

ATTACHMENT 3: CEQA CHECKLIST, DATED FEBRUARY 17, 2022



COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

Planning and Development

www.sbcountyplanning.org

State CEQA Guidelines § 15168(c)(4) Checklist for Commercial Cannabis Land Use Entitlement and Licensing Applications

A. Purpose

On February 6, 2018, the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors certified a programmatic environmental impact report (PEIR) that analyzed the environmental impacts of the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program (Program). The PEIR was prepared in accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines (§ 15168) and evaluated the Program’s impacts with regard to the following environmental resources and subjects:

- Aesthetics and Visual Resources
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use
- Noise
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Energy Conservation
- Population, Employment, and Housing

The PEIR evaluated the direct and indirect impacts, as well as the project-specific and cumulative impacts, that would result from the implementation of the Program. The PEIR set forth feasible mitigation measures for several significant impacts, which are now included as development standards and/or requirements in the land use and licensing ordinances.

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines (§ 15168(c)(4)), the following checklist was prepared to determine whether the environmental effects of a proposed commercial cannabis operation are within the scope of the PEIR.

B. Project Description

Please provide the following project information.

1. Land Use Entitlement Case Number(s): 19CUP-00000-00062, 20AMD-00000-00003, 19CDP-00000-00157
2. Business Licensing Ordinance Case Number(s): _____
3. Project Applicant(s): G&K Farms

4. Property Owner(s): Magu Farm, LLC
5. Project Site Location and Tax Assessor Parcel Number(s): 3561 Foothill Road, Carpinteria; APN 005-280-040
6. Project Description: The Proposed Project is a request for a Conditional Use Permit (Case No. 19CUP-00000-00062), a Development Plan Amendment to 82-DP-30 (Case No. 20AMD-00000-00003), and a Coastal Development Permit (Case No. 19CDP-00000-00157) to allow for the construction of a new 25,418-square-foot, 25-foot-tall cannabis processing building and a detention basin to capture run-off from the structure.

The site is currently developed with five existing greenhouses permitted under the original Development Plan, Case No. 82-DP-30, and one existing warehouse, which was permitted under a Modification to the Development Plan, Case No. 86-M-4. Of the existing 379,757 square feet of development, 356,070 square feet is currently used for cannabis cultivation as approved by Coastal Development Permit, Case No. 18CDP-00000-00077. The proposed processing building will be used for the storage, drying, trimming, and packaging of cannabis grown both on-site and off-site. Up to 50% of the product processed in the proposed processing building will be grown off-site. Proposed grading for the Project includes 1,400 cu. yd. of cut and 1,000 cu. yd. of fill. Other site improvements required include storm water detention and a septic system. No vegetation or trees are proposed for removal.

External lighting will be provided by sixteen wall-mounted full cut-off LED motion detector lights on the east, north, and west sides of the proposed building near doorways. The proposed building includes carbon filters in all processing areas, air curtains on exterior doors, spray insulation within the building, and negative pressure throughout the building to reduce fugitive odors. Existing landscaping along Foothill Road screens the Proposed Project from view. Two chillers associated with the HVAC system will be installed adjacent to the proposed building. Ten 3,450-gallon water tanks will also be installed.

The proposed cannabis processing building would add up to 50 new full-time year-round employees, for a maximum of 80 full-time year round employees for the entire cannabis operation the property. The Proposed Project will add 18 parking spots, including two ADA spots, and stripe the existing parking area, for a total of 54 parking spots. The operator will lease at least one 15-passenger van through CalVans (or a similar third party company) to provide daily roundtrip weekday vanpool transportation for employees commuting from Ventura County to the Project site for the life of the Project. All employee parking will be on-site and no employee parking on public roads is allowed.

The hours of operation for the processing building will be 6:00 am to 3:30 pm, seven days a week. Two emergency generators will be installed for backup power in case of an outage. Water for the processing building and all domestic uses on-site will be provided by the Carpinteria Valley Water District. The proposed processing building will contain two restroom areas for the use of employees. Wastewater treatment will be handled by a new septic system. Primary access to the site will continue to be provided through an existing easement on the neighboring parcel to the west (APN 005-280-015), which

connects to Via Real. The property is a 14.66-acre parcel zoned AG-I-10, shown as Assessor’s Parcel Number 005-280-040, and addressed as 3561 Foothill Road in the Toro Canyon Community Plan area, First Supervisorial District.

C. PEIR Mitigation Measures/Requirements for Commercial Cannabis Operations

The following table lists the specific mitigation measures set forth in the PEIR. The table further includes questions to determine the scope of the potential environmental impacts of a project. This information will be used by staff to determine if subsequent environmental review of a project is warranted.

Please answer all questions set forth in the following table. Planning and Development Department (P&D) staff complete § C.1 and County Executive Office (CEO) staff complete § C.2. If a question does not apply to the proposed cannabis operation, please check the corresponding “N/A” box.

C.1 Mitigation Measures/Requirements for P&D Staff Review

Mitigation Measure/Requirement	Code/Plan Sections*	Requirement
Aesthetics and Visual Resources		
MM AV-1. Screening Requirements	LUDC § 35.42.075.C.3	Is the proposed cannabis operation visible from a public viewing location? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	Article II § 35-144U.C.3	If so, does the proposed project include implementation of the required landscape and screening plan? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Agricultural Resources		
MM AG-1. Cannabis Cultivation Prerequisite Ancillary Use Licenses	LUDC §§ 35.42.075.D.3 and -4	Does the proposed project include ancillary cannabis uses (e.g., manufacturing of cannabis products)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Article II § 35-144U.C.2.a and -3.a	If the proposed project includes ancillary cannabis uses, does the proposed project comply with the minimum cultivation requirements to allow ancillary cannabis uses? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
MM AG-2. New Structure Avoidance of Prime Soils	LUDC § 35.42.075.D.1.b	Does the proposed project site have prime soils located on it? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Article II § 35-144U.C.1.b	Does the proposed project involve structural development? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If the proposed project involves structural

Mitigation Measure/Requirement	Code/Plan Sections*	Requirement
		development, are the structures sited and designed to avoid prime soils? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions		
MM AQ-3. Cannabis Site Transportation Demand Management	LUDC § 35.42.075.D.1.j	Does the proposed project include cannabis cultivation? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Article II § 35-144U.1.j	If so, does the project include implementation of the required Transportation Demand Management Plan? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
MM AQ-5. Odor Abatement Plan	LUDC § 35.42.075.C.6	<i>This mitigation measure/requirement does not apply to projects in the AG-II zone, unless a Conditional Use Permit is required for the proposed commercial cannabis operation.</i>
	Article II § 35-144U.C.6	Does the proposed project include cannabis cultivation, a nursery, manufacturing, microbusiness, and/or distribution? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If so, does the project include implementation of the required odor abatement plan? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Biological Resources		
MM BIO-1a. Tree Protection Plan	LUDC § 35.42.075.C.8 and Appendix J	Does the proposed project involve development within proximity to, alteration of, or the removal of, a native tree? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	Article II § 35-144.C.8 and Appendix G	If so, does the project include implementation of the required tree protection plan? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
MM BIO-1b. Habitat Protection Plan	LUDC § 35.42.075.C.8 and Appendix J	<i>Inland.</i> Will the project result in the removal of native vegetation or other vegetation in an area that has been identified as having a medium to high potential of being occupied by a special-status wildlife species, nesting bird, or a Federal or State-listed special-status plant species? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A If so, does the project include implementation of the required habitat protection plan? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

Mitigation Measure/Requirement	Code/Plan Sections*	Requirement
	Article II § 35-144.C.8 and Appendix G	<p><i>Coastal.</i> Does the project involve development within environmentally sensitive habitat (ESH) and/or ESH buffers? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p>If so, does the project include implementation of the required habitat protection plan? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>
MM HWR-1a. Cannabis Waste Discharge Requirements Draft General Order	LUDC § 35.42.075.D.1.d	Does the proposed project involve cannabis cultivation? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Article II § 35-144U.C.1.d	If so, did the applicant submit documentation from the State Water Resources Control Board demonstrating compliance with the comprehensive Cannabis Cultivation Policy? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
MM BIO-3. Wildlife Movement Plan	LUDC § 35.42.075.C.8 and Appendix J	Is the proposed project site located in or near a wildlife movement area? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	Article II § 35-144.C.8 and Appendix G	If so, does the project include implementation of the required wildlife movement plan? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Cultural Resources		
MM CR-1. Preservation MM CR-2. Archaeological and Paleontological Surveys	LUDC § 35.42.075.C.1	Does the proposed project involve development within an area that has the potential for cultural resources to be located within it? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Article II §§ 35-144U.C.1 and 35-65	<p>If so, was a Phase I cultural study prepared? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p>If so, did the Phase I cultural study require a Phase II cultural study? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p>If so, does the project involve implementation of cultural resource preservation measures set forth in the Phase II cultural study? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>
Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
MM HAZ-3. Volatile Manufacturing Employee Training Plan	LUDC § 35.42.075.D.4.c	Does the proposed project involve volatile manufacturing of cannabis products? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	Article II § 35-144U.C.3.c	If so, does the project involve implementation of the required Volatile Manufacturing Employee Training Plan? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts		

Mitigation Measure/Requirement	Code/Plan Sections*	Requirement
MM HWR-1. Cannabis Waste Discharge Requirements General Order	<i>See the Biological Resources items, above.</i>	
MM BIO-1b. Cannabis Waste Discharge Requirements General Order	<i>See the Biological Resources items, above.</i>	
Land Use Impacts		
MM LU-1. Public Lands Restriction	LUDC § 35.42.075.D.1.h	Does the proposed project involve cannabis cultivation on public lands? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
	Article II § 35-144U.C.1.h	
MM AQ-3. Cannabis Site Transportation Demand Management	<i>See the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions items, above.</i>	
MM AQ-5. Odor Abatement Plan	<i>See the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions items, above.</i>	
MM TRA-1. Payment of Transportation Impact Fees	County Ordinance No. 4270	Is the proposed project subject to the countywide, Goleta, or Orcutt development impact fee ordinance? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If so, did the applicant pay the requisite fee? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Compliance with Comprehensive Plan Environmental Resource Protection Policies	LUDC § 35.10.020.B	<i>All cannabis applications.</i> Does the proposed project comply with all applicable environmental resource protection policies set forth in the Comprehensive Plan? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	CLUP Chapter 3, § 3.1 and Policy 1-4	<i>Coastal cannabis applications.</i> Does the proposed project comply with all applicable coastal resources protection policies set forth in the Coastal Land Use Plan? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Noise		
MM AQ-3. Cannabis Site Transportation Demand Management	<i>See the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions items, above.</i>	
Transportation and Traffic		
MM AQ-3. Cannabis Site Transportation Demand Management	<i>See the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions items, above.</i>	
MM TRA-1. Payment of Transportation Impact Fees	<i>See the Land Use Impacts items, above.</i>	

Mitigation Measure/Requirement	Code/Plan Sections*	Requirement
Unusual Project Site Characteristics and Development Activities		
Activities and Impacts within the Scope of the Program/PEIR	State CEQA Guidelines § 15168(c)(1)	<p>Does the proposed project involve a project site with sensitive or unusual environmental characteristics, or require unusual development activities, which will result in a significant environmental impact that was not evaluated in the PEIR? Examples of unusual environmental characteristics or development activities which might cause a significant environmental impact include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • construction of a bridge across a riparian corridor that supports listed species protected under the Federal or California endangered species acts, in order to gain access to a project site; • structural development that cannot be screened from a public viewing location pursuant to the requirements of PEIR mitigation measure MM AV-1 (Screening Requirements); or • development activities that will have a significant impact on cultural resources, which cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level pursuant to the County's <i>Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual</i> (March 2018). <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>

LUDC = Land Use and Development Code; Chapter 35, Article 35.1 et seq., of the Santa Barbara County Code
Article II = Coastal Zoning Ordinance; Chapter 35, Article II, § 35-50 et seq., of the Santa Barbara County Code
CLUP = Santa Barbara County Coastal Land Use Plan
State CEQA Guidelines = California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, § 15000 et seq.


C.1.1 Environmental Document Determination

Check the appropriate box below, based on the responses to the questions and requests for information set forth in the checklist in § C.1, above, and pursuant to the requirements set forth in State CEQA Guidelines §§ 15162 and 15168.

- All of the environmental impacts of the proposed commercial cannabis operation are within the scope of the PEIR, and a subsequent environmental document is not required to evaluate the environmental impacts of the proposed commercial cannabis operation.
 - Certification is certification and the PEIR is certified for all purposes.
 - The PEIR's certification is not limited to particular purposes or particular areas of the County.

- The Coastal Commission considered the County’s PEIR, and reached their own conclusion using their certified regulatory program, and found the PEIR consistent with the County of Santa Barbara’s Local Coastal Program.
 - When the County of Santa Barbara takes action on cannabis entitlements in the Coastal Zone, the County of Santa Barbara relies on both the PEIR and the Local Coastal Program in making consistency findings.
- The proposed commercial cannabis operation will have environmental effects that were not examined in the PEIR, and an initial study must be prepared to determine whether a subsequent environmental impact report or negative declaration must be prepared.

Ben Singer
Name of Preparer of § C.1


Signature of Preparer of § C.1

2/17/2022
Date

C.2 Mitigation Measures/Requirements for CEO Staff Review

Mitigation Measure/Requirement	Code/Plan Sections*	Requirement
Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions		
MM UE-2a. Energy Conservation Best Management Practices	BLO § 50-10(b)	Does the proposed project include the implementation of the required energy conservation plan? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
MM UE-2b. Participation in a Renewable Energy Choice Program	BLO § 50-10(b)2.ii	Does the proposed project include participation in a renewable energy choice program to meet the applicable energy reduction goals for the proposed project? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
MM UE-2c. Plan review by the County Green Building Committee	BLO § 50-10(b)2.iii.K	Did the County Green Building Committee review the proposed project? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A If so, does the proposed project conform to the recommendations of the County Green Building Committee? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Utilities and Energy Conservation		
MM UE-2a. Energy Conservation Best Management Practices	<i>See the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions items, above.</i>	
MM UE-2b. Participation in a Renewable Energy Choice Program	<i>See the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions items, above.</i>	
MM UE-2c. Licensing by the County Green Building Committee	<i>See the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions items, above.</i>	
Unusual Project Site Characteristics and Development Activities		
Activities and Impacts within the Scope of the Program/PEIR	State CEQA Guidelines § 15168(c)(1)	Does the proposed project involve a project site with sensitive or unusual environmental characteristics, or require unusual development activities, which will result in a significant environmental impact that was not evaluated in the PEIR? Examples of unusual environmental characteristics or development activities which might cause a significant environmental impact include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • construction of a bridge across a riparian corridor that supports listed species protected under the Federal or California

Mitigation Measure/Requirement	Code/Plan Sections*	Requirement
		endangered species acts, in order to gain access to a project site; <ul style="list-style-type: none">• structural development that cannot be screened from a public viewing location pursuant to the requirements of PEIR mitigation measure MM AV-1 (Screening Requirements); or• development activities that will have a significant impact on cultural resources, which cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level pursuant to the County’s <i>Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual</i> (March 2018). <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

* BLO = Commercial Cannabis Business Licensing Ordinance; Chapter 50, § 50-1 et seq., of the Santa Barbara County Code
State CEQA Guidelines = California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, § 15000 et seq.

C.2.1 Environmental Document Determination

Check the appropriate box below, based on the responses to the questions and requests for information set forth in the checklist in § C.2, above, and pursuant to the requirements set forth in State CEQA Guidelines §§ 15162 and 15168.

- All of the environmental impacts of the proposed commercial cannabis operation are within the scope of the PEIR, and a subsequent environmental document is not required to evaluate the environmental impacts of the proposed commercial cannabis operation.
- The proposed commercial cannabis operation will have environmental effects that were not examined in the PEIR, and an initial study must be prepared to determine whether a subsequent environmental impact report or negative declaration must be prepared.

Name of Preparer of § C.2

Signature of Preparer of § C.2

Date

Attachment 1

Additional Information for the Proposed Cannabis Activity

CEQA Environmental Determination

The following discussion supports the determinations made in the Checklist for the G&K Processing Warehouse (Proposed Project), pursuant to the requirements of the State CEQA Guidelines §§ 15168(c) and 15162. The State CEQA Guidelines §§ 15168(c)(1) and -(2) state:

(1) If a later activity would have effects that were not examined in the program EIR, a new Initial Study would need to be prepared leading to either an EIR or a Negative Declaration. That later analysis may tier from the program EIR as provided in Section 15152.

(2) If the agency finds that pursuant to Section 15162, no subsequent EIR would be required, the agency can approve the activity as being within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR, and no new environmental document would be required. Whether a later activity is within the scope of a program EIR is a factual question that the lead agency determines based on substantial evidence in the record. Factors that an agency may consider in making that determination include, but are not limited to, consistency of the later activity with the type of allowable land use, overall planned density and building intensity, geographic area analyzed for environmental impacts, and covered infrastructure, as described in the program EIR.

The requirements of the State CEQA Guidelines § 15168 and 15162 are set forth below, along with an analysis of the Proposed Project with regard to these requirements. The following analysis supplements the information set forth in the State CEQA Guidelines § 15168 checklist prepared for the Proposed Project.

State CEQA Guidelines § 15168(c)(1)

As discussed below, the PEIR analyzed the environmental impacts of the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program. The effects of this particular Project were anticipated and examined in the PEIR and there are no project-specific effects that were not examined in the program EIR. Therefore, no new initial study is required and the PEIR can be relied upon for this Project based upon the checklist prepared pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines 15168(c)(4).

State CEQA Guidelines § 15162

State CEQA Guidelines § 15162 states that when a lead agency has prepared an EIR for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, that certain conditions exist. The specific conditions that warrant the preparation of a subsequent EIR are set forth below, with an analysis of the proposed project immediately following the respective condition.

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.**

The Proposed Project includes a request for a commercial cannabis cultivation activity that was anticipated and evaluated in the PEIR. The Proposed Project site is zoned AG-I-10, which is one of the zones that was evaluated for proposed cannabis cultivation activities in the PEIR (PEIR page 2-36, Table 2-5). Furthermore, the Carpinteria Valley region in which the Proposed Project site is located was one of five regions identified in the PEIR for organizing the data and analyzing the impacts of the Program (Ibid, page 2-5).

As discussed below, the Proposed Project consists of an activity the impacts of which were disclosed in, the PEIR. Cannabis processing is a cannabis activity that were anticipated to occur on AG zoned lands, such as the AG-I zoned lands which exist in the Carpinteria Valley region in which the Proposed Project site is located. The PEIR evaluated the potential increases in employment, traffic, noise, air emissions (including odors), etc., that would result from the Proposed Project and other commercial cannabis activities allowed under the Program. There is nothing unusual about the proposed processing activities as these are considered standard agricultural practices in the Carpinteria Valley area and the AG-I zone district. Therefore, the Proposed Project will not result in substantial changes to the Program which will require major revisions of the PEIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

Currently, there are approximately 36 land use entitlement applications involving proposed or permitted cannabis activities located in the Carpinteria Valley area (Santa Barbara County Interactive Map for Cannabis, available at <https://sbcopad.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=f287d128ab684ba4a87f1b9cf438f91>, accessed on August 28, 2020). The PEIR anticipated that certain areas in which cannabis activities historically have occurred would continue to experience cannabis activities under the Program. Furthermore, the PEIR projected the demand for cannabis cultivation that could occur under the Program (i.e., 1,126 acres of cultivation countywide), based on information that was known at the time the PEIR was prepared. The Program that was analyzed in the PEIR did not include a cap or other requirement to limit either the concentration or total amount of cannabis activities that could occur within any of the zones that were under consideration for cannabis activities (PEIR, pages 3-3, 3-5, 3-12, 3.1-19, and 3.12-26).¹ Although the PEIR did not predict the specific commercial cannabis applications on the properties located on and around the Proposed Project site, the programmatic analysis was broad enough to account for this pattern of development that has resulted from the Program. Therefore, the number and/or location of the commercial cannabis activities that have been either permitted or are currently under consideration within the general area of the Proposed Project site, do not constitute a substantial change with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken.

¹ The PEIR states, "...[T]he impact analysis in this EIR assumes that **future cannabis activity licenses would not be limited under the Project**, with the total area permitted to be unincorporated areas Countywide that are under County jurisdiction (excludes incorporated cities, state, federal, and tribal lands) (PEIR, page 3-5, emphasis added)."

Furthermore, the potential concentration of cannabis activities near the Proposed Project site will not create new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects evaluated in the PEIR. The PEIR evaluated the cumulative impacts to which cannabis activities, as well as other pending, recently approved, and reasonably foreseeable non-cannabis projects, would contribute (Ibid, page 3-11, Section 3.0.4). The PEIR concluded that unavoidable and significant (Class I) impacts would result from the Program with regard to the following environmental resources or issues:

- Aesthetics and visual resources
- Agricultural resources
- Air quality (including odor impacts)
- Noise
- Transportation and traffic

The Board of Supervisors adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations concluding that the benefits of the Program outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects identified above.

The Proposed Project is compatible with the surrounding zone districts and heavy agricultural uses. The processing structure would be shielded from public views by existing landscaping and greenhouses. The subject parcel is comprised primarily of prime soils, small portion of non-prime soils exists near the creek and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat along the southern portion of the property boundary. The proposed processing building would be constructed in the same general area as approved greenhouses. The proposed 25,418-square-foot cannabis processing building would be located in same general location as the sixth greenhouse previously approved under Development Plan No. 82-DP-30. The processing building would increase the amount of on-site development to a total of 405,175 square feet, and the overall on-site development will remain within the originally permitted 415,380 square feet.

The proposed Project would contribute to cumulative impacts on prime soils, air quality and transportation/traffic. The proposed Project would be subject to the mitigation measures set forth in the PEIR to reduce the proposed Project's contribution to these cumulative impacts. These mitigation measures include implementation of a Site Transportation Demand Management Plan to reduce vehicle trips generated by proposed Project, and implementation of an Odor Abatement Plan to prevent cannabis odors from being experienced within residential zones.

These are no new impacts resulting from a substantial change in the Program. As stated above, the Proposed Project is an activity that was anticipated to result from the Program and, consequently, the impacts associated with the Proposed Project were disclosed in the PEIR. As such, the PEIR analysis of cumulative impacts accounted for the impacts from the Proposed Project.

Therefore, no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken under the Program which will require major revisions of the PEIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

The PEIR evaluated the direct and indirect impacts of the Program as well as cumulative impacts that would result from the implementation of the Program. More specifically, the PEIR identified the following unavoidably significant (Class I) impacts that would result from the Program:

- Cumulative impacts to aesthetics and visual resources
- Cumulative impacts to agricultural resources
- Project-specific and cumulative impacts to air resources (including odors)
- Project-specific and cumulative noise impacts
- Project-specific and cumulative transportation and traffic impacts

The PEIR also identified the following significant but mitigable (Class II) impacts that would result from the Program:

- Project-specific impacts to aesthetics and visual resources
- Project-specific impacts to agricultural resources
- Project-specific and cumulative impacts to biological resources
- Project-specific impacts to cultural resources
- Project-specific impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials
- Project-specific impacts related to hydrology and water quality
- Project-specific land use impacts
- Project-specific impacts related to utilities and energy conservation

The PEIR identified a number of mitigation measures to reduce the significant impacts that would result from the implementation of the Program. The mitigation measures were included as development standards and other regulations of Chapters 35 and 50 of the County Code, which are applied to commercial cannabis activities resulting from the Program. As shown in Section C of the State CEQA Guidelines § 15168(c)(4) checklist that was prepared for the Proposed Project, the Proposed Project would be subject to the applicable mitigation measures that were included as development standards and other regulations of Chapters 35 and 50 of the County Code.

As stated above, the PEIR did not assume that there would be a cap or other limitation on activities or location. Therefore, although the PEIR did not predict the specific commercial cannabis applications on the properties located on and around the Proposed Project site, the programmatic analysis was broad enough to account for this pattern of development that has resulted from the Program. Furthermore, the concentration of commercial cannabis activities will not result in a new significant impact which was not disclosed in the PEIR. The cumulative impacts associated with aesthetics and visual resources, agricultural resources, air resources (including odors), noise, and traffic resulting from the Proposed Project and other proposed projects located within proximity to the Proposed Project site were discussed in the PEIR.

The Proposed Project includes a Site Transportation Demand Management Plan and Odor Abatement Plan. As such, the Proposed Project will not have any new impacts which were not discussed in the PEIR, because there is nothing unusual about the proposed development or the project site.

Therefore, there is no new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the PEIR was certified, which shows that the Proposed Project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the PEIR.

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

As stated above, the Proposed Project consists of a cannabis activity that was analyzed as part of the Program studied in the PEIR. There are no unique features of the Proposed Project such that the Proposed Project could cause more severe impacts than shown in the PEIR. The PEIR analyzed the impacts of cannabis processing on AG zoned lots within the Carpinteria Valley region. As shown in Section C of the State CEQA Guidelines § 15168(c)(4) checklist that was prepared for the Proposed Project, the Proposed Project complies with the applicable mitigation measures.

Furthermore, the PEIR did not assume that there would be a cap or other limitation on activities or location. Although the PEIR did not predict the specific commercial cannabis applications on the properties located on and around the Proposed Project site, the programmatic analysis was broad enough to account for this pattern of development, and disclosed the corresponding impacts that would result.

Therefore, there is no new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the PEIR was certified, which shows that significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the PEIR.

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

There are no mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible that would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the Proposed Project which are available at this time for the project proponents to consider.

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

There is no new information which was not known and could not have been known at the time the PEIR was certified that shows any mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR which would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment. Further, the project applicant agrees to adopt all applicable mitigation measures as demonstrated by Section C.1 of the 15168(c)(4) Checklist hereby incorporated into this attachment. The Site Transportation Demand Management Plan and Odor Abatement Plan have been incorporated into the Proposed Project.

ATTACHMENT 2

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATION CANNABIS LAND USE ORDINANCES

February 6, 2018

**Case Nos. 17ORD-00000-00004, 17ORD-00000-00010, 17ORD-00000-00009,
18ORD-00000-00001, and 17EIR-00000-00003**

1.0 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) FINDINGS

1.1 FINDINGS PURSUANT TO PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21081 AND THE CEQA GUIDELINES SECTIONS 15090, 15091, AND 15163:

1.1.1 CONSIDERATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The Board of Supervisors (Board) find that the Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (17EIR-00000-00003) dated December 2017, and EIR Revision Letter (RV 01), dated January 4, 2018, were presented to the Board and all voting members of the Board reviewed and considered the information contained in the EIR and its appendices and RV 01 prior to approving the project. In addition, all voting members of the Board have reviewed and considered testimony and additional information presented at, or prior to, its public hearings. The EIR, appendices, and RV 01 reflect the independent judgment and analysis of the Board and are adequate for this project. Attachments 7 and 8, of the Board letter, dated February 6, 2018, are incorporated herein by reference.

1.1.2 FULL DISCLOSURE

The Board finds and certifies that the EIR, appendices, and RV 01 constitute a complete, accurate, adequate, and good faith effort at full disclosure pursuant to CEQA. The Board further finds and certifies that the EIR, appendices, and RV 01 were completed in compliance with CEQA.

1.1.3 LOCATION OF RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the Planning and Development Department located at 123 East Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93101.

1.1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTING AND MONITORING PROGRAM

Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(d) and 15097 require the County to adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project that it has adopted or made a condition of approval in order to avoid or substantially lessen significant effects on the environment. The EIR has been prepared as a program EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168. The degree of specificity in the EIR corresponds to the specificity of the general or program level policies of the project and to the effects that may be expected to follow from the adoption of the project.

A detailed Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been provided in Section 7.0 of the EIR, incorporated herein by reference, and all mitigation measures identified in the MMRP have been incorporated directly into the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program as shown in Attachments 1, 2, 3, 6 and 13 of the Board letter dated February 6, 2018, incorporated herein by reference, and into the resolution and amendments to the Uniform Rules for Agricultural Preserves and Farmland Security Zones as shown in Attachment 5 of the Board letter dated February 6, 2018, incorporated herein by reference. To ensure compliance with adopted mitigation measures during implementation of Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program the County Land Use and Development Code (LUDC), Montecito Land Use and Development Code (MLUDC) and the Coastal Zoning Ordinance (CZO) amendments include requirements that future development projects comply with each policy, action, or development standard required by each adopted mitigation measure in the MMRP, as applicable to the type of proposed development. Therefore, the Board adopts the MMRP to comply with Public Resource Code Section 21081.6 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15097, and finds that the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program's above referenced ordinance amendments in the LUDC, MLUCD, and CZO are sufficient for a monitoring and reporting program.

1.1.5 FINDINGS THAT CERTAIN UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS¹ ARE MITIGATED TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT FEASIBLE

The EIR (17EIR-00000-00003), its appendices, and EIR Revision Letter (RV 01), for the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program identify several environmental impacts which cannot be fully mitigated and, therefore, are considered unavoidable (Class I). These impacts involve: agricultural resources; air quality and greenhouse gas emissions; noise; transportation and traffic; and aesthetic and visual resources. To the extent the impacts remain significant and unavoidable, such impacts are acceptable when weighed against the overriding social, economic, legal, technical, and other considerations set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations included herein. For each of these Class I impacts described in the EIR, feasible changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects to the maximum extent feasible, as discussed below. The Board letter, dated February 6, 2018, and its attachments are incorporated by reference.

Agricultural Resources

Impacts: The EIR identified significant project-specific and cumulative impacts related to the conversion of prime agricultural soils to a non-agricultural use or the impairment of agricultural land productivity (Impact AG-2).

¹ The discussion of impacts related to aesthetics and visual resources discussed in this section of these findings (below), addresses both the unavoidable cumulative impacts (Class I), as well as the project-specific impacts found to be significant but mitigable to a less-than-significant level (Class II), that are set forth in the EIR.

Mitigation: Mitigation Measure AG-2 requires that any new structures proposed for cannabis site development are sited on areas of the property that do not contain prime soils, to the maximum extent feasible. During the review of applications for cannabis site development, the County Planning and Development Department shall review the proposed location of any new structures proposed for cannabis-related structural development to ensure that they would avoid prime agricultural soils on-site. No other feasible mitigation measures are known that will further reduce impacts. Under a reasonable buildout scenario for cannabis related development, impacts to prime soils will remain significant and unavoidable.

Cumulative impacts to agricultural resources are mitigated to the maximum extent feasible with measure MM AG-2. Program approval would contribute to cumulative agricultural impacts associated with pending and future growth and development projects Countywide. The combined effect of cumulative development is anticipated to result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts to agricultural resources.

Findings: The Board finds that the feasible mitigation measure (MM AG-2) has been incorporated into the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program to reduce the significant environmental effects identified in the EIR to the maximum extent feasible. This mitigation measure will be implemented during the review of entitlement applications for cannabis development, to mitigate project-specific and cumulative impacts to agricultural resources to the maximum extent feasible. However, even with this mitigation measure, impacts to agricultural resources (Impact AG-2) will remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the Board finds the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program's residual impacts to agricultural resources are acceptable due to the overriding considerations discussed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Finding 1.1.8 below.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impacts: The EIR identified significant project-specific and cumulative impacts related to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions from future cannabis activities that would be permitted if the Project is approved. Specifically, the EIR identified the following adverse and unavoidable effects: inconsistency with the Clean Air Plan (Impact AQ-1), traffic generated emissions (Impact AQ-3), inconsistency with the Energy and Climate Action Plan (Impact AQ-4), and exposure of sensitive receptors to objectionable odors (Impact AQ-5).

Mitigation: The EIR identifies two mitigation measures, MM AQ-3 and MM AQ-5 to reduce impacts associated with traffic-generated emissions and objectionable odors, respectively.

MM AQ-3 requires that cannabis Permittees implement feasible transportation demand management (TDM) measures that reduce vehicle travel to and from their proposed sites. Each Permittee must consider location, total employees, hours of operation, site access and transportation routes, and trip origins and destinations associated with the cannabis operation. Once these are identified, the Permittee is required to identify a range of TDM measures as feasible for County review and approval. No other feasible mitigation measures are known that will further reduce traffic-generated emissions impacts. Under a reasonable buildout

scenario for cannabis related development, impacts from traffic-generated emissions will not be fully mitigated and will remain significant and unavoidable.

MM AQ-5 requires that cannabis licensees implement feasible odor abatement plans (OAPs) consistent with Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District requirements and subject to the review and approval of the County. No other feasible mitigation measures are known that will further reduce odor impacts. Under a reasonable buildout scenario for cannabis-related development, impacts from objectionable odors will not be fully mitigated and will remain significant and unavoidable.

Cumulative impacts related to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions are mitigated to the maximum extent feasible with measures MM AQ-3 and MM AQ-5. Since the Project is inconsistent with the Clean Air Plan and the Energy and Climate Action Plan, and the County is anticipated to remain in non-attainment, the Project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts would be cumulatively considerable and, therefore, significant and unavoidable (Class I).

Findings: The Board finds that feasible mitigation measures (MM AQ-3 and MM AQ-5) have been incorporated into the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program to reduce the significant environmental effects identified in the EIR to the maximum extent feasible. These mitigation measures are implemented during project review to mitigate project-specific and cumulative impacts related to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions, to the maximum extent feasible. However, even with these mitigation measures, impacts related to inconsistency with the Clean Air Plan (Impact AQ-1), traffic generated emissions (Impact AQ-3), inconsistency with the Energy and Climate Action Plan (Impact AQ-4), and exposure of sensitive receptors to objectionable odors (Impact AQ-5), will remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the Board finds the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program's residual impacts related to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions are acceptable due to the overriding considerations discussed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Finding 1.1.8 below.

Noise

Impacts: The EIR identified significant project-specific and cumulative impacts to sensitive receptors from long-term increases in noise from traffic on vicinity roadways (Impact NOI-2).

Mitigation: As discussed above in the summary of air quality impacts, MM AQ-3 would require cannabis Permittees to implement feasible TDM measures that reduce vehicle travel to and from their proposed sites, subject to the review and approval of the County. No other feasible mitigation measures are known that will further reduce impacts. Under a reasonable buildout scenario for cannabis-related development, impacts to sensitive receptors from long-term noise increases from Project traffic will not be fully mitigated and will remain significant and unavoidable.

Cumulative impacts to sensitive receptors from traffic-generated noise are mitigated to the maximum extent feasible with measure MM AQ-3. The Project has the potential to contribute to cumulative noise impacts from roadway noise effects on ambient noise levels in the County. Combined with other development, increased vehicle trips could increase congestion and daily travel on roadways in rural areas that experience relatively minimal traffic noise. As the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable, even with implementation of MM AQ-3 to require reduced employee trips through TDM measures, cumulative impacts from the Project would be significant and unavoidable.

Findings: The Board finds that the feasible mitigation measure (MM AQ-3) has been incorporated into the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program to reduce the significant environmental effects identified in the EIR, to the maximum extent feasible. This mitigation measure will be implemented during the review of entitlement applications for cannabis activities, in order to mitigate project-specific and cumulative impacts to sensitive receptors from traffic generated noise, to the maximum extent feasible. However, even with this mitigation measure, noise impacts related to long-term noise increases (Impact NOI-2) will remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the Board finds the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program's residual noise impacts are acceptable due to the overriding considerations discussed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Finding 1.1.8 below.

Transportation and Traffic

Impacts: The EIR identified significant project-specific and cumulative impacts related to transportation and traffic from future cannabis activities that would be permitted if the Project is approved. The following adverse and unavoidable effects were identified: increases of traffic and daily vehicle miles of travel that affect the performance of the existing and planned circulation system (Impact TRA-1), and adverse changes to the traffic safety environment (Impact TRA-2).

Mitigation: The EIR identifies two mitigation measures, MM AQ-3 and MM TRA-1, to reduce impacts associated with traffic.

As discussed above in the summary of air quality impacts, MM AQ-3 would require cannabis Permittees to implement feasible TDM measures that reduce vehicle travel to and from their proposed sites, subject to the review and approval of the County. No other feasible mitigation measures are known that will further reduce these traffic impacts. Under a reasonable buildout scenario for cannabis-related development, impacts from traffic will not be fully mitigated and will remain significant and unavoidable.

MM TRA-1 requires that cannabis Permittees pay into the County's existing Development Impact Mitigation Fee Program, at an appropriate level (e.g., Retail Commercial and Other Nonresidential Development) in effect at the time of permit issuance for the County and Goleta and Orcutt Planning Areas to improve performance of the circulation system. No other feasible mitigation measures are known that will further reduce these traffic impacts. Under a

reasonable buildout scenario for cannabis related development, impacts from traffic will not be fully mitigated and will remain significant and unavoidable.

Cumulative impacts related to traffic would be mitigated to the maximum extent feasible with measures MM AQ-3 and MM TRA-1. The Project's contribution to cumulative changes in the transportation environment as a result of generation of new vehicle trips could still result in exceedances of acceptable road segment or intersection Level of Service, as well as inconsistency with the Regional Transportation Plan-Sustainable Communities Strategy. Therefore, the proposed Project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative traffic impact, and impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.

Findings: The Board finds that feasible mitigation measures (MM AQ-3 and MM TRA-1) have been incorporated into the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program to reduce the significant environmental effects identified in the EIR, to the maximum extent feasible. These mitigation measures will be implemented during the review of entitlement applications for cannabis activities in order to mitigate project-specific and cumulative impacts related to traffic, to the maximum extent feasible. However, even with these mitigation measures, increases of traffic and daily vehicle miles of travel that affect the performance of the existing and planned circulation system (Impact TRA-1) and adverse changes to the traffic safety environment (Impact TRA-2) would remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the Board finds the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program's residual impacts related to traffic are acceptable due to the overriding considerations discussed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Finding 1.1.8 below.

Aesthetics/Visual Resources

Impacts: Although the EIR identifies that project-specific impacts to County scenic resources would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, it also found that Project-related future development in combination with other County projects and plans would contribute considerably to aesthetic and visual impacts. Thus, potential cumulative impacts resulting from changes to scenic resources and existing character would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation: Mitigation Measure MM AV-1 would reduce direct visual impacts associated with hoop structures and ancillary development for cannabis cultivation, such as fencing, by requiring appropriate screening in compliance with the land use entitlement (e.g., LUP, CDP, or CUP) that would be required for the cannabis operation. To the maximum extent feasible, screening for cannabis cultivation sites shall consist of natural barriers and deterrents to enable wildlife passage, prevent trespass from humans, and shall be visually consistent, to the maximum extent possible, with surrounding lands. Screening requirements would be set forth in the conditions of, and on the plans related to, the entitlement for the cannabis operation. While project-specific impacts to aesthetics/visual resources will be less-than-significant (Class II) with implementation of this mitigation measure, cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable (Class I).

Findings: The Board finds that the feasible mitigation measure (MM AV-1) has been incorporated into the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program to reduce the significant environmental effects identified in the EIR, to the maximum extent feasible. This mitigation measure will be implemented during the review of entitlement applications for cannabis operations in order to mitigate project-specific impacts to a less-than-significant level. However, even with this mitigation measure, the Project's contribution to significant cumulative visual impacts would remain cumulatively considerable, and would be significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the Board finds the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program's residual cumulative impacts to aesthetic and visual resources are acceptable due to the overriding considerations discussed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Finding 1.1.8 below.

1.1.6 FINDINGS THAT CERTAIN IMPACTS ARE MITIGATED TO INSIGNIFICANCE BY MITIGATION MEASURES

The EIR (17EIR-00000-00003), its appendices, and EIR Revision Letter (RV 01), for the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program, identify several subject areas for which the project is considered to cause or contribute to significant, but mitigable environmental impacts (Class II). For each of these Class II impacts identified by the EIR, feasible changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect, as discussed below.

Aesthetics/Visual Resources

As discussed in Section 1.1.4 of these findings (above), the EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable project-specific impacts to County scenic resources from development associated with cannabis cultivation (Impact AV-1). The Board finds that implementation of MM AV-1 would reduce the significant project-specific environmental effects related to aesthetic and visual resources (Impact AV-1) to a less-than-significant level (Class II).

Agricultural Resources

Impacts: The EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable project-specific impacts as a result of potential land use incompatibility from manufacturing and distribution uses on agriculturally zoned lands (Impact AG-1).

Mitigation: MM AG-1 would require cannabis Permittees for manufacturing or distribution on lands designated for agricultural use (e.g., AG-I and AG-II), to cultivate cannabis on-site and have approval for a cultivation license. The requirement would specify that non-cultivation activities must be clearly ancillary and subordinate to the cultivation activities on-site so that the majority of cannabis product manufactured and/or distributed from a cannabis site is sourced from cannabis plant material cultivated on the same site. The requirement would also specify that the accessory use must occupy a smaller footprint than the area dedicated to cannabis cultivation. Further, the requirement would apply to microbusiness licenses (Type

12) to ensure that proposed manufacturing or distribution would be ancillary and subordinate to the proposed cultivation area.

Findings: The Board finds that MM AG-1 has been incorporated into the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program. The Board finds that implementation of MM AG-1 will reduce the significant project-specific environmental effects related to incompatibility with existing zoning for agricultural uses (Impact AG-1) to a less-than-significant level (Class II).

Biological Resources

Impacts: The EIR identified the following potentially significant but mitigable project-specific impacts from future cannabis activities: adverse effects on unique, rare, threatened, or endangered plant or wildlife species (Impact BIO-1); adverse effects on habitats or sensitive natural communities (Impact BIO-2); adverse effects on the movement or patterns of any native resident or migratory species (Impact BIO-3); and conflicts with adopted local plans, policies, or ordinances oriented towards the protection and conservation of biological resources (Impact BIO-4).

Mitigation: The EIR identifies several mitigation measures that would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.

MM BIO-1a would require applicants who apply for a cannabis permit for a site that would involve pruning, damage, or removal of a native tree or shrub, to submit a Tree Protection Plan (TPP) prepared by a County-approved arborist/biologist. The TPP would set forth specific avoidance, minimization, or compensatory measures, as necessary, given site-specific conditions and the specific cannabis operation for which the applicant would be requesting a permit.

MM BIO-1b would require applicants who apply for a cannabis permit for a site that would involve clearing of sensitive native vegetation, to submit a Habitat Protection Plan (HPP) prepared by a County-approved biologist. The HPP would set forth specific avoidance, minimization, or compensatory measures, as necessary, given site-specific conditions and the specific cannabis operation for which the applicant would be requesting a permit.

MM BIO-3, Wildlife Movement Plan, would be required for outdoor cultivation sites that would include fencing. The Wildlife Movement Plan would analyze proposed fencing in relation to the surrounding opportunities for migration, identify the type, material, length, and design of proposed fencing, and identify non-disruptive, wildlife-friendly fencing, such as post and rail fencing, wire fencing, and/or high-tensile electric fencing, to be used to allow passage by smaller animals and prevent movement in and out of cultivation sites by larger mammals, such as deer. Any required fencing would also have to be consistent with the screening requirements outlined in MM AV-1, which is discussed in these findings (above).

MM HWR-1 would require applicants for cultivation permits to provide evidence of compliance with the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) requirements (or

certification by the appropriate Water Board stating a permit is not necessary). The SWRCB has drafted a comprehensive Cannabis Cultivation Policy which includes principles and guidelines for cannabis cultivation within the state. The general requirements and prohibitions included in the draft policy address a wide range of issues, from compliance with state and local permits to riparian setbacks. The draft general order also includes regulations on the use of pesticides, rodenticides, herbicides, insecticides, fungicides, disinfectants, and fertilizers.

Findings: The Board finds that MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-1b, MM BIO-3, and MM HWR-1 have been incorporated into the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program. The Board finds that implementation of MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-1b, MM BIO-3, and MM HWR-1 would reduce the significant project-specific environmental effects related to biological resources (Impacts BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, and BIO-4) to a less-than-significant level (Class II).

In addition, the Board finds that implementation of MM BIO-1a, MM BIO-1b, MM BIO-3, and MM HWR-1 would reduce the Project's contribution to significant, cumulative impacts to biological resources, such that the Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution and, therefore, the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts to biological resources would be less-than-significant with mitigation (Class II).

Cultural Resources

Impacts: The EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable impacts to historical resources (Impact CR-1) as well as to archaeological resources, tribal cultural resources, human remains, or paleontological resources (Impact CR-2) from future cannabis activities.

Mitigation: The EIR identifies two mitigation measures that would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.

MM CR-1 would require cannabis licensees to preserve, restore, and renovate onsite structures consistent with the requirements of CEQA and the County Cultural Resources Guidelines. This mitigation measure requires an applicant for a cannabis permit to retain a qualified historian to perform a Phase I survey, and if necessary, a Phase II significance assessment and identify appropriate preservation and restoration/renovation activities for significant onsite structures in compliance with the provisions of the most current County Cultural Resources Guidelines.

MM CR-2 would require a Phase I archaeological and paleontological survey in compliance with the provisions of the County Cultural Resources Guidelines for areas of proposed ground disturbance. If the cannabis development has the potential to adversely affect significant resources, the applicant would be required to retain a Planning and Development Department-approved archaeologist to prepare and complete a Phase II subsurface testing program in coordination with the Planning and Development Department. If the Phase II program finds that significant impacts may still occur, the applicant would be required to retain a Planning and Development Department-approved archaeologist to prepare and complete a Phase III

proposal for data recovery excavation. All work would be required to be consistent with County Cultural Resources Guidelines. The applicant would be required to fund all work.

Findings: The Board finds that the feasible MM CR-1 and MM CR-2 have been incorporated into the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program. The Board finds that implementation of MM CR-1 and MM CR-2 would reduce the significant project-specific effects related to cultural resources (Impacts CR-1 and CR-2) to a less-than-significant level (Class II).

Hydrology and Water Resources

Impacts: The EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable impacts to surface water quality (Impact HWR-1) as well as groundwater quality (Impact HWR-2) from future cannabis activities.

Mitigation: MM HWR-1 would require applicants for cultivation licenses to provide evidence of compliance with the SWRCB requirements (or certification by the Regional Water Quality Control Board stating that a permit is not necessary). The SWRCB has drafted a comprehensive Cannabis Cultivation Policy which includes principles and guidelines for cannabis cultivation within the state. The general requirements and prohibitions included in the draft policy address a wide range of issues, from compliance with state and local permits to riparian setbacks. The draft general order also includes regulations on the use of pesticides, rodenticides, herbicides, insecticides, fungicides, disinfectants, and fertilizers.

Findings: The Board finds that the feasible MM HWR-1 has been incorporated into the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program. The Board finds that implementation of MM HWR-1 would reduce the significant project-specific effects related to surface water quality (Impact HWR-1) and groundwater quality (Impact HWR-2) to a less-than-significant level (Class II).

Land Use

Impacts: The EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable impacts related to conflicts with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation, specifically with regard to conflicts with public land uses (Impact LU-1).

Mitigation: MM LU-1 would establish a regulation prohibiting cannabis activities on publicly owned lands within the County.

Findings: The Board finds that the feasible MM LU-1 has been incorporated into the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program. The Board finds that implementation of MM LU-1 would reduce the significant project-specific effects related to conflicts with uses on public lands (Impact LU-1) to a less-than-significant level (Class II).

Utilities and Energy Conservation

Impacts: The EIR identified potentially significant but mitigable impacts related to increased demand for new energy resources (Impact UE-2) from future cannabis activities.

Mitigation: The EIR identifies several mitigation measures that would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.

MM UE-2a would require cannabis licensees to implement energy conservation best management practices to the maximum extent feasible. This would include the use of renewable energy sources and energy efficient development and operations.

MM UE-2b would require that cannabis licensees participate in a Regional Renewable Choice (RRC) program, Green Rate program, Community Renewable program, or similar equivalent renewable energy program, if feasible.

MM UE-2c would encourage cannabis Permittees to participate in the Smart Build Santa Barbara (SB2) Program as part of the permit review process. This measure would ensure that Permittees receive direction on feasible energy conservation measures, incentives, or other energy-saving techniques.

Findings: The Board finds that the MM UE-2a, MM UE-2b, and MM UE-2c have been incorporated into the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program. The Board finds that implementation of MM UE-2a, MM UE-2b, and MM UE-2c would reduce the significant project-specific effects related to increased demand for new energy resources (Impact UE-2) to a less-than-significant level (Class II).

1.1.7 FINDINGS THAT IDENTIFIED PROJECT ALTERNATIVES ARE NOT FEASIBLE

The EIR (17EIR-00000-00003) evaluated a no project alternative and three additional alternatives (Alternative 1 - Exclusion of Cannabis Activities from the AG-I Zone District, Alternative 2 - Preclusion of Cannabis Activities from Williamson Act Land, and Alternative 3 - Reduced Registrants) as methods of reducing or eliminating significant environmental impacts. The Board letter, dated February 6, 2018, and its attachments are incorporated by reference. The Board finds that the identified alternatives are infeasible for the reasons stated.

1. No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative addresses the potential environmental impacts that could result if the proposed Project is not adopted and the mitigation measures of the Project are not implemented. Under the No Project Alternative, the direct impacts associated with licensing of an expanded cannabis industry would not occur. However, this alternative would not address unregulated and illegal cannabis activities, and would not offer an avenue for licensing and permitting. Thus, it is likely that illegal cannabis activities would continue to

exist. Under the No Project Alternative, existing County law enforcement would continue on a primarily response-to-complaints and call-for-service basis. Over the more than three decades of local, state and federal law enforcement activities cannabis cultivation and related activities have not been eradicated. Even with local, state, and federal participation in cannabis law enforcement, as well as pending state-level regulations and programs developed from MAUCRSA, the illicit cultivation and sale of cannabis in California and the County would likely continue to be a major illicit business. Therefore, there would be no orderly development, nor oversight of cannabis activities within the County, with potential for expanded illegal activities.

Under the No Project Alternative, aesthetic/visual and agricultural resource impacts would likely be reduced. However, potential impacts related to air quality, biology, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards, hydrology, land use, public services, transportation, and utilities/energy would be more severe under the No Project Alternative.

The No Project Alternative fails to achieve the objectives of the project. Therefore, the Board finds that the project (as modified by incorporation of EIR mitigation measures, and additional development standards shown in RV 01) is preferable to the No Project Alternative.

2. Alternative 1: Exclusion of Cannabis Activities from the AG-I Zone District

Under Alternative 1 - the Exclusion of Cannabis Activities from the AG-I Zone District, cannabis-related activities would not be allowed within the AG-I zone districts throughout the County. This would reduce the areas of eligibility in the County, particularly within the Carpinteria Valley and the Santa Ynez Valley. Alternative 1 would reduce the total amount of eligible area and sites as compared to the proposed Project, and would require substantial relocation or abandonment of existing cannabis operations. Existing cultivators would need to find locations within the reduced area of eligibility.

The classification of all impacts under Alternative 1 would be similar to those under the proposed Project, including significant and unavoidable impacts to agricultural resources; air quality and greenhouse gas emissions; noise; and transportation and traffic. Adoption of Alternative 1 would achieve most of the Project objectives, which include regulating cannabis activities within the County including: providing an efficient and clear cultivation and manufacturing permit process and regulations; and regulating sites and premises to avoid degradation of the visual setting and neighborhood character, odors, hazardous materials, and fire hazards. However, adoption of Alternative 1 would not achieve Project objectives related to development of a robust and economically viable legal cannabis industry (Objective 1), encouraging businesses to operate legally and secure a license to operate in full compliance with County and state regulations (Objective 4), and minimization of adverse effects of cultivation and manufacturing and distribution activities on the natural environment (Objective 6).

Although this alternative would be consistent with some of the objectives of the Proposed Project, it would not adequately meet Objectives 1, 4, and 6. As such, it has been found infeasible for social, economic and other reasons. The Board finds that the project (as modified by incorporation of EIR mitigation measures, and additional development standards shown in RV 01) is preferable to Alternative 1.

3. Alternative 2: Preclusion of Cannabis Activities from Williamson Act Land

Alternative 2 considers environmental impacts under a modified set of licensing regulations that would reduce the area of eligibility on lands that are subject to a Williamson Act contract in the County where licenses may be issued for cannabis cultivation activities. Under Alternative 2, cannabis activities would not count towards the minimum cultivation requirements to qualify for an agricultural preserve contract pursuant to the Williamson Act; however, cannabis activities would be considered compatible uses on lands that are subject to agricultural preserve contracts. Cannabis cultivation activities would be limited to a maximum of 22,000 square feet of cannabis canopy cover for each Williamson Act contract premises. Agricultural use data for commercial production and reporting that would be used to determine compliance with minimum productive acreage and annual production value requirements would not include cannabis activities.

This alternative would result in limiting the potential for cannabis activities on over 50 percent of eligible County area, and would eliminate hundreds of potential cannabis operations from occurring on Williamson Act lands. As compared to the proposed Project, the approximate total area of eligibility for manufacturing and distribution would be reduced while retail sales and testing area would remain about the same.

Adoption of Alternative 2 would achieve some of the Project objectives which include regulating commercial cannabis cultivation, manufacturing, and distribution activities within the County, providing an efficient and clear cultivation and manufacturing permit process and regulations, and regulating sites and premises to avoid degradation of the visual setting and neighborhood character, odors, hazardous materials, and fire hazards. However, Alternative 2 would not reduce any significant impacts to a less-than-significant level. Moreover, adoption of this alternative would not achieve some of the basic Project objectives, including those related to development of a robust and economically viable legal cannabis industry (Objective 1), encouraging businesses to operate legally and secure a license to operate in full compliance with County and state regulations (Objective 4), and minimization of adverse effects of cultivation and manufacturing and distribution activities on the natural environment (Objective 6).

Although this alternative would be consistent with some of the objectives of the Proposed Project, it would not adequately meet Objectives 1, 4, and 6. As such, it has been found infeasible for social, economic, and other reasons. The Board finds that the project (as modified by incorporation of EIR mitigation measures, and additional development standards shown in RV 01) is preferable to Alternative 2.

4. Alternative 3: Reduced Registrants

Under the Reduced Registrants Alternative, the total number of licenses issued by the County would consist of half of the number of each category of licenses that were indicated as part of the 2017 Cannabis Registry. This would restrict the County to issuing a total of 962 licenses (50 percent of the 1,924 identified), which would subsequently limit the representative buildout of the Project analyzed in the EIR by a commensurate 50 percent. Existing operators identified in the 2017 Cannabis Registry would be prioritized for licensing under this alternative, which would substantially reduce the net new buildout, while allowing for limited growth.

Alternative 3 would result in substantial reductions in the severity of most impacts compared to the Project, and would reduce significant and unavoidable impacts to agricultural resources to a less-than-significant level. However, it would not achieve the most basic Project objectives, including those related to development of a robust, economically viable, and legal cannabis industry (Objective 1), and encouraging businesses to operate legally and secure a license to operate in full compliance with County and state regulations (Objective 4).

Although this alternative would be consistent with some of the objectives of the Proposed Project, it would not adequately meet Objectives 1 and 4. As such, it has been found infeasible for social, economic and other reasons. The Board finds that the project (as modified by incorporation of EIR mitigation measures, and additional development standards shown in RV 01) is preferable to Alternative 3.

1.1.8 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The Board makes the following Statement of Overriding Considerations: The Cannabis Land Use and Licensing Program EIR (17EIR-00000-00003) found that impacts related to agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions, noise, transportation and traffic, and aesthetic and visual resources (cumulative) will remain significant and unavoidable (Class I). The Board has balanced “the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits” of the project (as modified by incorporation of EIR mitigation measures, and additional development standards shown in RV 01) against these effects and makes the following Statement of Overriding Considerations, which warrants approval of the project (as modified by incorporation of EIR mitigation measures, and additional development standards shown in RV 01) notwithstanding that all identified adverse environmental effects are not fully avoided or substantially lessened [CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a)]. The Board finds that the benefits of the “proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects,” and therefore, “the adverse environmental effects may be considered ‘acceptable’” [CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a)].

Each of the reasons for approval cited below is a separate and independent basis that justifies approval of the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing Program. Thus, even if a court

were to set aside any particular reason or reasons, the Board finds that it would stand by its determination that each reason, or any combinations of reasons, is a sufficient basis for approving the project (as modified by incorporation of EIR mitigation measures, and additional development standards shown in RV 01) notwithstanding the significant and unavoidable impacts that may occur. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the other Findings for Approval set forth in this document, the EIR, and in the Record of Proceedings, including, but not limited to, public comment received at the numerous public hearings listed in the incorporated Board letter dated February 6, 2018.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(b) and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15043, 15092, and 15093, any unavoidable adverse environmental effects of the project (as modified by incorporation of EIR mitigation measures, and additional development standards shown in RV 01) are acceptable due to the following environmental benefits and overriding considerations:

- A. The project (as modified by incorporation of EIR mitigation measures, and additional development standards shown in RV 01) provides for 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, improves the County's tax base. For a detailed discussion of the economic viability, see the Fiscal Analysis of the Commercial Cannabis Industry in Santa Barbara County, prepared by Hdl Companies and dated October 31, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference:
<https://santabarbara.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5685428&GUID=E6A9F289-B740-40DC-A302-B4056B72F788>
- B. The project (as modified by incorporation of EIR mitigation measures, and additional development standards shown in RV 01) enhances the local economy and provides opportunities for future jobs, business development, and increased living wages. Moreover, the project (as modified by incorporation of EIR mitigation measures, and additional development standards shown in RV 01) promotes continued agricultural production as an integral part of the region's economy by giving existing farmers access to the potentially profitable cannabis industry, which in turn would provide relief for those impacted by competition from foreign markets and rising costs of water supply.
- C. The project (as modified by incorporation of EIR mitigation measures, and additional development standards shown in RV 01) expands the production and availability of medical cannabis, which is known to help patients address symptoms related to glaucoma, epilepsy, arthritis, and anxiety disorders, among other illnesses.
- D. The project (as modified by incorporation of EIR mitigation measures, and additional development standards shown in RV 01) allows for the orderly development and oversight of commercial cannabis activities by applying development standards that

- require appropriate siting, setbacks, security, and nuisance avoidance measures, thereby protecting public health, safety, and welfare.
- E. The project (as modified by incorporation of EIR mitigation measures, and additional development standards shown in RV 01) provides a method for commercial cannabis businesses to operate legally and secure a permit and license to operate in full compliance with County and state regulations, maximizing the proportion of licensed activities and minimizing unlicensed activities. Minimization of unlicensed activities will occur for two reasons. First, the County will be providing a legal pathway for members of the industry to comply with the law. Secondly, the County will use revenue from the project (as modified by incorporation of EIR mitigation measures, and additional development standards shown in RV 01) to strengthen and increase code enforcement actions in an effort to remove illegal and noncompliant operations occurring in the County unincorporated areas.
 - F. The project (as modified by incorporation of EIR mitigation measures, and additional development standards shown in RV 01) establishes land use requirements for commercial cannabis activities to minimize the risks associated with criminal activity, degradation of neighborhood character, groundwater basin overdraft, obnoxious odors, noise nuisances, hazardous materials, and fire hazards.
 - G. The project (as modified by incorporation of EIR mitigation measures, and additional development standards shown in RV 01) minimizes the potential for adverse impacts on children and sensitive populations by imposing appropriate setbacks and ensuring compatibility of commercial cannabis activities with surrounding existing land uses, including residential neighborhoods, agricultural operations, youth facilities, recreational amenities, and educational institutions. For detailed discussions on compatibility, see Section 3.9, *Land Use and Planning*, in the EIR, incorporated herein by reference, as well as the other Findings for Approval in this document.
 - H. The project (as modified by incorporation of EIR mitigation measures, and additional development standards shown in RV 01) provides opportunities for local testing labs that protect the public by ensuring that local cannabis supplies meet product safety standards established by the State of California.
 - I. The project (as modified by incorporation of EIR mitigation measures, and additional development standards shown in RV 01) protects agricultural resources, natural resources, cultural resources, and scenic resources by limiting where cannabis activities can be permitted and by enacting development standards that would further avoid or minimize potential impacts to the environment.

2.0 ADMINISTRATIVE FINDINGS FOR CANNABIS LAND USE ORDINANCES

In compliance with Section 35.104.060.A (Findings for Comprehensive Plan, Development Code and Zoning Map Amendments) of the Santa Barbara LUDC the Board shall make the

findings below in order to approve a text amendment to the County Land Use and Development Code (LUDC).

The findings to approve a text amendment to the County's certified Local Coastal Program are set forth in Section 35-180.6 (Findings Required for Approval of Rezone or Ordinance Amendment) of the Coastal Zoning Ordinance (CZO). In compliance with Chapter 2, Administration, Article V, Planning and Zoning, Section 2-25.2, Powers and Duties, the Board shall make the following findings in order to approve the text amendment to the CZO.

In compliance with Section 35.494.050 (Action on Amendment) of the Montecito Land Use and Development Code (MLUDC), the Board shall make the following findings in order to approve the text amendment to the MLUDC.

2.1 The request is in the interests of the general community welfare.

The proposed ordinance amendments are in the interest of the general community welfare since the amendments will serve to (1) define new land uses associated with cannabis activities (2) indicate those zones that allow the Cannabis land uses, and (3) set forth development standards for various permitted commercial cannabis activities to avoid compromising the general welfare of the community, as analyzed in the Board letter, dated February 6, 2018, which is hereby incorporated by reference.

2.2 The request is consistent with the County Comprehensive Plan, the requirements of state planning and zoning laws, and the LUDC, CZO, and MLUDC.

Adoption of the proposed ordinances, as analyzed in the Board letter, dated February 6, 2018, which is hereby incorporated by reference, will provide more effective implementation of the State planning and zoning laws by revising the LUDC, CZO, and MLUDC to provide clear zoning standards that will benefit the public, consistent with the state licensing program for the cannabis industry. The proposed ordinances: define the uses associated with commercial cannabis activities; identify the zones in which cannabis land uses would be prohibited; and set forth a number of development standards and other requirements that would apply to personal cultivation, in order to avoid or otherwise minimize adverse effects from cannabis activities. The proposed ordinances would be consistent with the adopted policies and development standards of the Comprehensive Plan, including the Community Plans. The proposed ordinance amendments are also consistent with the remaining portions of the LUDC, CZO, and MLUDC that these ordinance amendments would not be revising. Therefore, the proposed ordinance amendments would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan including the Community Plans, the requirements of State Planning and Zoning Laws, and the LUDC, CZO, and MLUDC.

2.3 The request is consistent with good zoning and planning practices.

The proposed ordinances, as analyzed in the Board letter, dated February 6, 2018, which are hereby incorporated by reference, clearly and specifically address personal cultivation and commercial cannabis activities within the unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County. The ordinances are consistent with sound zoning and planning practices to regulate land uses for

the overall protection of the environment and community values since it provides for clear direction regarding where cannabis land uses are allowed and prohibited, which serves to minimize potential adverse impacts to the surrounding area. As discussed in Finding 2.2, above, the amendments are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, including the Community Plans, LUDC, CZO and MLUDC. Therefore, the proposed ordinances are consistent with sound zoning and planning practices to regulate land uses.

3.0 ADMINISTRATIVE FINDINGS FOR AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE X (CASE NO. 18ORD-00000-00001)

In compliance with Section 35.104.060.A (Findings for Comprehensive Plan, Development Code and Zoning Map Amendments) of the Santa Barbara LUDC the Board shall make the findings below in order to approve the amendment and partial rescission of Article X, Medical Marijuana Regulations, of Chapter 35, Zoning, of the Santa Barbara County Code (Case no. 18ORD-00000-00001).

3.1 The request is in the interests of the general community welfare.

The proposed ordinance to amend and partially rescind Article X is in the interest of the general community welfare since it will:

- Maintain the amortization of Legal Nonconforming medical marijuana operations as established by the Board in November of 2017.
- Clarify the timing of the amortization periods for Legal Nonconforming medical marijuana operations, thereby providing certainty to the operators and the public alike regarding the status of the operations.
- Rescind the existing prohibition against medical marijuana cultivation upon the operative dates of the Cannabis Land Use Ordinances (Case Nos. 17ORD-00000-00004, -00009, -00010), thereby ensuring that the new regulations are not in conflict with existing regulations.
- Rescind the entirety of Article X upon the termination of Legal Nonconforming uses, thereby removing obsolete regulations.

3.2 The request is consistent with the County Comprehensive Plan, the requirements of state planning and zoning laws, and the LUDC and CZO.

Adoption of the proposed ordinance, as analyzed in the Board letter, dated February 6, 2018, which is hereby incorporated by reference, will ensure that the provisions in Article X are consistent with the new regulations in the LUDC, CZO, and MLUDC should the Board adopt the Cannabis Land Use Ordinances (Case Nos. 17ORD-00000-00004, -00009, -00010). The amended Article X would be consistent with the adopted policies and development standards of the Comprehensive Plan, including the Community Plans. Together with the Cannabis Land Use Ordinances, the amended Article X will allow for more effective implementation of the State planning and zoning laws by ensuring consistency with the new State licensing program for the cannabis industry. Therefore, the proposed ordinance amendments would be

consistent with the Comprehensive Plan including the Community Plans, the requirements of State Planning and Zoning Laws, and the LUDC, CZO and MLUDC.

3.3 The request is consistent with good zoning and planning practices.

The proposed amendments to Article X are consistent with sound zoning and planning practices since they will ensure that there is no conflict between the new cannabis regulations and the existing medical marijuana regulations. Moreover, the amendments provide a clear timeframe for the termination of Legal Nonconforming uses for medical marijuana cultivation. Finally, the amendments provide for Article X to be rescinded entirely once Legal Nonconforming medical marijuana operations are terminated and the separate medical marijuana regulations are no longer necessary. Thus, the proposed amendments are consistent with sound zoning and planning practices to regulate land uses.

4.0 AMENDMENT TO THE UNIFORM RULES FINDINGS (Case No. 17ORD-00000-00019)

4.1 The request is in the interests of the general community welfare.

The proposed amendment to the Uniform Rules would limit the amount and types of cannabis activities that would be permitted on Williamson Act lands. This is in the interests of the general community welfare because the preservation of a maximum amount of the limited supply of agricultural land is necessary to the conservation of the state's economic resources, and also for the assurance of adequate, healthful, and nutritious food for residents of the state and the nation. The amendment would also specify that cannabis activities are not compatible with Williamson Act contracts for open space or Williamson Act contracts for recreation, thereby ensuring the continued protection of scenic, biological and recreational resources in those preserves.

4.2 The request is consistent with the County Comprehensive Plan, the requirements of state planning and zoning laws, and the LUDC and CZO.

The amendment of the Uniform Rules, as analyzed in the Board letter, dated February 6, 2018, which is hereby incorporated by reference, would be consistent with the adopted policies and development standards of the Comprehensive Plan, including the Land Use and Agricultural Elements. The Agricultural Element contains goals and policies which require the protection of agriculture lands, the reservation of prime soils for agricultural uses, and the preservation of a rural economy. The amendment would limit the types and amounts of cannabis activities that would be permitted on Williamson Act lands. It would also specify that some cannabis activities, including cultivation, are compatible with the agricultural uses on Williamson Act lands, thereby ensuring consistency with the Cannabis Land Use Ordinances (Case Nos. 17ORD-00000-00004, -00010).

4.3 The request is consistent with good zoning and planning practices.

The Agricultural Preserve Advisory Committee (APAC) held three hearings on the matter of cannabis activities to be permitted on Williamson Act lands. At the hearings, public input was received and information such as current zoning and planning practices, assessor policies and procedures, potential environmental impacts, and approaches taken by other counties was discussed. The purpose of agricultural preserve program and uniform rules was also discussed

as a factor in making a recommendation to the Board. APAC recommended the proposed amendments to the Uniform Rules on December 1, 2017, with particular consideration given to applying good zoning/planning practices while preserving agricultural and open space land in the County. As also stated under 4.2 above, the proposed Uniform Rules amendment is consistent with all applicable policies of the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use and Development Code.