

From: Autumn Shelton <autumn@autumnbrands.com>
Sent: Monday, April 1, 2019 4:57 PM
To: sbcob; Miyasato, Mona; Villalobos, David; Williams, Das; 'Michael@IGSB.com'
Subject: Maintain the County Ordinance- Public Comment

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

Dear Supervisors and Planning Commissioner,

Thank you for all the hard work over the last couple years in developing the Cannabis Land Use Permit and Business License Program. I for one sat all day in more hearings than I can remember. Every hearing was full of cannabis growers, advocates for cannabis and anti-cannabis members of the community. A lot of time, research, public comment, the Ad hoc Committee and tax dollars went into developing the ordinance and business license that we have today in order to protect the community and businesses. Another successful moment at the end of 2018 was when the Coastal Commission finalized the ordinance for those in the Coastal zone, so that they could begin the Land use Permit process. The current Land Use Permit and Business License process is arduous, expensive and long. No other industry is scrutinized like Cannabis is for California and Santa Barbara County regulations. The ordinance and business license may not be perfect for those in the community or those in the industry, but it was created based on years of hard work. In Agriculture, we never change anything too dramatically until you really can see the effects otherwise you never really know what works. To make dramatic changes to the Ordinance or Business License process now only sets everyone back. And as you know we are all on a timeline with Provisional Licenses expiring early next year. Majority of the Cannabis growers in the state of California are still black market. The county truly helped the community and provided jobs by creating a pathway for cultivators to continue operating legally and regulated, which eliminated a heavy saturation of the black market in our county.

Today, I ask that you maintain the County Ordinance as is until all the growers that have been apart of this process for the last few years can be fully operational under a Land Use Permit and Business License for an extended period of time (2022). For the growers that switched from cut flowers to cannabis, they were able to better the community in a number of ways. Cannabis growers could pay higher wages, provide more jobs, stop spraying pesticides, dramatically reduce the number of semi-trucks that picked up flowers multiple times per day to a small cargo van, provide a cleaner environmental footprint and support the county with tax revenue. Odor will continue to be an issue until every grower either has odor control or is shut down. We understand this isn't possible until all applicants have gone through the land use permit process or until the County can enforce on all illegal grows.

Thank you again for your time and efforts.



AUTUMN BRANDS™

Autumn Shelton

Owner/CFO

P: (805) 566-4226 **M:** (805) 689-0257

E: autumn@autumnbrands.com **W:** autumnbrands.com



de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Jodi Pitts <jodi_pitts@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 1, 2019 5:15 PM
To: Davis, Rose; sbcob
Subject: Cannabis Ordinance that will be discussed on Tuesday, April 2, 2019 at the BOS meeting and Planning and Development Commission on Wednesday, April 3, 2019
Attachments: JBP letter to Board of Supervisors.docx

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

Please see attached letter regarding the Cannabis Ordinance that will be discussed at the upcoming meetings. We ask that you please consider our thoughts and opinions about this very important matter.
Thank you,
Jodi Pitts

April 1, 2019

TO:

Santa Barbara County Supervisors and Planning Commissioners

FROM:

Jodi Pitts

P.O. Box 189

Santa Ynez, CA 93460

805-750-1553

Jodi_pitts@yahoo.com

RE: Cannabis Ordinance that will be discussed on Tuesday, April 2, 2019 at the BOS meeting and Planning and Development Commission on Wednesday, April 3, 2019.

Dear Honorable Supervisors and Planning Commissioners,

I am writing in regard to the Cannabis Ordinance that will be discussed on Tuesday, April 2, 2019 at the BOS meeting and Planning and Development Commission on Wednesday, April 3, 2019.

I am a wife, mother, ranch owner and grape grower. I was raised in this valley, and am currently raising my children here. I love this valley, and I am writing with concerns over the current amount and influx of cannabis grows in the Santa Barbara County. While I am supportive of agriculture and new business in the county, I believe the current regulations need to be amended.

I request the ordinance contain the following limited allowances and regulations. .

1. Limit outdoor grow sizes on Ag-II parcels to 1 acre.
2. Limiting one cannabis license per parcel as intended by the state law.
3. Outdoor cannabis grows in Ag-II should be required to fully contain nuisance aromas within their property boundaries.
4. Increase definition of sensitive receptor to include wine grapes and other ingested crops and create reasonable setbacks from such sensitive receptors.
 - a. Reasonable conditions should be in place to limit grows where it is obvious ahead of time that nuisance will occur based on data currently available regarding volatile terpenes oils and their impact on crops such as wine grapes.

My brothers and I were lucky enough to be raised here. After moving away for years, getting married and having kids, my husband and I moved back to Santa Barbara County because we want to bring up our kids in a safe, close-knit community that is agriculturally minded and an environment that fosters and empowers our young to be outstanding citizens. I am writing

today on behalf of them, and the ideals in which we decided to join the Santa Barbara County community. I hope that you will read and take to heart my rationale for including limited allowances and regulation of Cannabis in Santa Barbara County.

Cannabis growers in Santa Barbara county should be subject to size limitations on Ag-II parcels to 1 acre.

- Santa Barbara county grows 22.1% of all Cannabis in the state of California. The highest in the state. (<https://mjbizdaily.com/chart-where-does-californias-recreational-marijuana-supply-come-from/>)
- In a report published by the California Department of Food and Agriculture the state is producing 15.5 million pounds of cannabis and consuming 2.5 million pounds. (http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Economics/Major_Regulations/Major_Regulations_Table/documents/Cultivation_SRIA_CDFA_1-5-2018.pdf, <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/01/02/us/buying-legal-weed-in-california.html>)
- There has been a requested 147-acre Cannabis grow farm on Drum Canyon Road. This would be the largest in Santa Barbara county, the largest in California and the largest in North America. Therefore, this farm would be capable of producing enough Cannabis to supply the entirety of California's current Cannabis consumption. (<https://growersnetwork.org/industry/largest-cannabis-producers-in-north-america-2018/>)

The already extreme excess supply results in the majority of Cannabis grown filtered into the black- market. Therefore, unless regulated to an extent that make sense, our community stands to be in the hands of growers supplying the completely distasteful and destructive black market. I think it increases the likelihood of crime, puts our children and neighbors in danger, troubling our current and very positive agricultural mindset, and ruining our tourist industry.

Furthermore, limiting Cannabis growers to the size limitation of 1 acre on Ag-II parcels is consistent with our neighboring counties in CA (see Appendix 1).

Limiting one cannabis license per parcel as intended by the state law.

- The state of CA intended to limit grow sizes by not permitting licenses for large farms until 2023.
- The stacking of license within more than one parcel directly contradicts the spirit of the law.

Mendocino County averages 1 license per parcel, San Luis Obispo county averages 1.5 licenses per parcel. Santa Barbara County currently averages an astounding 18.7 licenses. Why? Does Santa Barbara County want to create an environment where no farmer will be able to survive unless we grow Cannabis? I would hope you as our leaders, recognize the need for diverse agriculture that benefits everyone.

Outdoor cannabis grows in Ag-II should be required to fully contain nuisance aromas within their property boundaries and reasonable setback to sensitive crops such as “farmers market” produce and wine grapes.

- Cannabis grows have a “skunky” aroma, caused by volatile terpene oils.
- These oils are also in eucalyptus. Eucalyptus has been studied and it has been established that they present a negative impact on existing agricultural products such as wine grapes and other ingested “farmers market” type crops (<https://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/jf204499h>).

Therefore, to ensure the benefit of all Farmers in all agricultural zones (specifically Ag-1 and Ag—II), it would be prudent to require odor abatement of this crop.

I implore the Planning Commissioners and Santa Barbara County Supervisors to take an approach of regulating Cannabis now such that new Cannabis farms are limited to 1 acre per Ag-II Parcel and one license per parcel. Odor abatement and proper setbacks should be included to ensure limited impact to adjacent crops. Overtime, regulations can be amended, such that additional growth and size can be expanded overtime. These limit allowances will allow the product to be grown, however, limit supply to the black market and allow proper studies to be done on the impact of negative aromas (volatile terpene oils) on ingested crops such as wine grapes and “farmers market” produce. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

Jodi B. Pitts

Jodi B. Pitts
Jodi_pitts@yahoo.com

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Jerome Wiedmann <jeromewiedmann@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, April 1, 2019 4:21 PM
To: Miyasato, Mona; sbcob
Subject: Fwd: Cannabis Grows and SBCo Approvals

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

This was directed to Supervisor Hart, but it should be useful for consideration by the BoS as a whole.
Jerome Wiedmann, MA, MS
jeromewiedmann@icloud.com
M 805 895 0566 and on WhatsApp

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jerome Wiedmann <jeromewiedmann@icloud.com>
Subject: Cannabis Grows and SBCo Approvals
Date: April 1, 2019 at 3:44:32 PM PDT
To: Hart Gregg <ghart@countyofsb.org>
Cc: mculver@countyofsb.org, eBertrand@countyofsb.org, Ashley.kruzel@countyofsb.org

Jerome Wiedmann,
1365 Anderson Lane,
Santa Barbara, CA
805 895 0566
jeromewiedmann@icloud.com

Hello Supervisor Hart,

Formerly, I was an SB County Commissioner for Economic Development, and happen to hold an MA and MS from studying BioChem, Pharmacology, and Electronics. Recently I have been studying environmental and health issues relative to cannabis nurseries.

From what I have learned to date, a major source of the smell, as well as possible negative effectors on health and safety come from the terpenes the cannabis plants produce and emit into the air.

Have there been any literature searches or scientific studies on the toxicity of terpenes or the THC itself that were taken into consideration during SBC's discussion of approval of cannabis grows? Note, terpenes are known to degrade, and may even cause the production of benzene, which is known to cause cancer and genetic mutations along with other problems.

As an introduction to the type of research I have done, what follows below is from [Medscape.com](http://www.Medscape.com), a site for medical professionals.

I have found other peer-reviewed scientific articles that also point out the dangers of terpenes.

Remember, we can choose not to ingest cannabis as a user, but we cannot choose not to breathe the air.

With Best Regards,

Jerome Wiedmann

Practice Essentials

Terpenes are natural products derived from plants that have medicinal properties and biological activity. Terpenes may be found in cleaning products, rubefacients, aromatherapy, and various topical preparations. Terpenes may exist as hydrocarbons or have oxygen-containing compounds such as ketone or aldehyde groups (terpenoids).

The basic structure of terpenes is repeating isoprene units (C₅H₈)_n, and they are grouped according to the number of repeating isoprene units. Monoterpenes contain 2 isoprene units; examples include cantharidin, menthol, pinene, and camphor. ^[1] Diterpenes contain 4 isoprene units; examples include phytol, vitamin A₁ ^[2], and paclitaxel (Taxol).

The best-known compounds in this group are camphor oil and turpentine. ^[3] The antineoplastic agent paclitaxel is a terpene derived from yew plant bark. ^[4] An oil derived from the *Salvia officinalis* tree, thujone, became popular because of its hallucinogenic qualities, and became a drug of abuse. ^[5]

Absinthe, a green liquor containing thujone, has been thought to be responsible for enhancing the creativity of many famous artists including Edouard Manet, Vincent Van Gogh, and Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec. ^[6]

Pathophysiology

Terpenes are local irritants and thus are capable of causing GI signs and symptoms. CNS manifestations may range from an altered mental status to seizure to coma. Aspiration is a particular concern and can result in long-term complications or fatality.

Absorption begins in the oral cavity and is rapid, as evidenced by the early onset of toxicity in significant ingestions. Terpenes are metabolized through cytochrome P450 and are excreted as conjugated metabolites by the kidney.

Etiology

Most exposures are the result of an unintentional ingestion.

Some subcultures of society continue to use turpentine as an antihelminthic, purgative, and general elixir of good health. This practice may produce the potentially disastrous situation where the product is available and considered to be innocuous.

Camphorated oil often is supplied in small bottles that closely resemble castor oil. The bottles may be kept on pharmacy or grocery store shelves next to each other so that an individual with vision impairment may easily choose the incorrect preparation.

A case report described camphor toxicity in a 35-year-old Cambodian man with diarrhea, vomiting, and altered mental status. He was described as having parallel and symmetric ecchymotic streaks on his back as a result of "coining". In this case, toxicity occurred by the application of camphor to the skin prior to coining. Toxicity occurred presumably by transcutaneous absorption. ^[7]

Epidemiology

According to the 2017 Annual Report of the American Association of Poison Control National Poison Data System, 3251 single exposures to disinfectants containing pine oil, 9975 single exposures to camphor, and 290 single exposures to turpentine were reported. No deaths were reported for any of the above exposures. ^[8]

Males overrepresent cases associated with terpenes. Most exposures are in children and are unintentional.

Prognosis

Morbidity and mortality^[9] associated with exposure to terpenes is largely related to the degree of CNS depression and if aspiration occurs. Despite the toxicity of these agents, morbidity is extremely low. Mortality is rare. Most patients make full recoveries without sequelae. Aspiration of hydrocarbons may result in serious complications requiring long-term follow-up.

Patient Education

Preventive education is essential. Information regarding proper storage of chemicals is important.

All families of victims should be given the telephone number of the local or regional poison control center.

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Tina Fanucchi-Frontado <tina-f@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, April 1, 2019 4:34 PM
To: sbcob; Miyasato, Mona; Villalobos, David; Williams, Das;
"Michael@IGSB.com."@prfpntagnt4.co.santa-barbara.ca.us
Subject: Carpenterian's for Cannabis

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

Since 1976, our family has lived at 3678 Foothill Road in Carpinteria. And, for 43 years we've respectfully and happily shared the neighborhood with our farmer neighbors.

We, nor any residential neighbors that we know of, have signed with Concerned Carpenterians, and in reviewing their website, neither a list of supporters or neighborhoods in which they monitor is available.

We're extremely alarmed at their mission stating "*We will actively monitor and remedy Commercial Cannabis practices that adversely impact our residents.*"

As a private, law abiding resident, we do not support any citizen group "monitoring" or conducting any form of surveillance in our neighborhood. The parking on our corner for hours, logging whatever they're logging, flying drones over private property is invading our privacy and quality of life.

Santa Barbara County policy makers, staff, law enforcement, advisors, industry and the public have invested thousands upon thousands of planning hours and capital in the development and implementation of a highly regulated Cannabis Ordinance. We're confident in the County's ability to manage the licensing process and the *Sheriff's Cannabis Compliance Team* to professionally monitor, investigate and crackdown on any and all unlawful industry owners.

Concerned Carpenterians are relentlessly bogging down Santa Barbara County's departments with their strategic and unethical complaint and appeal filing protocol. We view this behavior as both economically and socially irresponsible. They are wasting hundreds of thousands of tax-payer dollars under the guise that they know best. Their ruthless harassing, slandering and viciously interfering with family livelihoods is not a crusade, but rather a cruel and careless mission.

The scare tactics they're peddling are also untruths: "the odor of cannabis causes brain damage," "those who use cannabis are a less intelligent breed," "property values have decreased" at last week's State of the City, Mark Schniepp, President of California Economic Forecast shared Carpinteria home values continue to rise as crime rates continue to fall.

The Concerned Carpenterians Mission stating they'll "*safeguard the quality of life we have historically enjoyed here in Carpinteria and the Carpinteria Valley*" does not hold an ounce of value for us. Our quality of life has greatly improved since the conversion from flowers to cannabis. No more bumper-to-bumper refrigerated semi's pounding the 192, the spraying of chemical laced pesticides on flowers, or the sight of dilapidated greenhouses. Not to mention the continued philanthropic dedication and commitment our farmers have bestowed upon our community for decades.

The Concerned Carpinterians have declared war on every single cannabis farmer in our valley, war on our neighbors, war on our friends, war on our quality of life. They're gunning to get every plant out of our valley, because they seem to think that they know what's best for all of us.

A tremendous amount of time, capital and resources have gone into developing our County's Cannabis Ordinance. Considering any type of amendment is not giving the Ordinance the time required to complete its purpose. Contemplation for a change of course should only be to correct a miscalculation, not because of a very small group, very loud group trying to manipulate change.

Respectfully,
Tina Fanucchi-Frontado
Greg Frontado



Virus-free. www.avast.com

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Brad Tisdale <btisdale44@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 1, 2019 4:57 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Cannabis

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

Dear Supervisors

Recently, I was visiting with friends one evening in Carpinteria. It was a gorgeous evening and just after dark we stepped outside to enjoy the night air. After a few minutes my hosts asked, "Do you smell that"? I replied that I did smell it then I asked if they had a problem with skunks on their property. It was so pungent we had to step back inside and could not enjoy the night air and stars. They lamented it is what they now smell most days/nights in Carpinteria. They went on to share how much they, their neighbors and families in the community absolutely hate it and how frustrated they are that this was allowed to happen.

These friends and thousands of other residents have had the unfortunate experience of living with cannabis growers all around them, and are experiencing the horrible, negative impacts of odor, noise, traffic, night lighting, health issues, crime, and forced life style changes coming from this new industry. There are many unresolved issues and the Supervisors seem to be tone-deaf concerning the needs and wishes of their constituents.

I am a Goleta resident in the AG-2 zoning area, and it is my understanding there are NO protections on AG-2 parcels and we residents have NO protection. If cannabis is grown behind our homes it will devastate our quality of life, health, safety, and diminish our home values. I can see it diminishing our tourism as well and decreasing the attraction of a weekend stay at one of Goleta's new Marriott or Hilton hotels.

I strongly encourage you to stand against any regulations (or lack thereof) that would make it possible for the cannabis industry to set up shop and grow marijuana just above our own neighborhoods. This new outside industry has little regard for the existing character and lifestyle of our communities and we are relying on you to slow it down if not stop it all together.

As our representatives, I urge you to stand against the corporate cannabis industry and to stand for the local residents you were elected to serve.

Thank you,

Brad Tisdale

Sent from my iPhone

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Aimee Miller <aimeemiller@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 1, 2019 5:17 PM
To: Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Cc: Tom Miller
Subject: Santa Barbara County / Homeowner in Goleta Foothills - Concerns about Cannabis in our neighborhoods

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

As a homeowner in the Goleta foothills (Rancho Ciervo) I'm extremely concerned about allowing Cannabis Cultivation on any AG2 land that is within or surrounding our neighborhoods. I know that you are looking at AG-1 revisions and we (along with many of our neighbors) are very worried about the potential impact of cannabis cultivation on our air quality - odors travel a great distance and impact health and air quality in surrounding areas. We are seeing the horrible experience in the Carpinteria neighborhoods where residents are complaining of health (headaches, stench, etc) and quality of life impacts. The Cannabis industry also brings the scary potential for increased crime, lower property values and an extremely negative impact to quality of life. I was shocked to hear there are currently over 9,000 requests in SB County for Cannabis cultivation permits. Our children play in yards next to these agriculturally zoned areas - this is the long term history and beauty of Goleta, we must not let it be ruined by this industry.

I'm asking for you to protect our neighborhoods and to please recommend that the Supervisors (or Commissioners) consider making regulations on AG-2 properties that protect ALL neighborhoods. We must learn from the terrible experiences of our neighbors in Carpinteria - it can't be simply about generating profits with this nascent industry. Santa Barbara County must set an example that protects our residents with thoughtful regulations! I truly hope you will represent the people of Goleta and protect us from this potential disaster.

Thank you
Tom & Aimee Miller

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Alan Siebenaler <alsiebs@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 1, 2019 5:39 PM
To: Hart, Gregg; Villalobos, David; sbcob
Subject: Cannabis Cultivation

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

Dear Supervisors and Planners -

I am a resident of district 2 and I am against cannabis cultivation anywhere even close to a residential area. Carpenteria has its large amount of issues now due to the smell of constant skunk and increased crime. Please lets learn from their mistakes and do not allow the cultivation anywhere close to where we live.

Thank you

Alan Siebenaler

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Gwen Rigby <lamarque@sbceo.org>
Sent: Monday, April 1, 2019 10:47 PM
To: sbcob; Hart, Gregg
Cc: SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis
Subject: Cannabis permit for Seaview Nursery

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

April 1, 2019

Distinguished Board of Supervisor Members and Planning Commission Members:

Just over two weeks ago I learned that a neighbor (Seaview Nursery) is applying for a permit to cultivate cannabis. This nursery is three parcels away from my house. I hope that you can consider the concerns of the residents around this nursery. I do not have faith in this nursery to be good caretakers of their new enterprise should they be granted the right to grow cannabis.

I can recount three reasons why. The first is that this nursery has not been a good neighbor. We live on a private lane that is barely wide enough for two vehicles. Trucks come to this nursery at all times of the day and can block the road for 5-20 minutes because they must back in an awkwardly narrow driveway to receive the goods. Those trucks with long trailers have sometimes gotten stuck or have required someone to come from the office to guide them in the back and forth process. Over the last 20 years I have often thought of writing county planning officials to ask if there is a legal size limit to trucks that are allowed to come up a narrow, private road. I've heard that other neighbors have approached them about reconfiguring their driveway so that trucks do not block our ingress or egress on the lane. They have done nothing. With a cannabis venture, this could become a greater grievance.

The other two reasons are perhaps more alarming. Several years ago I left a note in their mailbox asking if I had to contact County Health for them to clean up the effluent that was accumulating in the ditch in front of their property. For over a week there was toilet paper and other evidence of private business. They had been working on the hedge that fronts their property, and so I waited for them to notice what was in the ditch. Nothing changed until I threatened to call Public Health. The second example might be corrected now. I know a fellow who lived in the back of the property years ago. There is a private dwelling carved out of the nursery area. This fellow said he left because of all the pesticides that they had to live with. He and his family were getting headaches and feeling sick. He asked them to move the pesticide storage, but they did not. A number of years ago, I went back toward that dwelling and saw that their floor was dirt, at least at the entry. Perhaps the living situation has improved. Nonetheless, I don't see the management as one that takes care of the health or safety of its workers. Would neighbors fare better?

Last year I participated in research on odors in Goleta and Santa Maria. I learned about Code 303, the public nuisance ordinance, and about the Right to Farm regulations, which nullifies some of that. However, when an agricultural enterprise begins a new venture, it should still be beholden to public nuisance regulations. Certain endeavors should not be automatically granted permits when there are evident inconveniences, even dangers, to be taken into account.

At the Goleta City Council meeting on toxic odors last spring, quality of life and the ability to open one's windows and enjoy fresh air were cited as citizens' rights. Leaders of several county agencies (Fire, Public Health, Environmental Health, Air Pollution Control, Agriculture) were at this meeting, which was meant to assuage the local citizens that the County had their interests in mind. What has happened to that sentiment? Cannabis is like a 24-hour skunk infestation. Do you really have the right to say we must live with that?

You should realize that property values decrease if you have to admit to unlivable conditions. Disclosures would need to be in all sales agreements; waivers could be part of the sale. If property values decrease as a result, so do revenues from property taxes. Moreover, Santa Barbara and environs do not want to have the reputation of being stinky. Tourism is a major business here. I do not think that you want to endanger our image because more tax money will disappear.

I believe that the name of the coalition conveys my point: Santa Barbara Coalition for Responsible Cannabis. In my case, I cannot assume that my neighbors will act responsibly if they are given a permit. Please keep my remonstrance in mind when allowing permits, specifically to Seaview Nursery on Anderson Lane. And consider the right to clean air and secure housing for all the citizens of Santa Barbara County.

Gwen Rigby
1451 Anderson Lane
Santa Barbara CA 93111
805 964 8197

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Miyasato, Mona
Sent: Monday, April 1, 2019 5:23 PM
To: sbcob
Cc: Bozanich, Dennis
Subject: Fwd: Cannabis cultivation

Begin forwarded message:

From: Allison <allisonvanwingerden@yahoo.com>
Date: April 1, 2019 at 3:07:52 PM PDT
To: mmiyasato@countyofsb.org, dvillalo@santa-barbara.ca.us
Subject: **Cannabis cultivation**

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

Hello,

My name is Allison Van Wingerden.

Please maintain the Cannabis ordinance that has been developed and please allow a two-year moratorium on any changes.

There are now more jobs, higher hourly wages, no chemical pesticides. No heavy semi-truck traffic, there has been renovation of older greenhouses, there is a clean environmental footprint and there is an excellent source of tax revenue.

Thank you for your consideration,
Allison Van Wingerden

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Allen, Michael (COB)
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 8:38 AM
To: sbcob; de la Guerra, Sheila; Relis, Mia
Subject: FW: BOS Public Comment
Attachments: Public Comment to BOS, 4.2.19.docx

FYI

From: Renee ONeill <chasingstar2701@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 1, 2019 5:53 PM
To: Allen, Michael (COB) <allen@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>
Cc: Villalobos, David <dvillalo@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>
Subject: BOS Public Comment

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

Hi Gentlemen,

Attached, please find my BOS Public Comment for April 2, 2019.
David, please Cc to Planning Commissioners.

I also hope to have thumb drive, slide presentation, ready for tomorrow... 'song and a prayer... don't add above comment to Public Comment, please.

Warmest Regards,

Renée O'Neill

To: SBC Supervisors,

April 2, 2019

Tepusquet Community strongly supports the Santa Barbara Coalition for Responsible Cannabis (CRC). We are grateful to them and their legal counsel, who have scrutinized county ordinances, exposing many, 'misrepresentations' and the Board's failure to take adequate measures of protections. You have also failed to hire essential numbers of Staff and Enforcement. After receiving numerous complaints, *you hired one*, new FTE.

BOS Letter 4.2.19 - Quarterly Report re Cannabis Staffing/Enforcement and State Licensing:

"The Board approved Final FY2018-19 Annual Budget included 10.5 Full Time Equivalents (FTEs). In *December, 2018* the Board approved the addition of **one District Attorney Investigator** position *that was previously vacant and unfunded*. This position was filled as of January, 2019. The Enforcement Team is now fully staffed with a total of 11.5 FTEs dedicated to cannabis enforcement against unlicensed cannabis operations."

"In this reporting period, Planning and Development opened 32 new enforcement cases, of which 29 are still in progress."

State Licensing

"During the first quarter, there were 102 operators holding 832 active State licenses on approximately 196 acres countywide. As of January 31, 2019, the number of operators decreased to 98 operators holding 2,197 active State licenses that would equate to approximately 513 acres countywide." (Talk about kicking the 'small growers' to the curb).

How can our County expect Staff/Enforcement to supervise/enforce on the excessive explosion of unabated, cannabis industry? That's just it... you don't! County has *purposely failed* to include CAPS/Restrictions and blatantly designed this 'system of failure,' to support cannabis industry! You *purposely* misrepresent and tie the hands of justice, limiting enforcement's potential for greater success. I deem this reprehensible and criminal! You have failed to fulfill the state's (*if not your*) number one priority, 'to protect public health, safety and welfare.' I have brought this matter to your attention, many times over the years, *especially* after you developed your list of 'Ten Priority Objectives,' "1. Develop a robust and economically viable legal cannabis industry to ensure production and availability of high quality cannabis products to help meet local demands, and, as a public benefit, improve the County's tax base;" (The first 7, of your 10 priority objectives, remain in *support of cannabis industry*.) **You broke your promises** to us, re 'Majority of Cannabis Tax Revenue would go to Enforcement.' Less than half was used to hire Staff/Enforcement and we *still* have *only one-person trying to process hundreds of Provisional Licenses and/or Affidavits*. Hello! I find it impossible to trust you and anything you '*promise!*' Walk-the-walk! It has become blatantly evident that in *this town*, "Money not only talks, it supersedes the law."

Unified, countywide teams support CRC letter, which has identified many issues, detailed in their letter to you. We insist that you follow their recommendations and take immediate action to rectify the mistakes you have made. After five years of pleading with this county to 'do something' (about the escalation of unabated, unregulated, unenforced, illicit cannabis industry growers that *repeatedly* disregard county/state/federal regulations), it's *high time* someone brought this 'dereliction of duty,' to the foreground.

We simply cannot/will not continue to 'be patient' and endure the problems that this county has subjected us to. You have allowed this industry to, "Write the Rules for Cannabis-Driven, Revenue-Oriented Regulations," while they escalate their destructions of our once pristine, rural, peaceful, family-oriented, scenic communities. You have not only thrown the majority of your 'law-abiding, revenue-making, tax-paying constituents' *Under the Proverbial Bus* but fed them to the, "Greedy, Gaping Jowls of Cannabis Industry Carnivores!"

Once again, I want to remind the compliant, small-farm growers that my level of angst is not directed at you.

Renée O'Neill

Tepusquet Advocate with Fortitude and 'Attitude'