

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Sally Isaacson <sixwildponies@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2022 4:02 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public Comment for Board of Supervisors meeting on 5/24/22
Attachments: Letter to BOS May 2022.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.

To whom it may concern,

Please submit this attached letter as a public comment for the Board of Supervisors' Meeting on 5/24/22

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter.

Many thanks,

Sally Isaacson
(805) 260-2252

Public Comment Letter for May 24th Hearing

Re: Case No. 22ORD-00000-00001

Dear Santa Barbara County Supervisors,

Thank you for bringing the proposed changes to the Cannabis Ordinance to this hearing.

As a long-term member of the north county agricultural community, I fully support the move from a LUP requirement to a CUP requirement for all cannabis projects. The idea that this will allow the Board more scrutiny over new cannabis projects will be a very good thing.

I have never fully understood why the county government feels that their hands are tied by the LUP process, however we are assured that the CUP process will give the Board more leeway in considering the effects of each project upon the surrounding area.

I, like many others, voted to legalize cannabis in California, however, I now regret this vote, due to the harmful effects that that the huge explosion of this crop in our county has already had on our local environment.

I urge you to approve the changes recommended in the proposal sent to you by the Planning Commission. I hope, however, that **you will not exempt the seven projects under appeal** from the new requirements. If you feel that these applicants need some concessions due to a rule change, you could simply exempt them from the increased fees for conversion of their applications to CUP status.

Being all too familiar with the potential negative effects of more than one of the seven projects under appeal, I believe that a CUP requirement could well help the Board to save our environment from further severe degradation.

Appeals are brought against projects for well-founded reasons, and more than one of the seven appeals focus on the **availability of water for wildlife and for long term residents**.

As we all know, in eight of the last ten years, Santa Barbara County received below average rainfall, and global warming will not help us over the long term. To allow projects to go forward when they greatly increase water use in our semi-arid area will have severe and irreversible repercussions.

I do understand that applicants spend lots of money to create plans, and to attempt to satisfy requirements of various local, state, and federal agencies. **Applicants do this of their own choice** even though they are not assured of success. Government agencies create the regulations, and, therefore, these agencies should be able to implement their own rules.

Appellants also spend a great deal of their own money and time and suffer a great deal of stress in an effort to prevent damaging effects to local ecosystems, to human inhabitants, and to our beautiful landscape - usually without success.

Appeals are filed in good faith for the greater good of our community and for the good of future generations.

In at least one of the seven cases, a LUP was approved by staff even though incorrect and incomplete information was provided by applicants about factors including water availability and potential effects on endangered and threatened species.

Recently, one case of note (among the seven) was hastily withdrawn from the Planning Commission agenda due to new information provided by appellants about historical water use. At that point, staff felt that they could no longer recommend approval of this project without further study.

Will the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors allow such projects to go forward just because it will inconvenience applicants if they do not approve them?

Do not let the timing of the ordinance change prevent you from protecting our environment.

Please think about the long term effects of each individual project - including these seven - and consider the implications of each for our precious ecosystems and for future generations.

Respectfully,

Sally Isaacson