



#1

**Alexander, Jacquelyne**

---

**From:** Lillian Clary <mzlil2988@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 26, 2018 11:09 AM  
**To:** sbcob; Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Adam, Peter; Wolf, Janet  
**Cc:** Metzger, Jessica; Klemann, Daniel; Fogg, Mindy  
**Subject:** Public Comment for BOS 2/27/18 Agenda # 18-00149  
**Attachments:** 2 27 18 BOS comment letter.docx

Please accept the attached document for Public Comment for the February 27, 2018 meeting of the Board of Supervisors.

Thank you...and let's hope that the incoming rain leaves our hillsides alone.

Lil Clary

Public Comment for Agenda Item 18-00149 Cannabis  
February 27, 2018

From Lil Clary on behalf of the Tepusquet Canyon Crisis Committee

The LUDC text adopted on February 6 and under consideration on February 27 provides for a CUP for Ag I parcels accessed through an EDRN but only requires a CUP for Ag II parcels that are adjacent to the EDRN.

For those unfamiliar with the topography of the Tepusquet Canyon EDRN, it should be noted that there are Ag II parcels accessed through the EDRN that are not adjacent to the EDRN boundaries.

Canyon residents are requesting that the Board make a minor change to the language to ensure that there is no ambiguity about parcels reached through an EDRN.

Here is a prime example: one major cannabis cultivation operation on property zoned Ag II (a grow site purchased in October, 2016 and established since the county-wide moratorium was adopted) is not adjacent to the EDRN boundary. It is, in fact, a private inholding inside the national forest.

This property is only accessible by driving most of the length of Tepusquet Road.

I suspect that there are other parcels with this same zoning and access but have not had time to identify them on the county's maps.

As you know, the Tepusquet Canyon Crisis Committee has stated the following concerns throughout the last year:

1. traffic impacts including deliveries of plants and supplies, constant trips of fuel and water tankers, employee commuter trips
2. night lighting of grow sites with hoop houses
3. distance from county public safety services (law enforcement, and even more important, SB County fire)
4. roadway only 1.5 lane wide with steep grades and hairpin turns

If the supervisors would add language to link footnote #3 on page 37 to the Ag II zoning column on page #36 the issue would be resolved.

Footnote #3 text: "Commercial cannabis cultivation on lots located in an Existing Developed Rural Neighborhood (EDRN), or commercial cannabis cultivation that requires the use of a roadway located within an EDRN as the sole means of access to the lot on which cultivation will occur, require a CUP."