de la Guerra, Sheila

Public Safety: Fire

From: Renee ONeill <chasingstar2701@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, June 8, 2020 4:52 PM

To: sbcob; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; Williams, Das

Cc: Villalobos, David

Subject: Public Comment for BOS Budget

Attachments: Bos - re Budget Hearings 6-9-20, 6-11-20.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.

Dear Clerk and Sups,

I am rushing to get this in before 5:00pm. Right now, we are watching a fire on Hwy 166, near Rock Front Ranch. Winds are high and dangerous... gotta go.

June 9, 2020

To: Santa Barbara County Supervisors Cc: Santa Barbara Planning Commissioners

From: Renée O'Neill

Chair Hart and Supervisors,

This letter and attached letters include Budget concerns that Tepusquet Fire Associates and/or Crisis Committee have brought to your attention, since 2012. Let me begin by expressing this:

There are many great philosophers and inspirational leaders that I have held/hold in high esteem, two of which are listed here:

Martin Luther King, Jr. - "There comes a time when one must take a position that is neither safe nor politic nor popular, but he must take it because his conscience tells him it is right."

"He who passively accepts evil (immorality/corruption), is as much involved in it as he who helps to perpetrate it. He who accepts evil (malevolence and injustice), without protesting against it is really cooperating with it." (Protestors around the world are expressing and reacting to this viewpoint - especially apropos, - today).

Albert Einstein- "Great spirits have always encountered violent opposition from mediocre minds." (History illustrates this, repeatedly).

"The world as we have created it is a process of our thinking. It cannot be changed without changing our thinking."

With those words of inspirational insight, let me ask you this. Why does this county continue to perpetuate the narrative that the cannabis industry and its purported revenue will be the answer to all our county's financial problems? This simply cannot be verified by your budget reports, whether you choose to disclose the true cost/benefit details to the public or not.

Is it worth the long-term, detrimental impacts you are allowing/imposing on our cherished, charming, serene and family-oriented, world-famous, county? I would like to know your answer. Please email me your response. I am genuinely interested in your rationality for this. I understand the need to fill *county coffers* but I will not/cannot accept a selfish desire to fill *private coffers*. I consider this, "immoral."

On April 13, Asst. CEO Mr. Jeff Frapwell commented: 'Ensure the continuity of government; continue essential services needed for response and recovery; shift more taxes to SBCFIRE to support their efforts.' (When I served on the board of the SBCFSC and as long-standing Fire Associate/Advocate for Tepusquet, I strongly supported funding SBCFIRE and other fire-related committees).

Mr. Frapwell also expressed concerns re: 'uncharted territory, uncertain future, intent of Board Policy,' and remarked, 'I support comments in response to this pandemic that we must be strategic, forward looking and..., "resist the temptation to make short-term decisions that will have long-term, negative ramifications." (Thank you, Mr. Frapwell! My sentiments, exactly).

This was followed by Supervisor William's quip, 'Cannabis Revenue may be what saves us through this economic crisis.' *Substantiate it!*)

Supervisor William's remark is what prompted me to start making PRA requests about *purported* Cannabis Revenue.

SBC Budget reports do not include what I consider applicable, <u>'all-inclusive-cannabis-costs.'</u> For example, how much of these costs are related to hiring professionals that are not SBC employees? The Tax Pro that was hired to help BOS develop cannabis tax regulations for 2019, was not from our county.

What about the costs of revolving door PC hearings, BOS appeals for cannabis projects like, "Herbal Angel, Avo-Vista, What-the-Heck" that has been in "process" for over a year; has been heard multiple times... under a different LLC?

I struggle with understanding the costly, possibly undisclosed ramifications of navigating the county website and oft times must ask for assistance. Mostly, I just 'fly-by-the-seat-of-my-pants,' while trying to comprehend this mind-boggling system/process, which is overwhelming for me, at times. I <u>know</u> that the following facts are true:

- 1 There are many cannabis-related expenses that I cannot find in the County Budget Records (thus, I PRA request them).
- 2 The majority of growers either do not pay taxes or claim they made no profit (BOS allows them to "self-report", which is Ludicrous)!
- 3 Growers <u>appear to</u> 'drag-their-feet' through the licensing process so they don't have to report profits or pay taxes. One Tepusquet grower has been 'dragging his feet' while he accumulates multiple county/state/federal violations on his county records, for years!
- 4. No other industry has been allowed to operate a business without first, undergoing a very strict permitting process, *before* approval!
- 5. No other industry has produced the plethora of problems/costs that cannabis industry perpetrates on our county legislators or residents!

The Budget Overview Presentation appears to place emphasis on BOS' reliance of cannabis revenue but this report makes no mention of the backlog of cannabis applications, let alone the unpermitted status of the cannabis operations that are not paying taxes... because they are not permitted to operate... because they are still dragging-their-feet through the licensing process! Are you planning to address this issue during the Budget Hearing? Or will you, too, 'fly by the seat of your pants,' while trying to convince the public to swallow, 'hook-line-and-sinker' distorted truths about purported cannabis-revenue? This bears thoughtful consideration in light of current events.

The Memorandum added on June 6, indicates that the 'one-time-tax-cannabis-revenue' of \$480,100 is back in the books (is this the money that was earmarked for the Elks Rodeo Traffic Study, last year, which our county failed to disclose to SBC Public?). If so, that's good to know you had second thoughts. If the total "discretionary fund" of \$688,200 is assigned today, I would request (as I have from the outset) that you hire adequate staff for Planning and Development, re oversight of the enormous backlog of cannabis applications and/or hire more SBC Sheriffs for Cannabis enforcement. These two critically understaffed departments (hands tied from the outset), have been undermanned from the get-go. IF you do not increase their departmental staff then I would strongly advocate for our D.A.'s recommendation re, "Purchase of full-sized truck for cannabis compliance team for District Attorney's Office (#1 on cannabis funding expansion request list; include small ongoing amount). "I will leave that up to the D.A. and our "boys/gals in green, black or blue uniforms." However, I believe more P&D staff for processing affidavits and more Sheriff's feet on the ground are more urgently needed, at this point in time. We must do whatever it takes to help our agencies oversee and enforce the cannabis industry that majority of BOS has so blatantly supported and allowed to run roughshod over our community and our county for many years!

"We the People," of Santa Barbara County do not want our future generations to read or hear stories about how their legacy was destroyed by selfish, biased **Ad Hoc Supervisors that put their environment, public safety and children last on their list of Priority Objectives**. We will not tolerate current legislators who could not resist, "...the temptation to make short-term decisions that had long-term, negative ramifications." We/You may not be able to shove Pandora back into her proverbial Box but you can certainly remedy the problems you've caused by funding all efforts to regulate, oversee, monitor, tax, enforce and... **Adopt PC's recommendations to** deny projects, instead of Overruling

them! These projects are excessive, invasive, non-compatible and/or increase risks to communities (Carpinteria) EDRN's (Tepusquet and Cebada), Wine Industries, Avocado Farmers and other, Legacy Ag. They pose threats to all of us that are being impacted. We have ALL brought numerous concerns to the BOS for many years, to no avail!

MLK Jr., "Every man must decide whether he will walk in the light of creative altruism or in the darkness of destructive selfishness."

Respectfully Submitted,

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Renee ONeill <chasingstar2701@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 9, 2020 1:15 AM

To: sbcob; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; Williams, Das

Cc: Villalobos, David; Melekian, Barney **Subject:** Re: Public Comment for BOS Budget

Attachments: Lavagino re Crew One - 2012, Property Tax Transfer.docx; Sup Lav, failure to notify and

failure in Property Tax Status for SBC Fire.docx; Lav, P&D, etc. early emails, correspondence.docx; Ad Hoc Cannabis Speech.docx; Traffic Study for ELKS 5-29-19.docx; Dennis Bozanich, re traffic study and staff concerns, 6-1-19.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.

Dear All,

In my haste to post my public comment before 5:00pm deadline on the 8th (due to 2nd fire within the course of days that had potential to impact on our community), my focus was shifted to my role as Fire Associate. Now that I feel 100% assured that all is well, I have the time to attach the documents I intended to submit earlier that were referenced in my budget letter. Please include the attachments to my letter dated June 8th at about 4:52pm.

The attached documents regard correspondence with Supervisor Lavagnino, SBC P&D, etc., from 2012 to current. Thank you for accepting these attachments at this very late hour. Much Appreciated!

See You Tomorrow at 9:00am...

Renée O'Neill

On Monday, June 8, 2020, 4:52:16 PM PDT, Renee ONeill <chasingstar2701@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Clerk and Sups,

I am rushing to get this in before 5:00pm. Right now, we are watching a fire on Hwy 166, near Rock Front Ranch. Winds are high and dangerous... gotta go.

March 12, 2012

Renee O'Neill and Linda Tunnell F.A.C.T. Fire Associates for the Community of Tepusquet 2701 Tepusquet Canyon Road Santa Maria, CA 93454

The Honorable Steve Lavagnino Fifth District Supervisor 511 E. Lakeside Parkway, Suite 141 Santa Maria, CA 93455

Subject: Support Property Tax Transfer Proposal for Santa Barbara County Fire Department

Dear Supervisor Lavagnino,

As Fire Associates for the Community of Tepusquet, we would like to request your support to apportion a larger percentage of tax revenues to support the Santa Barbara County Fire Department's efforts to reinstate Crew One. Specifically, we want the SBC Supervisors to prioritize an increase in funding for the Wildland Fire and Urban Interface protection of Santa Barbara County.

Please do whatever you can to help allocate these funds to re-establish SBCF Crew One and staff that are desperately needed to keep our Wildland Urban Interface areas and SBC roadways protected. SBCF Crew One is so affordable compared to other county employees that are hired for hazardous fuels reduction purposes. They are highly trained and worth their weight in '24 carat gold.' Our communities deserve the very best protection we can afford to provide and SBCF Crew One is the very best! We need them back!

It is frightening to contemplate what this 2012 fire-season will likely bring, considering the extremely low rainfall we have received (less than 5 inches). All indicators point to a very scary and dangerous year. Benjamin Franklin's fire-prevention advice stated, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." These words of wisdom are so apt in our trying economical times.

Our support is conditional in that these tax revenues are strictly focused on re-staffing SBCF Crew One.

Sincerely Yours,

Renee O'Neill and Linda Tunnell F.A.C.T. Fire Associates for the Community of Tepusquet April 10, 2012

Renee O'Neill and Linda Tunnell F.A.C.T. Fire Associates for the Community of Tepusquet 2701 Tepusquet Canyon Road Santa Maria, CA 93454

The Honorable Steve Lavagnino Fifth District Supervisor 511 E. Lakeside Parkway, Suite 141 Santa Maria, CA 93455

Subject: Property Tax Reapportionment Status for SBC Fire Department

Dear Supervisor Lavagnino,

Last month, Linda and I wrote to you regarding the Property Tax Reapportionment issue and requested your support for reinstating Santa Barbara County Fire Department, Crew One. We were just notified that the Supervisors are meeting *today* to discuss the status and future needs for SBC Fire. From what I've heard, this report does not appear to provide for an increase in funds for the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) suppression capabilities, nor does address returning Crew One to their preexisting status (2005- June 2011). Furthermore, there was no mention of having two helicopters available during extreme fire weather. What is this money actually being allocated for?

Inequitable distribution of this Property Tax Reapportionment raises our concerns for the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) areas of our county. In the last 50 years, Santa Barbara County has experienced the highest loss of property and property tax revenues from WUI, ever! The following list of fires has caused these devastating losses: Coyote Fire 1964, Romero Fire 1971, Sycamore Fire 1977, Wheeler Fire 1985, Paint Fire 1991 and most recently the Zaca, La Brea, Jesusita, Gap and Tea Fires.

Linda and I have brought our concerns about fire protection to the Board many, many times. We would like to see our lost resources replaced *before* we add any other additional requested resources. It would be wise and prudent to reinstate Crew One. We greatly appreciate you listening to us and want to know how we can support your efforts to accomplish this.

As we stated before, our support of this proposal is conditional, in that these tax revenues are primarily focused on reinstating SBCF Crew One and providing greater protection for the Wildland Urban Interface areas by staffing a second helicopter on extreme fire-weather days. This will ultimately save SB County thousands of dollars, which will then generate more revenue.

Appreciatively Yours,

Renee O'Neill and Linda Tunnell F.A.C.T. Fire Associates for the Community of Tepusquet Lavagnino, Steve <steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org>
To:chasingstar2701@yahoo.com
Wed, May 2, 2012 at 7:56 AM
Great job! I will need her vote come budget time.
Steve

From: Renee ONeill <chasingstar2701@yahoo.com>

To: Lavagnino, Steve

Cc: Linda Tunnell <|stunnell@aol.com> Sent: Tue May 01 17:00:07 2012

Subject: WRA & Adams Letter for Sup Wolf

Dear Supervisor Lavagnino,

I'm not real familiar with how information is shared among the Board. In any event, I wanted to provide you with a copy of the attached letter that was sent to Supervisor Wolf, by Ted Adams (Vice President SBCFSC) and Mike Williams (President WRA). I am happy to report that these two professional agency folks are adding their much needed support to the critical issue of Tax Reapportionment Revenue for the SBCF Hand Crew.

Once again, we want to express our deepest appreciation for your genuine support in bringing back Crew One.

Warm Regards,

Renée O'Neill and Linda Tunnell F.A.C.T. Fire Associates for the Community of Tepusquet

Lavagnino, Steve <steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org>
To:Renee O'Neill
Tue, Mar 21, 2017 at 6:56 AM
Good Morning Renee

Our staff Ad Hoc Committee meets again tomorrow, but is not open to the public. At this meeting we will set a date to bring in certain stakeholders, you will be invited. I will email you the date after tomorrows mtg.

Steve

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S7, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: Renee O'Neill <chasingstar2701@yahoo.com>

Date: 3/21/17 12:11 AM (GMT-08:00)

Steve" <steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org>

Subject: Re: Ad Hoc Committee

When is the next Hearing?

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 16, 2017, at 8:27 PM, Renee ONeill < chasingstar2701@yahoo.com > wrote:

Dear Supervisors,

At the Hearing on Tuesday, February 14th, Supervisor Lavagnino indicated that it would be 'a good idea' for me to be a member of the 'Ad Hoc Committee,' to discuss Regulations for 'Cannabis Farms.'

As the Fire Associate/Advocate for the Community of Tepusquet, I would be honored to participate.

Warmest Regards,

Renée O'Neill

From: Leyva, Petra <petra@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>
To: 'Renee ONeill' <chasingstar2701@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 30, 2017, 4:36:28 PM PDT

Subject: RE: URGENT APN info

Renee,

I have Helios Dayspring as owner of parcels 131-090-027, 131-200-21m 131-100-005 and 017. The owner Unified Investments Inc. owns 131-090-073 and 074, 131-200-016 and 018. I obtained this information from the County's internal website.

As to grading work being done, we need the parcel number as to where the clearing is happening and if it can be seen by someone's parcel, they would need to invite us on to their property to view the work/grading/clearing.

Petra

From: Renee ONeill [mailto:chasingstar2701@yahoo.com]

Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2017 10:27 PM

To: Leyva, Petra

Subject: URGENT APN info

Hi Petra,

My husband mentioned the three, additional properties that you discovered in Helios Dayspring's name but he seems to have misplaced the 3" x 5" index card he wrote them on. Could you please send us the APN numbers for the three properties you found, after our meeting last week? Apparently, these properties were *in addition* to the ones our 'savvy neighbor' gave us, which we shared with you.

Could you please call us and leave that information on our answering machine or email the parcel numbers to me? It would also be helpful to know how/where you acquired that information, as they do not seem to be listed on the county website.

I went back to research info re Dayspring, on the SB County Website and discovered something that concerns me:

A four page document, regarding a "Certificate of Compliance" for Dayspring, Helios Raphael, dated March 3rd? You can go onto www.sbvote.com and follow it to this specific link:

Grantor-Grantee Index Search Results

Grantor-Grantee Index Search Results

You should also be aware that my neighbor that has a visual overview of Daysping's property, called me tonight and reported that 'he can see extensive work being done with the bulldozer; road grading and bulldozing a new, large extension in the area where the hoop houses are... no covers are visible, yet.'

I have personally observed/photographed the Hertz Rental company delivering a bulldozer to Dayspring's Foreman, Luis Gonzalez and Cal Portland delivering numerous *truck and trailer loads* of ??? material to Dayspring's farm. I counted/photographed that vehicle going through here 6 *times*, yesterday and they continued today... but I had to leave to help my husband do a Cultural Diversity Presentation at Alan Hancock College and was gone for most of the day.

As I drove down canyon, I noticed/photographed Cal Portland's "extra trailer," at the junction of Tepusquet and Colson Canyon. There is WAY MORE than 51 cubic yards of material that is being moved!

Warmest Regards,

Renée O'Neill

From: Leyva, Petra <petra@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>
To: 'Renee O'Neill' <chasingstar2701@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 5, 2017, 3:46:52 PM PDT

Subject: RE: Dayspring

Renee,

Enforcement staff has not received contact from Mr. Dayspring. If you have photos of the greenhouse that were taken without trespassing, please send the photos.

Petra

----Original Message----

From: Renee O'Neill [mailto:chasingstar2701@yahoo.com]

Sent: Friday, June 02, 2017 2:25 PM

To: Leyva, Petra Subject: Dayspring

Hi Petra,

Has your office been in contact with Helios Dayspring?

It appears he is playing the same game he played last year... avoid inspections until it's too late.

I have been reviewing the Medical Cannabis Regulations and Safety Act.

Section 19303 specifies "Protection of the public shall be the highest priority for all licensing authorities..."

Section 19321 (b), indicates '...the person that is operating IN COMPLIANCE ... on or before January 1, 2018, may continue its operation...and (2) 'In issuing licenses, the licensing authority shall prioritize any premises or person... that can demonstrate... that the person was in operation and in GOOD STANDINGnj with the local jurisdiction by January 1, 2016.

If Helios Dayspring obtains a license for his multiple cannabis farms, in Tepusquet, I will personally inform the appropriate Administrative Departments listed in these documents; inquire why he was issued a license in the first place and testify that Helios and Luis Gonzalez have threatened us and members of our community for years; that he and his associates are intrusive, uncooperative and out of compliance with our licensing authorities.

Regards, Renee Sent from my iPhone

Thomas C. Gibbons <tgibbons@smvwcd.org> To:Renee ONeill Sat, Jul 1, 2017 at 1:16 AM

I just finished sending the material to Mindy Fogg (Supervising Planner, SBCO P&D) she got the message about the ground water basin, challenged me on it and I sent her the California Water Resources Department (CWRD) state water basin map. Now she agrees that Tepusquet is not a numbered or a subbasin.

I thanked her for the healthy exchange, the challenge and being professional enough to admit she learned some thing to day. The lack of basin issue could take away any opportunity to support that the current effort of irrigated agriculture is or even that it could be sustainable. The Ag Commissioner tried to support what I said to the Staff in the exchange after the Work Shop and took some flack for it. I had CCD her and she knows how unique the Canyon truly is.

"Every person that drove in a nail helped build the house"

Group efforts produce team wins. My hat is off and I am so proud of everyone. One time My Mother told me if you don't have much to add (or don't think you do) just show up and take up one of the seats so one of the other side has to stand or go home!

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Verizon Wireless 4G LTE network.

From: Renee ONeill

Sent: Saturday, July 1, 2017 12:30 AM

Reply To: Renee ONeill

Subject: BRAVO Tepusquet Team

Hi Gang,

I had hoped to get this out to you... yesterday but I missed it by about 30 minutes. I have toothpicks in my eyelids to keep them open... I hope I didn't miss anyone but feel free to forward to our 'cannabis committee,' if I did.

Enjoy the pics and the letter.

Warmest Regards,

Renée O'Neill

----- Original message -----

From: Renee ONeill <chasingstar2701@yahoo.com>

Date: 1/5/18 4:26 PM (GMT-08:00)

To: "Lavagnino, Steve" < steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org>, "Adam, Peter"

<peter.adam@countyofsb.org>, "Williams, Das" <DWilliams@countyofsb.org>, "Hartmann, Joan"
<jHartmann@countyofsb.org>, "Wolf, Janet" <jwolf@countyofsb.org>

<jHartmann@countyofsb.org>, "Wolf, Janet" <jwolf@countyofsb.org>
Cc: "Bantilan, Cory" <cory.bantilan@countyofsb.org>, "Biely, Yvonne"

<yvonne.biely@countyofsb.org>
Subject: Questions and Appeals

Dear Honorable Supervisors,

I reviewed the BOS Agenda for January 9th. It appears that Taxes will be the main focus, again, with no mention of addressing Land Use Ordinances. You may recall, this was the item we wanted to address on December 14th, during the All Day Cannabis Meeting but time ran out and this item was postponed. I thought that it would be listed on the January 9th agenda. Have I overlooked something or was there an oversight, in putting this important item on the January 9th agenda? If this will not be addressed on January 9th, then how does that work, with regard to the Planning Department Meeting, on January 10th? Please let me know what your plan is, to address the Land Use Ordinance issue.

Attached, please find my one-page letter to the Planning Department, regarding their "Revision Letter."

Warmest Regards,

Town Hall Cannabis Speech

June 30, 2017

Ad Hoc Committee, my name is Renee O'Neill, resident and Advocate for the Community of Tepusquet. As a **community**, we have researched and recognize the fact that there are <u>State and Federal Requirements you Must Follow</u>, <u>BEFORE you allow cannabis cultivation in Santa Barbara County</u>. Tepusquet Community expects the County of Santa Barbara to enforce the laws identified in, "MCRSA" (Comprehensive Medical and Cannabis Regulation and Safety Act). <u>Section 19303 states</u>, <u>"Protection of the public shall be the Highest Priority for all licensing authorities</u> in exercising its licensing, regulatory and disciplinary functions under this chapter."

Tepusquet Community Will Hold the County of Santa Barbara accountable, for ignoring the issues and concerns we have brought to your attention, since 2014. These will be addressed by other residents.

As one of Tepusquet's long-standing, Community Advocates, I want to express and document our community's disappointment in our governing agencies for the following reasons:

- **1.** For failing to acknowledge or remedy the numerous issues and grave concerns our community has brought to your attention, **since 2014.**
- 2. For failing to exercise your authority, to partially or expressly ban medical Cannabis activities, within your borders, until you are able to regulate and enforce them. The "Medical Cannabis Regulation & Safety Act ("MCRSA") and the Adult Use of Marijuana Act (AUMA) give counties and cities the authority to permit, partially ban, or expressly ban medical Cannabis activities within their borders..." San Luis Obispo and Ventura County have already implemented restrictions on cannabis grown in unincorporated areas. (See attached)
- **3.** For ignoring the fact that cannabis growers, in Tepusquet, were committing CEQA Violations, when witnesses reported this to you, two years ago.

It is <u>your responsibility to protect your constituents</u>, the law-abiding, tax-paying citizens of this country. You are charged to uphold our Constitutional Rights, "Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness!" You will be held accountable if you fail to defend these rights!

We have requested, for three years that you help us. Instead, we have been ignored or misled by those who deem REVENUE more important than the safety and well-being of their citizens. Therefore, we insist that our governing agencies flex their authoritative power and protect our community from these threats. We choose to continue to 'Happily Pursue our Lives,' in our beloved community that has been passed on to us and will be protected for future generations to come.

If you are Unable or Unwilling to Uphold our Constitutional Rights or Enforce the County, State and Federal Cannabis Regulations, then step aside. Resign! You won't be reelected, next term, because **WE** will flex **OUR** power and **vote** for those who **ARE** able and willing, to achieve this.

To: County of SB, Countywide Teams and Media

Re: Traffic Study for ELKS Rodeo

I was dismayed to learn that although this story pertained directly to SBC, it was aired on KSBY in SLO County and not covered by KCOY or KEYT. It was not posted in the SM Times or any other local newspaper. I learned about this news event, re BOS decision to spend \$400,000 one-time-cannabis tax for a Traffic Study, from SLO Cannabis Watch Group.

<u>I want to know which supervisors</u> approved/voted for this irrational use of one-time-tax. Why wasn't the public notified or given an opportunity to provide input on how \$400,000 dollars of cannabis tax revenue was being spent, let alone, \$361,000 you approved to extend the Union Valley Parkway over the next two years?

Here is the link to *our county's story* that aired on KSBY on May 21, 2019 https://ksby.com/news/local-news/2019/05/21/traffic-study-to-be-funded-by-santa-barbara-county-cannabis-tax-money

I was appalled when I learned about this frivolous use of cannabis tax revenue.

BOS assured voters that the majority of cannabis tax revenue would be used to Enforce and oversee cannabis in the unincorporated regions of our county where county allowed (pushed) cannabis industry.

Fulfill your promises to "We the People."

- **1. Hire Law Enforcement!** Special Forces Cannabis Team <u>still has only SIX Detectives</u>. I verified this, recently.
- **2. Hire more Staff!** There is still only ONE person overseeing the influx and proliferation of cannabis applications and that ONE person is expected to *verify* hundreds of affidavits from growers that claim to be 'legal non-conforming.' This is not humanly possible. Between January 2018 and May 16, 2019, SBC has acquired/allowed 3,316 cannabis licenses (one third of state's 10,760 total). SBC also holds 40% of the state's Provisional Licenses, even though we represent only one percent of the state's population and two percent of state's land mass.
- 3. Re \$400,000 for a Traffic Study and \$361,000 to extend the Union Valley Parkway: **Commons sense** dictates that county bring existing roads that are in deplorable condition up to decent standards <u>before</u> they spend money on unnecessary traffic studies, let alone, develop or extend roads.
- 4. If 'one-time-use funds' are not being used to *improve roads*, then use it to fund behavioral wellness programs that are seeing an increase in drug-induced psychosis, in clients that are smoking/vaping/eating all that *highly potent* cannabis <u>you allowed and encouraged to impact</u> on residents of Santa Barbara County!

It is intuitively obvious to "We the people" that the cannabis lobby and your cannabis *pals* wrote Regulations:

Anyone who applied for temporary state permit and claimed they were growing prior to Jan 2016, could continue to grow unlimited amounts of cannabis, *before* they obtained county permit(s). No other business or industry is allowed to do this, *without permits*. For example, no one can decide to open a restaurant and serve a product to consumers, *until* they have gone through a very strict regulatory permit process.

"We the People" highly suspect that this county has not only purposely tied the hands of Law Enforcement and Staff but is also manipulating and/or silencing our media. As I have stated numerous times, "In this town, money not only talks..., it supersedes the law. Our Civil Rights are being trampled on!"

Countywide Advocate,

Hi Dennis,

Thank you for your reply, *especially considering* it is *Saturday*. I recognize and appreciate your dedication and commitment in serving our county, to the very best of your abilities. As you know, I have been involved in the cannabis regulation process from the outset. I have also waited patiently to see 'Bad Actors' removed from Tepusquet, since 2014. As growers continue to proliferate and destroy our beloved communities, our environment and our way of life, I have become more and more disillusioned and lost all faith in our legislators' desire or ability to control this illicit industry. We did not vote for the problems that commercial cannabis industry is producing throughout our county.

I have spoken with both Sheriff's and P&D on a number of occasions. They continue to verify the statements I made. However, I would be pleased to have the facts re countywide staff that was hired to Enforce and Oversee Cannabis. I do recognize the fact that all our departmental teams are doing an outstanding job, considering the circumstances.

Thank you for offering to help me clarify the facts. I would appreciate receiving the following information:

- 1. List of 'roughly 20 countywide staff' and their specific employment titles/positions
- 2. Timekeeping Records for all 'personnel working on cannabis compliance and enforcement' per P&D and Sheriff's Special Cannabis Forces Team (1 Sgt and 5 Dep Detectives, to the best of my current knowledge).

Re Enforcement: This brings to mind additional inquiries I have, regarding a need for the following information:

- 1. Number of enforcement cases (Civil and Criminal) that have been filed re Cannabis Industry, in Tepusquet
- 2. List of County Council's Attorneys that have been assigned to enforce cannabis and the civil or criminal case numbers re cannabis enforcement that has taken place in Santa Barbara County, since Prop 64 passed, 2016.
- 3. Who, specifically, is investigating the death of the 16-year-old minor that was killed in Tepusquet Canyon, on August 4, 2018? This incident took place at a Cannabis grow site on 'Autumn Road.' What, if anything, was ever done to prosecute the employer of that cannabis operation, under state or federal laws? Please provide all written reports that were made by various law enforcement agencies, regarding that case. Is it still an 'ongoing investigation?' Can the involved parties be required to testify in court, considering they were threatened by cannabis grower/owner, not to say anything to investigators? This has been a grave concern to our community.
- 4. Re expenditures of Cannabis Tax Revenue. Please provide a current, itemized list of where this money is being spent. Does the Public have any say in where these funds are going or what the 'one-time-tax' is used for?

Sincerely Appreciative for anything you can do to help answer these questions,