

7



Katherine Douglas

Public Comment - SBCRC

From: Lionel Neff <zuma13@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 1, 2025 5:02 PM
To: sbcob; Laura Capps; Roy Lee; Joan Hartmann; Bob Nelson; Steve Lavagnino
Cc: Wade Cowper
Subject: COALITION'S ACREAGE CAP POSITION
Attachments: Coalition June 4th Hearing.docx

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

Distinguished Members of the Santa Barbara Board of Supervisors,

Please open the attached document as a reference to the SBCRC's position regarding the Cannabis acreage CAP in the 1st District, the Carpinteria Valley.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Lionel Neff, Board Member
SBCRC*

Coalition's Position Regarding the June 3rd Hearing Pertaining to
District 1's Cannabis Acreage Cultivation Caps
By Lionel Neff, Coalition Board Member

Distinguished Members of the Santa Barbara Board of Supervisors, the SBCRC (herein after referred to as the Coalition) takes the position in opposition to fulfilling the original 186-acre cannabis cultivation CAP. Instead, a more reasonable reduction of cannabis cultivation to **138 acres** would serve the City of Carpinteria and its residents, and the County of Santa Barbara for the following reasons:

- 1) **There exists a glut of cannabis** in the marketplace which in turn is serving to depress the price the existing licensed growers can realize. The County in its infinite wisdom championed the opinion the more permits and acreage allocated to cannabis cultivation, the more taxes to be realized by the County. At this pivotal juncture in the cannabis chronicles, this mindset has proven to be imprudent to both the County and the existing Growers. Looking to the future a better path forward would be in support of a "LESS IS BETTER" approach.
- 2) **The present 186-acre cap** was and is oppressive in such a confined area that constitutes the Carpinteria Valley. All the presently existing issues of cannabis cultivation odor and traffic need not be aggravated with the addition of additional cannabis grows nor its processing.
- 3) **The Cannabis Cultivation experiment** in the Carpinteria Valley is an example of a failed County policy. It's tantamount to installing a sewage treatment facility next to residences. To date, the odor problem has not been brought under control voluntarily by the various cannabis growers even though an effective odor abatement technology has been available from Envinity of Holland for the past four years. Nor has the County come close to realizing the tax revenues projected when this experiment was fomented. Why more of the same?
- 4) **Cannabis Processing and its attendant enhanced odor levels** should be included in the 136-acre cap. It was originally, then removed from the cap a few years ago. I wonder why?
- 5) **PROCESSING**: It is the Coalition's most urgent position that processing not be permitted unless and until the underlying odor abatement issues have been addressed. As previously mentioned herewith, the Carbon Scrubbers to date, which are mandated by the County for installation, have yet to be ordered let alone installed. Once that takes place to the satisfaction of the County and the Coalition, any discussions regarding processing should be placed on HOLD.