led by the compromised Das Williams - bow to the Cannabis Lobby's demands for more acreage for processing and cultivation in Carpinteria. Doing so would be a gross intensification of use, contrary to Article II and the Coastal Act, and

to the detriment of our quality of life, which is already severely impacted by the current acreage. Let the County know that enough is enough and that we see this sneaky change for what it is - another devastating blow to the residents, students and children of Carpinteria! See the SB Independent's latest article on our mess HERE.

TAKE ACTION - **Let the Supes know you Do Not Want Processing Exempted from the Cap or ANY Increases to the Cap:**

- **Email your views to the Board of Supervisors prior to 5pm tomorrow, Monday 2/14/22 to:** sbcob@countyofsb.org., dwilliams@countyofsb.org, ghart@countyofsb.org, jhartmann@countyofsb.org, steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org, bob.nelson@countyofsb.org.
- **Virtually attend and speak at the Board of Supervisors Meeting on Tuesday, 2/15 at 9am.** The Business License proposed changes are Item 3 on the agenda. We recommend that you dial in around 10am to be on the safe side.
    - If you want to speak during public comment, **you must register in advance**: https://countyofsb.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_Ut6jCztNSUyOTHFxpwPJDA
    - After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing important information about joining the webinar.
    - Watch the public livestream of the meeting HERE. Once the Chair has announced Item 3 on the agenda (which is the item you want to comment on), please join the meeting with the speaker information provided in the registration confirmation email you received.
    - You will be placed on mute until it is your turn to speak. You will be able to hear the Board meeting live after calling in. The Clerk will call you by name. When removed from mute, you will hear a notification that your line has been unmuted. If you are using a touchtone phone, you may need to press *6.
    - Each person may address the Board for up to three minutes at the discretion of the Chair. When your time is up or you have concluded your comments, please hang up or log out.
    - If you have any questions or if you are participating in the hearing telephonically or electronically and need a disability-related modification or accommodation or have any issues attempting to access the hearing telephonically or electronically, please contact the Clerk of the Board's Office at (805) 568-2240.

Other Brief Updates:

- We are pleased to note that Concerned Carpinterians has filed an appeal against the Everbloom grow near Carpinteria High School and Canalino Elementary School. We will provide more details on what you can do to assist in our efforts to protect our schools and children from negative cannabis impacts.
- The appeal of the Planning Commission's approval of G&K's proposed massive processing facility will be heard by the Board of Supervisors on 3/1 - more details to follow on how you can support this important appeal, which can

be subsequently appealed to the Coastal Commission as an additional layer of recourse.

- We are waiting to hear whether the appeal of the Board of Supervisors' approval of Cresco will be heard by the Coastal Commission
- Update on Pot Shop proposal on Santa Claus Ln (Hearings Soon): The "Roots" retail cannabis application for Santa Claus Lane is still pending. We expect hearings before the SBAR and Zoning Administrator soon. Despite over 100 letters and emails of opposition in 2020, the Board of Supervisors and County CEO found Santa Claus Lane to be a suitable location for retail pot - despite the parking issues and family friendly atmosphere there. Stay tuned - the business owners and residents around Santa Claus Lane need our support once the hearings begin - and continue to let Das Williams know we do NOT need more commercial cannabis in Toro Canyon! Contact protectsantaclauslnbeachaccess@gmail.com to be informed of upcoming hearings.

How to Donate to ***Concerned Carpinterians:***

We deeply appreciate donations to help us continue appealing and fighting cannabis proliferation in Carpinteria Valley. 100% of funds donated are used for Carpinteria Valley issues and appeals, and ***we do not enter into compromises with the growers***. We stand in support of residents, farmers and schoolchildren in Carpinteria Valley in trying to preserve our quality of life. To donate, send a check to:

Concerned Carpinterians
P.O. Box 464
Carpinteria, CA 93014

CONCERNED CARPINTERIANS

Protecting Our Community, Schools, Residents & Agriculture

concernedcarpinterians.com

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Villalobos, David
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 8:03 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: FW: URGENT: Stop the County from Secretly Boosting Cannabis Acreage Cap on Tuesday!

From: Concerned Carpinterians <concernedcarpinterians@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 12:55 AM
To: Elaine Dietsch <epd1950@gmail.com>
Cc: Villalobos, David <dvillalo@countyofsb.org>; Miyasato, Mona <mmiyasato@countyofsb.org>
Subject: Fwd: URGENT: Stop the County from Secretly Boosting Cannabis Acreage Cap on Tuesday!

See emails above

From: Elaine Dietsch <epd1950@gmail.com>

Date: February 13, 2022 at 7:12:06 PM PST
To: Concerned Carpinterians <concernedcarpinterians@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: URGENT: Stop the County from Secretly Boosting Cannabis Acreage Cap on Tuesday!

Good evening,
So, I've written an email to the Bof S and pasted/copied the email address from your email and once again
I get it 'kicked back' as not formatted property.
Other people have had this problem in the past, as I have in previous emails.
FYI my email did go through when I just emailed it to the County.
I then emailed it to all the supervisors, except for Bob Nelson, and it went through.
Then I emailed Bob Nelson separately and it went through.
It shouldn't be this annoying. I do not know why this problem has consistently happened.
Bet if it was a 'Pro' cannabis letter it would fly through.
Thank you for all of your hard work. You are all very tenacious!

Elaine Dietsch

On Sun, Feb 13, 2022 at 2:30 PM Concerned Carpinterians <concernedcarpinterians@gmail.com> wrote:

CONCERNED CARPINTERIANS

concernedcarpinterians.com

Dear Concerned Carpinterians,

Red Alert: We are facing an existential threat to Carpinteria's 186 acre cannabis cap. On Tuesday (2/15/22), the Board of Supervisors, under the guise of purportedly "minor" changes to the cannabis Business License, is planning to exempt processing - ***the most smelly, noxious activity in cannabis production*** - from our current (already unacceptable) 186 acre cannabis cap. This is a rear guard, sneak attack in which the Supervisors - once again led by the compromised Das Williams - bow to the Cannabis Lobby's demands for more acreage for processing and cultivation in Carpinteria. Doing so would be a gross intensification of use, contrary to Article II and the Coastal Act, and to the detriment of our quality of life, which is already severely impacted by the current acreage. Let the County know that enough is enough and that we see this sneaky change for what it is - another devastating blow to the residents, students and children of Carpinteria! See the SB Independent's latest article on our mess HERE.

TAKE ACTION - Let the Supes know you Do Not Want Processing Exempted from the Cap or ANY Increases to the Cap:

- **Email your views to the Board of Supervisors prior to 5pm tomorrow, Monday 2/14/22 to:** sbcob@countyofsb.org., dwilliams@countyofsb.org, ghart@countyofsb.org, jhartmann@countyofsb.org, steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org, bob.nelson@countyofsb.org.
- **Virtually attend and speak at the Board of Supervisors Meeting on Tuesday, 2/15 at 9am.** The Business License proposed changes are Item 3 on the agenda. We recommend that you dial in around 10am to be on the safe side.
    - If you want to speak during public comment, **you must register in advance**: https://countyofsb.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_Ut6jCztNSUyOTHFxpwPJDA
    - After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing important information about joining the webinar.
    - Watch the public livestream of the meeting HERE. Once the Chair has announced Item 3 on the agenda (which is the item you want to comment on), please join the meeting with the speaker information provided in the registration confirmation email you received.
    - You will be placed on mute until it is your turn to speak. You will be able to hear the Board meeting live after calling in. The Clerk will call you by name. When removed from mute, you will hear a notification that your line has been unmuted. If you are using a touchtone phone, you may need to press *6.
    - Each person may address the Board for up to three minutes at the discretion of the Chair. When your time is up or you have concluded your comments, please hang up or log out.
    - If you have any questions or if you are participating in the hearing telephonically or electronically and need a disability-related modification or accommodation or have any issues attempting to

access the hearing telephonically or electronically, please contact the Clerk of the Board's Office at (805) 568-2240.

Other Brief Updates:

- We are pleased to note that Concerned Carpinterians has filed an appeal against the Everbloom grow near Carpinteria High School and Canalino Elementary School. We will provide more details on what you can do to assist in our efforts to protect our schools and children from negative cannabis impacts.
- The appeal of the Planning Commission's approval of G&K's proposed massive processing facility will be heard by the Board of Supervisors on 3/1 - more details to follow on how you can support this important appeal, which can be subsequently appealed to the Coastal Commission as an additional layer of recourse.
- We are waiting to hear whether the appeal of the Board of Supervisors' approval of Cresco will be heard by the Coastal Commission
- Update on Pot Shop proposal on Santa Claus Ln (Hearings Soon): The "Roots" retail cannabis application for Santa Claus Lane is still pending. We expect hearings before the SBAR and Zoning Administrator soon. Despite over 100 letters and emails of opposition in 2020, the Board of Supervisors and County CEO found Santa Claus Lane to be a suitable location for retail pot - despite the parking issues and family friendly atmosphere there. Stay tuned - the business owners and residents around Santa Claus Lane need our support once the hearings begin - and continue to let Das Williams know we do NOT need more commercial cannabis in Toro Canyon! Contact protectsantaclauslnbeachaccess@gmail.com to be informed of upcoming hearings.

How to Donate to Concerned Carpinterians:
We deeply appreciate donations to help us continue appealing and fighting cannabis proliferation in Carpinteria Valley. 100% of funds donated are used for Carpinteria Valley issues and appeals, and ***we do not enter into compromises with the growers***. We stand in support of residents, farmers and schoolchildren in Carpinteria Valley in trying to preserve our quality of life. To donate, send a check to:

Concerned Carpinterians
P.O. Box 464
Carpinteria, CA 93014

CONCERNED CARPINTERIANS

Protecting Our Community, Schools, Residents & Agriculture

concernedcarpinterians.com

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Villalobos, David
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 8:03 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: FW: NO To SUPES Boosting Cannabis Acreage Cap on Tuesday!

From: Robert Lesser <robert.lesser@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 12:47 AM
To: Villalobos, David <dvillalo@countyofsb.org>
Cc: Miyasato, Mona <mmiyasato@countyofsb.org>; Salud Carbajal <saludcarbajal@gmail.com>; Jeremy Tittle <jeremy.tittle@mail.house.gov>
Subject: NO To SUPES Boosting Cannabis Acreage Cap on Tuesday!

To the BOS,

Vote NO to changes in Cannabis Business License to exempt processing.
Vote YES to Mandatory Odor Enforcement by County at property line!
Vote YES to reducing CAP in Carpinteria…

sincerely
Robert Lesser,
Carpinteria resident

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Concerned Carpinterians <concernedcarpinterians@gmail.com>
> **Date:** February 13, 2022 at 3:44:54 PM PST
> **To:** David Kowal <David.Kowal@usdoj.gov>
> **Subject: Fwd: URGENT: Stop the County from Secretly Boosting Cannabis Acreage Cap on Tuesday!**
>
> ## *CONCERNED CARPINTERIANS*
>
> ***Protecting Our Community, Schools, Residents & Agriculture***
>
> concernedcarpinterians.com
>
> Dear Concerned Carpinterians,
>
> **Red Alert:** We are facing an existential threat to Carpinteria's 186 acre cannabis cap. On Tuesday (2/15/22), the Board of Supervisors, under the guise of purportedly "minor" changes to the cannabis Business License, is

planning to exempt processing - ***the most smelly, noxious activity in cannabis production*** - from our current (already unacceptable) 186 acre cannabis cap. This is a rear guard, sneak attack in which the Supervisors - once again led by the compromised Das Williams - bow to the Cannabis Lobby's demands for more acreage for processing and cultivation in Carpinteria. Doing so would be a gross intensification of use, contrary to Article II and the Coastal Act, and to the detriment of our quality of life, which is already severely impacted by the current acreage. Let the County know that enough is enough and that we see this sneaky change for what it is - another devastating blow to the residents, students and children of Carpinteria! See the SB Independent's latest article on our mess HERE.

TAKE ACTION - Let the Supes know you Do Not Want Processing Exempted from the Cap or ANY Increases to the Cap:

- **Email your views to the Board of Supervisors prior to 5pm tomorrow, Monday 2/14/22 to:** sbcob@countyofsb.org., dwilliams@countyofsb.org, ghart@countyofsb.org, jhartmann@countyofsb.org, steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org, bob.nelson@countyofsb.org.
- **Virtually attend and speak at the Board of Supervisors Meeting on Tuesday, 2/15 at 9am.** The Business License proposed changes are Item 3 on the agenda. We recommend that you dial in around 10am to be on the safe side.
    - If you want to speak during public comment, **you must register in advance**: https://countyofsb.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_Ut6jCztNSUyOTHFxpwPJDA
    - After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing important information about joining the webinar.
    - Watch the public livestream of the meeting HERE. Once the Chair has announced Item 3 on the agenda (which is the item you want to comment on), please join the meeting with the speaker information provided in the registration confirmation email you received.
    - You will be placed on mute until it is your turn to speak. You will be able to hear the Board meeting live after calling in. The Clerk will call you by name. When removed from mute, you will hear a notification that your line has been unmuted. If you are using a touchtone phone, you may need to press *6.
    - Each person may address the Board for up to three minutes at the discretion of the Chair. When your time is up or you have concluded your comments, please hang up or log out.
    - If you have any questions or if you are participating in the hearing telephonically or electronically and need a disability-related modification or accommodation or have any issues attempting to access the hearing telephonically

or electronically, please contact the Clerk of the Board's Office at (805) 568-2240.

Other Brief Updates:

- We are pleased to note that Concerned Carpinterians has filed an appeal against the Everbloom grow near Carpinteria High School and Canalino Elementary School. We will provide more details on what you can do to assist in our efforts to protect our schools and children from negative cannabis impacts.
- The appeal of the Planning Commission's approval of G&K's proposed massive processing facility will be heard by the Board of Supervisors on 3/1 - more details to follow on how you can support this important appeal, which can be subsequently appealed to the Coastal Commission as an additional layer of recourse.
- We are waiting to hear whether the appeal of the Board of Supervisors' approval of Cresco will be heard by the Coastal Commission
- Update on Pot Shop proposal on Santa Claus Ln (Hearings Soon): The "Roots" retail cannabis application for Santa Claus Lane is still pending. We expect hearings before the SBAR and Zoning Administrator soon. Despite over 100 letters and emails of opposition in 2020, the Board of Supervisors and County CEO found Santa Claus Lane to be a suitable location for retail pot - despite the parking issues and family friendly atmosphere there. Stay tuned - the business owners and residents around Santa Claus Lane need our support once the hearings begin - and continue to let Das Williams know we do NOT need more commercial cannabis in Toro Canyon! Contact protectsantaclauslnbeachaccess@gmail.com to be informed of upcoming hearings.

How to Donate to Concerned Carpinterians:
We deeply appreciate donations to help us continue appealing and fighting cannabis proliferation in Carpinteria Valley. 100% of funds donated are used for Carpinteria Valley issues and appeals, and ***we do not enter into compromises with the growers***. We stand in support of residents, farmers and schoolchildren in Carpinteria Valley in trying to preserve our quality of life. To donate, send a check to:

Concerned Carpinterians
P.O. Box 464
Carpinteria, CA 93014

CONCERNED CARPINTERIANS

Protecting Our Community, Schools, Residents & Agriculture

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Villalobos, David
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 8:03 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: FW: Do Not Increase or Exempt Cannabis Processing from Cannabis Cap

From: A.L. Bardach <albardach@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 12:29 AM
To: Villalobos, David <dvillalo@countyofsb.org>
Cc: Frapwell, Jeff <jFrapwell@countyofsb.org>
Subject: Do Not Increase or Exempt Cannabis Processing from Cannabis Cap

To the BOS,

Truly, Supervisors, is this a rumor or are you serious? You're planning some end run around on the Cannabis Cap? when there is already way too much pot grown in Carpinteria.
Word has it that at Tuesday's meeting you're going to up the ante and change the Business License to exempt Processing (the most noxious, smelly part of all) from the cannabis acreage cap.
You dont think there is enough suffering and in Santa Barbara County from the great failed cannabis experiment - producing a fraction of promised revenues?

When the books are written about this sorry chapter - and they will be as they were on Big Oil- one will surely be called *The Selling of Santa Barbara.*

We all know this is an industry end run around the acreage cap, under the guise of supposedly minor changes to the Business License (Chapter 50).
Carpinteria Valley's 186 acre cap is TOO MUCH …and has made the area uninhabitable for some residents who have had to move.
Try to spend a half day sitting a few hours inside Carp High - that is now entombed in weed grows

Do the right thing…
Just once.

A.L. Bardach
resident

A.L. Bardach
805.684.7675 off
805.895.6919 cell

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Villalobos, David
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 8:04 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: FW: Do Not Exempt Processing from Cannabis Cap

-----Original Message-----
From: Sarah Trigueiro <sarah.trigueiro@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 13, 2022 5:46 PM
To: Villalobos, David <dvillalo@countyofsb.org>
Subject: Do Not Exempt Processing from Cannabis Cap

Board of Supervisors,

I am writing in advance of Tuesday's meeting in opposition to the proposed Business License changes that would exempt processing from the cannabis acreage cap. We are suffering enough in Santa Barbara County due to the negative impacts of cannabis. There is already far too much and it is not well controlled or enforced by the County. The negative impacts are disproportionately borne by Carpinteria and the North County. To add to the already egregious situation by exempting processing, the most smelly and air-implicative part of the production cycle, from the cap would be a terrible error, resulting in more cultivation and processing in areas where cannabis activities are already intense and excessive.

It is apparent that this is an industry end run around the acreage cap, under the guise of supposedly minor changes to the Business License (Chapter 50). It is clearly designed to obfuscate so that the public doesn't understand that it is a proposal to gut the acreage cap. Carpinteria Valley's 186 acre cap should not be expanded, through direct or indirect means such as this.

Please think of the residents and schoolchildren who are already suffering, in a situation where the County is unable to enforce air quality and odor complaints effectively to protect us, and vote against these changes.

Kind regards,
Sarah Trigueiro
Carpinteria

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Jon Ohlgren <johlgren@radiusgroup.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 9:44 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Ohlgren letter for Chapter 50 BOS discussion

Esteemed Supervisors,

My name is Jon Ohlgren and I'm an agricultural broker in Santa Barbara County. I have clients who are interested in selling or bringing in investors to support their cannabis projects. At the current stage of cannabis industry growth there is a natural need for recapitalization or outright sale based on case by case business considerations. My clients and I fully support an efficient business license transfer system. As County residents we should be supporting the efficient changeover of ownership (and transparent vetting of new owners) to keep maximum tax revenues coming in. We deal with license transfers for other types of businesses in the County (wineries etc.) all the time.

I support the proposed amendments to Chapter 50 to allow transferability of cannabis business licenses.

Sincerely,

Jon Ohlgren

Jon Ohlgren
Senior Vice President
Ranch, Vineyard and Agriculture Properties
Radius Commercial Real Estate
226 E. De la Guerra Street, Suite 100 | Santa Barbara, CA 93101
Cell: 805.689.7839
johlgren@radiusgroup.com | www.radiusgroup.com | Current Listings

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Coastal Blooms Nursery <coastalbloomsnursery@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 10:13 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Agenda Item 3 - Amend Chapter 50 of the County Code - Licensing of Cannabis Operations

Good Morning Honorable Chair Nelson and Supervisors,

Coastal Blooms Nursery currently works with several cannabis farms in Carpinteria. We support the proposed amends to Chapter 50 as proposed. The following are important changes among the proposed amendments:

Removing processing activities from the acreage cap
This change will encourage operators to invest in infrastructure that assists the long-term health of the Santa Barbara County farming industry, providing additional space for activities traditionally ancillary to cultivation. It will result in additional operators processing (drying, curing, trimming) in Santa Barbara County and has the potential to substantially increase tax revenues to the County.

Ownership Changes & Transfers
Changes in ownership are common in any business. By allowing applicants and operators the option to transfer ownership rights in excess of twenty percent with a new business license application, the County will further encourage only the best operators are growing in Santa Barbara County.

We appreciate these amendments and look forward to working with the County on future amendments as legal non-conforming operations are transitioned to operators with County Cannabis Business Licenses regulated under Chapter 50.

Thank you for your support and consideration,

Ivan van Wingerden
Coastal Blooms Nursery, LLC

Sent with Shift

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Ann Matson <anncmatson@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 11:16 AM
To: sbcob; Williams, Das; Nelson, Bob; Lavagnino, Steve; Hartmann, Joan; Hart, Gregg
Subject: Changing the rules

Dear Board of Supervisors:
You have ruled in favor of the cannabis industry over and over again. You have ignored the pleas of Carpinteria residents and City Council to preserve our town from being over run by cannabis. Now you are considering caving again by exempting cannabis processing from the 186 acre cap.
Please do the right thing. Put a stop to the pressure put upon you from the powerful growers and processors. Consider the Carpinterians who live near the industry, the young people who smell the odor at school, the people with health issues related to cannabis, the tourists who are starting to regard Carpinteria as a pot farm. We don't want this. And you are the only ones who can change the direction of this crisis.

Respectfully,
Ann Matson
436 Arbol Verde St.
Carpinteria, CA.

Sent from my iPad

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Kim Jones <kimj684@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 8:11 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Keep cannabis within acreage limits.

Please keep the cannabis acreage cap in place and do not exempt processing locations from the cap.
Cannabis in greenhouses is very carbon intensive, making sure that our county will continue to fail at meeting our modest climate goals. We need more renewable energy, not more cannabis!
Kim Jones
Carpinteria

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Gail Herson <devesi@me.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 11:59 AM
To: sbcob; Lavagnino, Steve; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Williams, Das; Nelson, Bob; Villalobos, David; ino@countyofsb.org
Subject: Re 2.15.22 Bd of Supervisors meeting item 3 Cannabis Business License

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please do not exempt cannabis processing from the already much too much 186 Acre cap. **Cannabis processing is the most horrible smelling part of cannabis. Do not increase the Acreage cap in any way.**

Research shows that children's developing brains and nervous systems are irrevocably harmed by cannabis use, so it stands to reason that inhaling odors and emissions 24/7 can be harmful. We also do not know the **harmful effects of breathing the emissions that come from processing cannabis on children** or on the entire population. Despite the new scrubbers, once they finally show up, we will still be inhaling the emissions of Byers and Fogco, not once, but forever. **What are the long term effects?** Until such research is done, please exercise common sense and do not increase the harm that will be caused by functionally increasing the caps if you exempt processing. **More acres means more harm.**

Slow down; fix what doesn't work now! What is this rush to exempt? More haste means more mistakes.

Despite promises of controlling odor, **the nuisance odor still pervades Carpinteria and is getting worse as more growers come online**. We are prevented from enjoying our homes and gardens in Shepard Mesa and all of Carpinteria because of these noxious grows. **The nasty oily odor is pervasive and fouls our homes. Vulnerable neighbors are sickened.** Please, do no harm, **do not increase the caps from the back door by exempting processing**. **More acres means more stench.**

Please stop bowing to the Cannabis Lobby's demands for more acreage for processing and cultivation. There will be no end to their increasing demands. **Exemption means more acres means more nuisance.**

Thank you for thoughtfully considering my input.
Gail Herson
Carpinteria

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Anna Carrillo <annacarp@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 12:14 PM
To: sbcob; Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; Hart, Gregg; Nelson, Bob; Lavagnino, Steve; Heaton, Brittany
Subject: Item #3 - changes to Chapter 50

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Anna Carrillo
February 14, 2022

I'd like to make a few comments about the proposed supposedly "minor" changes specifically as it pertains to Carpinteria.

1. **Processing is the smelliest, most noxious activity of a cannabis operation.**

2.. In Carpinteria, the 186 acre cap is too much as it is. In Carpinteria there are basically two 4 mile stretches of roadways interspersed with EDRNs, residents, and cultivation sites surrounding the high school. **Please do not remove processing from the 186 acre cap in Carpinteria.**

4. According to pg. 6 of the Presentation, 6 acres in Carpinteria are already designated to processing. I'm not sure how that figure was derived.

5. In Carpinteria we have 4 already approved warehouses, built for previous processing in the flower industry that have now received their CDPs as part of their Cannabis CDPs. Two of these already built warehouses are stand-alone warehouses with no cannabis cultivation associated with them, each about a 1/2 acre and are listed separately on the business license site. Also CDP permits have already been issued for 2 newly built processing buildings as part of the approved cannabis site. The majority of the growers in Carpinteria already do their own processing. Almost all of the 20+ cultivation sites operating with state provisional licenses also have state provisional processing licenses. I see there are only 6 of the current 20+ growers that do not have a state provisional license to process. There are 6 brand new projects (not currently cultivating yet) that have their CDPs and at least 2 of these 6 have approved processing for their particular sites. So from my calculations if I include all those with active state provisional processing licenses and the new processing approvals I come up with a total of **19 processing locations already.**

6. In the inland area, small agricultural parcels of 5, 10 and possibly 20 acre sites were excluded from cultivation of cannabis but that same treatment was not accorded in the Carpinteria and the Coastal Zone. **So if rules are changed in the inland area of the county exempting processing, it doesn't need to happen here in the Coastal Zone.**

7. The problem of not having processing locally is very specific to the Inland areas with their open grows. As those in other farming areas, develop a co-operative situation, but do not change the caps.

8. **Please don't exempt processing from the cultivation cap in Carpinteria. Our 186 acre cap is too much as it is! We can't afford to have more acreage than the 186 cap which then would exclude processing.**

9. We don't need more poor air quality, noxious odors, and traffic affecting the quality of life in our very small area.

Thank you for listening and your time in this very important matter.

Anna Carrillo

Ramirez, Angelica

From: David Separzadeh <David@paramountgroupusa.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 12:25 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: RE: Support of Proposed Amendments to Chapter 50

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

Good afternoon, my name is David Separzadeh

I support the proposed amendments to Chapter 50 to allow transferability of cannabis business licenses.

David Separzadeh
213-272-5729

Ramirez, Angelica

From: rlapidus@cox.net
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 12:27 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: No to Cannabis Processing Exemption

Feb. 14, 2022

To: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors

From: Roxanne Lapidus

1975 Cravens Lane, Carpinteria, CA 93013

Do not pander to the Cannabis Lobby by caving in to their pressure to exempt cannabis processing from the 168-acre cap in the Carpinteria Valley. Enough is enough! The odor problem is far from solved, despite what we read in the press.

It's time to hold the line, and look out for the interest of ordinary citizens and residents of this county, which have been glaringly ignored by you, in your pursuit of more cannabis income for county coffers.

It's time to start scrutinizing the ongoing practices of current "legal" operations, as well as hunting down illegal operations. The county originally claimed they would not have the resources for oversight and enforcement until cannabis operations were legalized and contributing tax dollars. So where are those tax dollars now? And if they are less than anticipated, it's time to start investigating.

It is certainly not time to be caving in to more outrageous requests from the cannabis industry.

Show some backbone! Just say no.

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Nanette Nevins <nanettenevins@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 12:38 PM
To: Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Nelson, Bob; sbcob
Subject: Board of Supervisors Cannabis Business License Agenda Item 3

To all,
I would like to let you know my views as a homeowner near the proposed cannabis facility.
The smell has been terrible and affected us since we have lived in Carpinteria.
I have had bronchial and sinus problems as well. The cannabis growing odors have changed our ability to be outside and enjoy our home.
The interior of my home smells noxious when we return. We can't escape the odors and has held us hostage.
The same is true of my neighbors.
Please consider the neighborhood and people (your constituents) who are so adversely affected by this industry over the potential tax return.
Thank you.
Respectfully,
Henry and Nanette Nevins

Sent from my iPad

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Villalobos, David
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 1:19 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: FW: Re 2.15.22 Bd of Supervisors meeting item 3 Cannabis Business License

From: Gail Herson <devesi@me.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 11:59 AM
To: sbcob <sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>; Lavagnino, Steve <slavagnino@countyofsb.org>; Hart, Gregg <gHart@countyofsb.org>; Hartmann, Joan <jHartmann@countyofsb.org>; Williams, Das <DWilliams@countyofsb.org>; Nelson, Bob <bnelson@countyofsb.org>; Villalobos, David <dvillalo@countyofsb.org>; ino@countyofsb.org
Subject: Re 2.15.22 Bd of Supervisors meeting item 3 Cannabis Business License

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please do not exempt cannabis processing from the already much too much 186 Acre cap. **Cannabis processing is the most horrible smelling part of cannabis. Do not increase the Acreage cap in any way.**

Research shows that children's developing brains and nervous systems are irrevocably harmed by cannabis use, so it stands to reason that inhaling odors and emissions 24/7 can be harmful. We also do not know the **harmful effects of breathing the emissions that come from processing cannabis on children** or on the entire population. Despite the new scrubbers, once they finally show up, we will still be inhaling the emissions of Byers and Fogco, not once, but forever. **What are the long term effects?** Until such research is done, please exercise common sense and do not increase the harm that will be caused by functionally increasing the caps if you exempt processing. **More acres means more harm.**

Slow down; fix what doesn't work now! What is this rush to exempt? More haste means more mistakes.

Despite promises of controlling odor, **the nuisance odor still pervades Carpinteria and is getting worse as more growers come online**. We are prevented from enjoying our homes and gardens in Shepard Mesa and all of Carpinteria because of these noxious grows. **The nasty oily odor is pervasive and fouls our homes. Vulnerable neighbors are sickened.** Please, do no harm, **do not increase the caps from the back door by exempting processing. More acres means more stench.**

Please stop bowing to the Cannabis Lobby's demands for more acreage for processing and cultivation. There will be no end to their increasing demands. **Exemption means more acres means more nuisance.**

Thank you for thoughtfully considering my input.
Gail Herson
Carpinteria

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Renee ONeill <chasingstar2701@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 2:12 PM
To: sbcob; Hartmann, Joan; Nelson, Bob; Hart, Gregg; Lavagnino, Steve; Williams, Das
Cc: Villalobos, David
Subject: Public Comment re Chapter 50 amendments
Attachments: BOS re Chpt 50 amendments, 2-15-22.docx

Good Afternoon,

Attached and embedded please find my letter re amending Chapter 50 for public comment.

Honorable Chair Hartmann and Supervisors,

"Oh, what a tangled web we weave when first we practice to deceive." Sir Walter Scott, 1808.

I have a number of concerns re amending Chapter 50, licensing of commercial cannabis:

Re CAP:

It appears that our supervisors are planning to renege on your promise to us, by amending the Chapter 50 to exclude "processing-only" applications from the total number of acres in the CAP. What happened to your emphatic reassurances to us that the CAP would not be increased?

There appears to be no clarity or language re where and how these processing permit applications will be handled. If adopted, this amendment would allow the county to expand the CAP, which contradicts your original criteria for setting limits that would be applied to total processing acreage.

Re Legal nonconforming use:

Has P&D validated alleged legal nonconforming use, prior to 2016, with aerial images? If not, why not?

Tepusquet residents are well-aware of growers that falsified affidavits, expanded their footprints and continued operating, while violating multiple ordinances, for *seven years*. We also observed the county supporting these same growers who failed to make timely progress through the licensing process, for years. What other business in Santa Barbara County is allowed to continue operating and violating multiple ordinances for seven plus years?!? I challenge you to name one.

Re Change in Ownership:

Our experience with problematic Tepusquet growers is that they change their LLCs frequently, in an attempt to fly under the radar and avoid negative associations with previous LLC's (805 Ag Holdings, Tep Holdings, Depp Mtns, etc. etc.). These growers drag their feet to delay licensing and/or being held accountable. One operator is still pursing CUPs in our community, on the same USFS inholding lands, despite the fact that original owner is now facing federal charges of bribery and tax evasion.

Respectfully Submitted,

Renée O'Neill

Best Regards,

Renée O'Neill

Ramirez, Angelica

From: John Cavan <jtcavan@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 2:16 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Comment Letter for 2/15: Dept. Agenda No. 3 (Chapter 50 Cannabis Amendments)

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

Good afternoon, my name is John Cavan. I am an attorney that is very familiar with the Cannabis industry and the statutes, ordinances and regulations regulating cannabis in numerous jurisdictions in the State of California. The proposed amendments to section 50 are right in line with the code sections of many jurisdictions where cannabis has been allowed. Based on my experience I believe the proposed amendments would bolster those businesses who are currently licensed or are awaiting licensing, create jobs, create revenue for the county and strengthen the industry as a whole.

For those reasons, I support the proposed amendments to Chapter 50 to allow transferability of cannabis business licenses.

Respectfully submitted,

John Cavan

--

Ramirez, Angelica

From: ginbliss@aol.com
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 2:25 PM
To: sbcob; Williams, Das
Subject: Exemption for Cannibas Processesing

Feb. 14, 2022

Dear Supervisors,

We are opposed to expanding the 186 acre cap on cannabis grows by way of exempting processing from the 186 acre cap. Cannabis operations are cannabis operations whether it is growing or processing the plant. Why do the residents of Carpinteria always have to fight these operators every step of the way without (it seems) any support from our elected officials?

Sincerely,

Ginny and Tim Bliss

Ramirez, Angelica

From:	Carrie Miles <CarrieM@fastmail.com>
Sent:	Monday, February 14, 2022 2:26 PM
To:	Concerned Carpinterians; sbcob; Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Nelson, Bob
Cc:	Elizabeth Mandl
Subject:	We do not want any more acreage devoted to marijuana!

Please do not exempt processing of marijuana from the restrictions on marijuana cultivations. I agree completely with Concerned Carpinterians.

Carrie Miles

On Sun, Feb 13, 2022, at 2:30 PM, Concerned Carpinterians wrote:

CONCERNED CARPINTERIANS

Protecting Our Community, Schools, Residents & Agriculture

concernedcarpinterians.com

Dear Concerned Carpinterians,

Red Alert: We are facing an existential threat to Carpinteria's 186 acre cannabis cap. On Tuesday (2/15/22), the Board of Supervisors, under the guise of purportedly "minor" changes to the cannabis Business License, is planning to exempt processing - ***the most smelly, noxious activity in cannabis production*** - from our current (already unacceptable) 186 acre cannabis cap. This is a rear guard, sneak attack in which the Supervisors - once again led by the compromised Das Williams - bow to the Cannabis Lobby's demands for more acreage for processing and cultivation in Carpinteria. Doing so would be a gross intensification of use, contrary to Article II and the Coastal Act, and to the detriment of our quality of life, which is already severely impacted by the current acreage. Let the County know that enough is enough and that we see this sneaky change for what it is - another devastating blow to the residents, students and children of Carpinteria! See the SB Independent's latest article on our mess HERE.

TAKE ACTION - Let the Supes know you Do Not Want Processing Exempted from the Cap or ANY Increases to the Cap:

- **Email your views to the Board of Supervisors prior to 5pm tomorrow, Monday 2/14/22 to:** sbcob@countyofsb.org., dwilliams@countyofsb.org, ghart@countyofsb.org, jhartmann@countyofsb.org, steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org, bob.nelson@countyofsb.org.

- **Virtually attend and speak at the Board of Supervisors Meeting on Tuesday, 2/15 at 9am.** The Business License proposed changes are Item 3 on the agenda. We recommend that you dial in around 10am to be on the safe side.
    - If you want to speak during public comment, **you must register in advance**: https://countyofsb.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_Ut6jCztNSUyOTHFxpwPJDA
    - After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing important information about joining the webinar.
    - Watch the public livestream of the meeting HERE. Once the Chair has announced Item 3 on the agenda (which is the item you want to comment on), please join the meeting with the speaker information provided in the registration confirmation email you received.
    - You will be placed on mute until it is your turn to speak. You will be able to hear the Board meeting live after calling in. The Clerk will call you by name. When removed from mute, you will hear a notification that your line has been unmuted. If you are using a touchtone phone, you may need to press *6.
    - Each person may address the Board for up to three minutes at the discretion of the Chair. When your time is up or you have concluded your comments, please hang up or log out.
    - If you have any questions or if you are participating in the hearing telephonically or electronically and need a disability-related modification or accommodation or have any issues attempting to access the hearing telephonically or electronically, please contact the Clerk of the Board's Office at (805) 568-2240.

Other Brief Updates:

- We are pleased to note that Concerned Carpinterians has filed an appeal against the Everbloom grow near Carpinteria High School and Canalino Elementary School. We will provide more details on what you can do to assist in our efforts to protect our schools and children from negative cannabis impacts.
- The appeal of the Planning Commission's approval of G&K's proposed massive processing facility will be heard by the Board of Supervisors on 3/1 - more details to follow on how you can support this important appeal, which can be subsequently appealed to the Coastal Commission as an additional layer of recourse.
- We are waiting to hear whether the appeal of the Board of Supervisors' approval of Cresco will be heard by the Coastal Commission
- Update on Pot Shop proposal on Santa Claus Ln (Hearings Soon): The "Roots" retail cannabis application for Santa Claus Lane is still pending. We expect hearings before the SBAR and Zoning Administrator soon. Despite over 100 letters and emails of opposition in 2020, the Board of Supervisors and County CEO found Santa Claus Lane to be a suitable location for retail pot - despite the parking issues and family friendly atmosphere there. Stay tuned - the business owners and residents around Santa Claus Lane need our support once the hearings begin - and continue to let Das Williams know we do NOT need more commercial cannabis in Toro Canyon! Contact protectsantaclauslnbeachaccess@gmail.com to be informed of upcoming hearings.

How to Donate to Concerned Carpinterians:

We deeply appreciate donations to help us continue appealing and fighting cannabis proliferation in Carpinteria Valley. 100% of funds donated are used for Carpinteria Valley issues and appeals, and ***we do not enter into compromises with the growers***. We stand in

support of residents, farmers and schoolchildren in Carpinteria Valley in trying to preserve our quality of life. To donate, send a check to:

Concerned Carpinterians
P.O. Box 464
Carpinteria, CA 93014

CONCERNED CARPINTERIANS

Protecting Our Community, Schools, Residents & Agriculture

concernedcarpinterians.com

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Sally Eagle <sally.eagle@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 2:42 PM
To: sbcob; Williams, Das
Subject: Item#3 2/15/22 SB Supervisor Meeting

I write to express my opposition to the proposal to *exempt* processing from the marijuana grow caps in the county. I am opposed to *any* increase of the caps.

It's my understanding that in the Carpinteria Valley where cannabis grows are restricted to "greenhouses", that most operating or proposed facilities have processing abilities on site. Removing processing facilities from permitted growing area will open Pandora's Box to all sorts of issues in Carpinteria. The change game will begin, I'm afraid, and the actual growing of cannabis will expand where processing has already been permitted (or proposed). For Carpinteria Valley and the Coastal Zone this could be an end run around the establish cap in place....more grows in our already dense cannabis grows.

Open field growing as in the North county is another issue which might be best settled best by looking at co-op processing operations which would cut down on emissions, traffic, and other problems.

Respectfully submitted,

Sally Eagle
Sensitive receptor in Carpinteria's La Miraada EDRN

Ramirez, Angelica

From: merrily peebles <merpeebles@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 2:57 PM
To: sbcob; Villalobos, David; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Williams, Das
Subject: Cannabis cap

Dear Supervisors,
The cannabis industry in Carpinteria is out of control regarding odor and I have heard possibly tax collection? It does not make sense to remove processing from the cap at this time. Please organize the state of cannabis in our county as it now stands before changing the business license. At this moment do you really need a few more cannabis plants when the growers have not yet operated responsibly with what they have. Please consider maintaining the cap. At one time Mr Williams entertained a lower cap then now exists. Vote no on removing processing from cap acreage. Thank you
Merrily Peebles

Sent from my iPhone

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Nick Bobroff <nickb@ci.carpinteria.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 3:13 PM
To: sbcob
Cc: D, Dave; Steve Goggia
Subject: February 15 Board of Supervisors Hearing, Agenda Item D3) Amend Ch. 50 of the County Code, Licensing of Cannabis Operations

Good afternoon Chair Hartmann and Supervisors,
The City of Carpinteria wishes to go on record as being strongly opposed to the contemplated change to Chapter 50, Licensing of Cannabis Operations, that would remove cannabis processing activities from counting toward the 186-acre cap on cannabis cultivation in the Carpinteria Valley.
Cannabis "cultivation," as defined in both the Article II, Coastal Zoning Ordinance, and Chapter 50, Licensing of Cannabis Operations, explicitly includes processing activities (e.g., the "*drying, curing or trimming of cannabis*"). The 186-acre cap as currently applied in the Carpinteria Valley and codified in Section 50.7, Limits on cannabis business licenses in Ch. 50, plainly states that it applies to "*cannabis cultivation, nurseries, and microbusinesses with cultivation*."
To treat processing activities as "cultivation" for the purposes of permitting and licensing, but to then treat processing activities as somehow different and separate from "cultivation" for the purposes of applying the acreage cap would be grossly inconsistent and would allow for an exception to the intent of the acreage cap in the first place; that being, to limit the amount of commercial cannabis cultivation occurring within the small defined area of the Carpinteria Valley.
If, as the staff report purports, the County does indeed have a shortage of cannabis processing facilities, the shortage does not appear to be due to a lack of said processing facilities in the Carpinteria Valley where there are currently more than 15 such facilities that are either provisionally licensed or newly permitted. The analysis provided in the staff report suggests that if there is a need for additional processing facilities in the County, the need is mostly confined to the inland areas of the County, where out of 1,575 acres of allowable cannabis cultivation, only approximately 3 acres are estimated to be committed to processing activities. Meanwhile in the Carpinteria Valley, out of less than 186 acres currently under cultivation, already approximately 6 acres are committed to processing facilities. In other words, if the staff and the Board conclude that additional processing capacity is needed in the County, the focus should be placed on creating opportunities to accommodate additional processing where it is more sorely needed: in the inland portions of the County.
The County should honor their commitment to limiting cannabis cultivation, including processing activities, to the 186-acre cap previously adopted and established for the Carpinteria Valley.
Respectfully,
Nick Bobroff, Principal Planner
Community Development Department
(805) 755- 4407