

Ramirez, Angelica

Public Comment - Group 2

From: Beth Geiger <bethgeiger5@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2020 4:00 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Grand jury report and response



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 Board of Supervisors,

The response of the BOS to the Grand Jury's exhaustive report and investigation into the cannabis industry in our county, is infuriating to the citizens of Carpinteria. Your refusal to listen to the residents of this county raises the question of your objectivity with this issue. We are only asking for your consideration for the health and welfare of the people you are supposed to serve. It is not too late to enact proper regulations to control the impact of this industry. We need better environmental reviews of each project. Odor control must be brought up to standard.

As residents of Carpinteria, we expect the BOS to address the issues brought up by the Grand Jury report. We are calling for additional reforms to be enforced for the benefit of the residents of this county.

Sincerely,
William and Elizabeth Geiger
Padaro Lane, Carpinteria

Sent from my iPad

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Valerie C Williams <vcwinwyo@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2020 4:03 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Grand Jury Report and Response

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.

I am a resident in Carpinteria and my community is surrounded by green houses growing pot. It is more than unhealthy, it is affecting property values in residential neighborhoods. The Board of Supervisors must deny further licenses and rescind any pending applications marked for approval.

We've been sold out by our local representatives.

Sincerely,

Valerie C Williams

Sent from my iPhone

Ramirez, Angelica

From: S G <sasha477m@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2020 4:17 PM
To: sbcob; Hart, Gregg; Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; peter.adam@sountyofsb.org
Cc: Patty
Subject: Public Comment re. Draft Response to Grand Jury Report - Cannabis (Attachment A)

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 County Board of Supervisors,

We live adjacent to a large cannabis production operation and in proximity to several others in the Foothill Road/Heath Ranch area of Carpinteria. We are among the many residents and taxpayers negatively impacted on a continuous basis by excessively dense and unmitigated industrial cannabis cultivation taking place in the Carpinteria Valley.

The Grand Jury report was comprehensive and identified in a fair manner the many issues and concerns with how the County mishandled the creation of the cannabis ordinances and the severe negative consequences for residents in Carpinteria and other parts of the County. We also believe that, in the absence of a proper EIR, the actual extent of negative impacts is not yet fully understood.

Over the past two years, we have been continuously exposed to drifting concentrations of terpene VOCs and associated compounds from the various cannabis sites in the area. Our home is regularly inundated (almost daily) by these industrial pollutants, evidenced by strong cannabis odors, most often in the evening. Typically these odors waft into our living room, dining room and bedrooms in the evening, violating our right to enjoy our home in peace.

Although we continue to report violations to the County, the presence of cannabis terpenes in the air in Carpinteria is getting worse, not better. On September 10, 2020, at 2:40 AM, cannabis odor was so intense that it penetrated the closed windows of our bedroom and awakened one of us (Alexander) with an overwhelming feeling of suffocation. During the August heatwave, we experienced cannabis odor continuously throughout several days.

We have reviewed the Board of Supervisors' draft response to the Grand Jury report (Attachment A) and find it unacceptable. The issues identified in the Grand Jury report are real. Rather than deflect their responsibility, the Board needs to acknowledge its mistakes and make some significant course corrections:

- Rather than making "Develop a robust and economically viable legal cannabis industry" as the primary objective, it is more appropriate that the Board implement ordinances with the primary objective being "Limit potential for adverse impacts on children and sensitive populations by ensuring compatibility of commercial cannabis activities with surrounding existing land uses, including residential neighborhoods, agricultural operations, youth facilities, recreational amenities and educational institutions". Health and safety, as well as quality of life concerns of residents and taxpayers, need to be #1.
- The public needs to have much greater input to the changes that need to be made to the cannabis ordinances. Insufficient public input and undue influence of industry lobbyists call into question the legitimacy of the Board and the process.
- As pointed out in the Grand Jury report, the level of production and density of cannabis cultivation in Carpinteria and other parts of the County are too high relative to the projected demand in California and production taking place elsewhere in the state. New limits on the level of cannabis production in SB County, and the Carpinteria Valley in particular, need to be put in place, with proper public input.
- Air quality impacts of cannabis terpene VOCs, as well as of the associated chemicals from odor mitigation systems like Buyers need to be scientifically studied and stricter ordinances put in place based on air quality expert recommendations. Without any sort of definitive, scientific health study, we remain in the dark about the long-term health consequences of large scale industrial cannabis production and odor mitigation systems that disperse compounds in such close proximity to residences and schools. The County needs to stop playing Russian Roulette with residents (and greenhouse workers') safety.
- The cannabis taxation scheme needs to be revised and based on square footage (not gross receipts), as in other counties in California. The gross receipts method is simply a giveaway to cannabis producers at the expense of County residents and taxpayers (as indicated in the Grand Jury report's comparison to Monterey County).
- A Code of Ethics needs to be implemented to avoid conflicts of interest going forward. Without this, again, the legitimacy of the Board and regulatory process is called into question.

Given the seriousness of the Grand Jury report and its findings, it is unfortunate that more advanced public notice of the discussion of the Board's draft response (Attachment A) was not given to residents.

The CUP process, environmental impact assessment and other recommendations of the Grand Jury need to be implemented. The public must be made aware of the County's progress in implementing these changes.

As taxpayers and residents of Carpinteria for the past twenty-two years, we believe the County needs to much more fully accept and implement the Grand Jury's recommendations to address the issues with over-concentrated, unmitigated industrial cannabis cultivation in the Carpinteria Valley.

Thank you,

Alexander and Patricia Globa

1483 Anita St.

Carpinteria, CA 93013

818-419-2360

Ramirez, Angelica

From: PAUL EKSTROM <paulekstrom@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2020 4:27 PM
To: sbcob; Miyasato, Mona
Cc: concernedcarpinterians@gmail.com; Robert Collector; Melinda Burns; Blair Pence; Lionel Neff; Alison Laslett; Debra Eagle; Maureen Foley; Mary O'goreman; John Culbertson; Wade; epturpin@gmail.com
Subject: BOS Response to Grand Jury Report on Cannabis

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.

Please read into record:

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am disappointed but not surprised by your response. I remember in the 1980's certain Supervisors allowed themselves to be out-smarted by the flower industry in Carpinteria Valley. This resulted in a "gold rush" of permitted and non-permitted greenhouses and a saturation of the flower market. The market was great for a while but eventually flattened out. The world market found cheaper flowers and Carpinteria Valley is stuck with too many greenhouses.

Now look at what happened with the Cannabis Ad Hoc subcommittee, these members were out-smarted by the cannabis industry. The result of this is county residents, workers, wine producers, avocado growers, tourists, etc. are in effect second-class citizens. Also the cannabis industry out-smarted the committee with formulas for tax collection and reporting. Santa Barbara County has the most beneficial tax program in the nation, thanks to the committee.

The Supervisors of our County need to come to terms that they made wrong (possibly illegal) decisions and need to amend the current cannabis policies to make better neighbors of the cannabis industry. We are slated to have commercial growers from Canada growing cannabis in Carpinteria Valley, already saturated with commercial cannabis. Canada has a glut of cannabis products (article from Marijuana Business Times-Sept. 2020). Commercial cannabis has already begun to over saturate the world market. I urge the BOS to reconsider their response to the Grand Jury Report and stop the charade. The Grand Jury report was made by decent citizens of this county and deserve respect for their work on the cannabis issue in this county.

Thank you,

Paul Ekstrom

Carpinteria Valley resident since 1970

1489 Manzanita St.

Carpinteria, CA 93013

805-886-6712

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Sandy Weil <sandyweil@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2020 4:31 PM
To: sbcob; Hart, Gregg; Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve
Cc: Adam, Peter; Miyasato, Mona; Melekian, Barney
Subject: Response to the Board of Supervisor's Response to the Grand Jury Report

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: THE SANTA BARBARA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
RE: THE BOARD OF SUPERVISOR'S RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY REPORT

I want to begin by saying how dismayed my husband and I feel regarding your inability as a board to take **responsibility** for your actions in regard to how the cannabis growers in the county were allowed to begin and continue to operate their businesses without actually verifying the validity of their affidavits! In the rush for money, the board was willing to set up an Ad Hoc committee of two supervisors, Das Williams and Steve Lavagnino, who felt no need to include the public in the implementation of the permitting process. After attending the great majority of your meetings, it became abundantly clear that you did not want to listen to the various members of the county who sat through those meetings, We asked you to stop the permitting process if you didn't have the resources to verify the permits, actually check the sites and enforce the permits that were issued. We courteously listened to all the excuses and promises that were made. I have to say how infuriating it was to read that an email was passed to a supervisor from a cannabis representative during a meeting! Did any of the residents of the county have that privilege?

Reform is certainly needed. We need a review of the County's existing programs, permit issuance and oversight plans. In our opinion, a Public Working Group should be created to assure that the public is truly informed. The "Recommendations" from the Grand Jury Report were earned because of your **lack of transparency** the past three and a half years. We have constantly asked you as a Board to stop everything until you could get adequate control of what you were doing. But no, if there was a complaint for odor, lighting, noise or traffic, we were told nothing could be done until the grower came up for the next permit. In the Carpinteria Valley we have suffered from obnoxious odors since the beginning. You as a board have truly altered our lives and the reputation of our community whether you travel on Highway 101 or 192, the problem is still the same. It stinks! The residents, Carpinteria High School, the Boys & Girls Club and Girls Inc. are just a few of the sites that have suffered. We continuously smell cannabis or a mixture of chemicals that are an overlay of the cannabis odor. None of this is acceptable

We need better environmental review. Your current scheme has numerous flaws. We believe you should revise and update the PEIR and definitely have a better environmental review of each project. Each grower needs to be inspected four times a year for compliance. What we have seen is that the growers were not checked in the beginning and you have not taken the responsibility to **adequately inspect** the premises. The Carpinteria Valley is a very small area, approximately four and a half miles in length, and we are second in the state for production. **Quantity and Proximity** should have always been a priority.

We know that larger cannabis companies are moving into Carpinteria with no regard to the residents of Carpinteria or the Carpinteria Valley. **The "Recommendations" of the Grand Jury Report were warranted** and we do want to hold each member of the Board responsible for an acceptable quality of life in Santa Barbara County.

Allan & Sandra Wei
Carpinteria Valley

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Mike Lazaro <mlazaro1231@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2020 4:37 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Fwd: BOS hearing

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 Supervisors,

My name is Mike Lazaro, and I live in Carpinteria. To me, the Grand Jury report reads like it was written by people who believe cannabis should not be legal. Through this whole process, there have been numerous public hearings. There still are, like today's hearing. We all know everyone's opinions about cannabis. To claim voices have been shut out is false.

I've seen the great successes of cannabis in Carpinteria Valley. We need to stay the course, because agriculture is so important to our community. Thank you for holding another public hearing and doing the hard work it takes to listen to all voices and make tough decisions, even when you cannot make every county resident happy.

Sent from my smart phone please excuse any typos

Begin forwarded message:

From: Peter Dugre <pbdugre@gmail.com>
Date: September 21, 2020 at 4:10:41 PM PDT
To: Mike Lazaro <mlazaro1231@gmail.com>
Subject: BOS hearing

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Debra Eagle <debra@almarosawinery.com>
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2020 4:38 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Grand Jury Report and Response

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.

Please read into the record for the hearing on September 22, 2020:

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Alma Rosa Winery is disheartened by the Board of Supervisors' decision to disregard the majority of recommendations made by the Grand Jury. Why? Many of us in this county have businesses and residences in more than one county of the state. We are able to see firsthand how cannabis is controlled in every other county, while being given a blank check in Santa Barbara, with stacked licenses, unverified affidavits and enormous leeway on grow size, odor emissions, setbacks to business, EDRNs and even schools.

It's an insult to the citizens and business owners of Santa Barbara County that the thorough and thoughtful recommendations of the Grand Jury are being ignored by supervisors who seem to have a vested interest in the success of the cannabis industry at the expense of the residents and other businesses.

Debra Eagle
General Manager
Alma Rosa Winery
Cell: 707-227-8503
www.almarosawinery.com

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Amy Marie Orozco <amymarie@amymarieorozco.com>
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2020 4:53 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Grand Jury Report and Response - Agenda Item #5 for Sept. 22, 2020 Board of Supervisors meeting - please read during public commnet

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.

-Please read the following during public comment for Agenda Item #5, Grand Jury Report and Response-

Dear Honorable Board of Supervisors:

I support your response to the Santa Barbara Grand Jury 2019-2020 Report "Cannabis."

The Santa Barbara County cannabis policy was created in a transparent and legal way, with open and invited public participation. Months and months before the ordinance was crafted and passed, there were lots of packed public meeting. Additionally, the policy has been successful and will be more so as we move into the future.

The Grand Jury report does not in any way indicate my experience with the county's process.

I live in Carpinteria and I support legal cannabis.

Thank you for your service to our community. It is greatly appreciated. Your patience and professionalism have not gone unnoticed.

Best,

Amy

Amy Marie Orozco

Creative Services, Writing & Editing

(805) 284-2622

www.amymarieorozco.com

www.cbtsmagazine.com

Keeping the Art of Letter Writing Alive

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: paulsonjl@aol.com
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2020 4:56 PM
To: sbcob; Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve
Subject: BOS Responses to Grand Jury Report
Attachments: Letter to BOS on Grand Jury Response.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: Attached is the letter I put in the mail today to the Board of Supervisors. Unfortunately, I only had one hour to prepare this because I was away for the weekend.

Please include this with comments during the BOS meeting tomorrow.

Respectfully,

Judy Paulson

September 22, 2020

Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
105 East Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

To All Supervisors:

Re: Board of Supervisor's Response to Santa Barbara County Grand Jury Cannabis Report 2019-2020

The Cannabis Grand Jury Report contains clear and convincing evidence that the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors failed in fulfilling their mission to, "Protect the Health, Safety and Welfare" of their citizens. I believe all Supervisors are culpable regardless of whether they were aggressively pushing or meekly following.

In reading the report, I was struck by the lack of cooperation provided to the Grand Jury. The Grand Jury is comprised of integrous individuals appointed to keep watch over government agencies, cities, and districts within Santa Barbara County. To accomplish their mission, the Grand Jury must have full cooperation when investigating which evidently did not occur in this case:

"This investigation by the Jury was hindered by the denial of its request for subpoenas to be issued to non-government witnesses who might have been helpful to the inquiry. The investigation was further hindered by a two month delay in the final production of requested documents from the County of Santa Barbara that was purported to be responsive and complete. During the investigation, the Jury learned that all documents requested have not been provided."
Page 1, 2019-20 Santa Barbara County Grand Jury

Even with the obstruction the Grand Jury received in their investigation, they amassed compelling evidence and outlined factual Findings and Recommendations which appear to have been unilaterally dismissed. I disagree with nearly all responses provided by the Board of Supervisors but will highlight a few below that I believe are especially egregious.

FINDING 1: Impact of cannabis on the health and welfare of residents was inadequately weighed

- Just because you have "fully complied" with laws/regulations/procedures DOES NOT mean you adequately weighed the impacts of cannabis on the community.
- The content of your "Statement of Overriding Consideration", specifically A., provided the basis for decisions that were not in the best interest of residents, businesses, and traditional agriculture. It appears this point was completely missed.
- Refusing to hold public hearing to evaluate concerns further demonstrates a lack of interest in serving the people of Santa Barbara County

FINDING 2: Creation of non-Brown Act Ad Hoc Committee

- A reminder is in order here. The Board of Supervisors is elected to AID in the conduct of the people's business. I do not yield my authority to the BOS and I insist on remaining informed. Transparency, visibility, and full disclosure are required. I believe the "Ad Hoc" Committee forum has and is being used to avoid public input and interference.

FINDING 3: Unfettered and undisclosed access to cannabis growers and industry lobbyists

- Please reread the Grand Jury Report on this matter. There is not defense for behavior of Board members, access of lobbyists and growers, communication during Board meeting, email exchanges, etc.
- “Implementing the proposed recommendation would have a similar chilling effect.” This is just absurd.

FINDING 4: Conflict between cannabis and traditional agriculture

- “...there is no evidence that proximity to cannabis growers threatens the existence of those segments” Yes, there is evidence. We are already experiencing it with the hemp cultivation next to our property. Being challenged during our required ACP spraying. Lawsuits filed by cannabis growers.
- 50 foot setback. This is of course the most ludicrous of all the items you have taken credit for. This set back DOES NOTHING.

FINDING 11: Lack of effective odor control

- Your response to this is outrageous. Odor control is a major issue where you have failed miserably. This included for both cannabis and hemp. 50 foot setback??? Really???

FINDING 12: Code of Ethics to formalize ethical standard for the Board of Supervisors

- Just because you have a Conflict of Interest Code and received annual training does not mean your behavior has been ethical

In summary, your responses do not acknowledge your wrong doing, do not address the underlying issues, and provide excuses and distractor responses. This is extremely disappointing.

Respectfully,

Judy L. Paulson
Dewlson Family Farm
Santa Maria, CA

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: sec8300@aol.com
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2020 5:08 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Grand Jury Report and Response

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.

The Board of Supervisors,

Why won't you listen to the people of Carpinteria and The Grand Jury?

The issues have been addressed numerous times and it appears you've chosen to ignore them. Why?

- 1. Create a Public Working Group and Enhanced public processes. The County's review of existing programs, permit issuance and oversight is not accessible to the public. Reforms are needed.**
- 2. Shine sunlight on the Board's meetings and sources of information. The Board can and should agree to disclose the substance of all meetings with lobbyists and interested parties.**
- 3. Agree to prevent future secret two member "ad hoc" committees. This flies in the face of public information laws, and has already lead to destructive consequences in our County.**
- 4. Create basic ethics reform for the County. Campaign contributions should not nakedly lead to political influence. We should follow the example of numerous counties and create basic campaign finance laws.**
- 5. Need for better environmental review. The current scheme has numerous flaws, and should not be relied on in individual cannabis permit approvals. Either revise and update the PEIR, or prepare better environmental review of each project.**
- 6. Additional Ordinance revisions are required to require odor control in AG-II areas, reduce allowable site coverage, address overconcentration issues, reform Carpinteria's rules for cannabis in antiquated greenhouses, narrow allowable non-conforming uses, reform how permits are granted to grows that have expanded legal non-conforming uses, and set clear boundaries and standards for odor from cannabis operations.**

The Board of Supervisors has *broken* the public trust and has failed in its mismanagement of the Cannabis Program. We are calling for additional reforms NOW!

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Anna Cronshaw <annacronshaw@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2020 6:02 PM
To: sbcob; Hart, Gregg; Williams, Das; Hartmann, Joan; Lavagnino, Steve; Melekian, Barney
Subject: Santa Barbara County's Board of Supervisors simply blow off the Grand Jury's year long investigation of the cannabis issue...

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 Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors,

It has been *incredibly painful* to observe how our own elected officials in Santa Barbara County have so poorly dealt with the cannabis issue here.

I had no idea when I voted to legalize the cultivation of marijuana in California in 2016 that our own County of Santa Barbara would be woefully ill-prepared and lack the responsible planning that would to be in place when proposition 64 did pass.

Beginning with word of heinous backroom meetings between Supervisor Das Williams, Supervisor Steve Lavagnino and many of the major players in the cannabis industry *during the time of the terrible mudslides that occurred in our South County after the dreadful Thomas fire* - which resulted in no coherent responsible planning by County officials for cannabis growing including: county codes, accountable/responsible permitting, grow size limitations and *requirements for the installation of filtration systems*.

What a relief it was to know that the Grand Jury was granted a year to gather information and create an extensive report with twelve well thought out recommendations for our Board of Supervisors to address.

It is imperative that that our County Board of Supervisors not rebut these recommendations - and embrace them wholeheartedly - for the well being of the people who reside in this county - especially those that live in the Carpinteria Valley.

Please show that the County Board of Supervisors can be responsive to their constituents needs - and work to put PEOPLE OVER PROFIT.

Sincerely,

Anna Cronshaw

Hidden Valley Lane

Santa Barbara, CA 93108

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Anna Carrillo <annacarp@cox.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 7:43 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Fwd: Board of Supervisors' Response to the Grand Jury Report with map of applications in Carpinteria Valley
Attachments: Grand Jury response.docx; ATT00001.htm; Screen Shot 2020-08-17 at 1.29.22 PM.png; ATT00002.htm

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.

I realize I sent this to the individual board members, but neglected it to send it you so it would be in the public record.

Thank you for any consideration given to me.

Anna Carrillo

Begin forwarded message:

From: Anna Carrillo <annacarp@cox.net>
Subject: Board of Supervisors' Response to the Grand Jury Report with map of applications in Carpinteria Valley
Date: September 21, 2020 at 1:05:31 PM PDT
To: mmiyasato@countyofsb.org, "Melekian, Barney" <bmelekian@countyofsb.org>, "Hart, Gregg" <ghart@countyofsb.org>, "Williams, Das" <dwilliams@countyofsb.org>, jhartmann@countyofsb.org, peter.adam@countyofsb.org, steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Anna Carrillo
Re: Your response to the Grand Jury Findings
September 21, 2020

As a 47 year resident of the Carpinteria Valley, I find it quite disturbing that your responses to the Grand Jury Findings are so WEAK! Most of the findings from the Grand Jury Report are exactly the ones many of the 20,000 residents here in Carpinteria have been complaining about for the last 2 ½ years.

The document presented to you only agrees with Findings #6 and 7 regarding the lack of vetting on the affidavits and the size of the initial parcels and concludes that it is not reasonable or warranted to pursue this. Why? Are these growers so inept that they don't have the records necessary to prove what they had prior to Jan. 19, 2016. All of the current 23 growers claiming this in Carpinteria NEED TO VERIFY THAT THEY WERE GROWING MEDICAL MARIJUANA PRIOR TO JAN. 19, 2016 AND WHAT THE PARCEL SIZE WAS. When these Coastal Development Permits are issued, they become PERMANENT. Why should they become permanent based on "cheating the system" and sloppy bookkeeping? Also of the 289 Provisional State Cultivation Licenses issued for Carpinteria, there are almost 100 that are now for Cultivation of Adult Cannabis. Under the non-conforming status granted there was to be no expansion of Medical Cultivation.

In the finding #11 re: no effective odor control at the boundary, the Recommendation for this is not adequate as residents in the Carpinteria Valley are still having issues with odor and the fix – the odor phase system being utilized. There are many pockets where the odor phase system is not working – I was standing next door to a site that had the vapor phase pipes but could still smell the skunky odor. Also many still report health issues from both the cannabis terpenes and the ingredients in the vapor-phase system. This is still a problem at Carpinteria High School. With our inverse air flow in the Carpinteria Valley this system is not workable when residents, teachers, and students are in such close proximity to these old greenhouses that need to vent. At the last Planning Commission meeting, a grower presented a system of sensors that is being developed to use sensors that would be able to measure what's in the air from the cultivation, the processing, and the vapor phase system. This monitoring needs to be done 24/7 rather than having to rely on neighborhood complaints and report it to the grower and the county immediately. Eventually there will probably be approximately an additional 300 tons of Ecosorb pumped into our air. No one knows the long-term consequence of this. Please require these sensors!

In Finding #1 re: Health Dept. presentation, I was at the July 11, 2017 meeting and do remember Dr. Dean discussing the health effects of consuming cannabis, nothing about the negative effects on those living nearby from the cultivation and processing. Since this was a good 6 months before the rush for signing affidavits Dec. 2017/Jan. 2018 and the issuance of 100s of temporary state licenses to cultivate, no one knew of the unintended consequence on

nearby residences. The first time anyone complained of odors was around Sept. 2017 and this illegal grow that was noticed was occurring just on one street.

How can you disagree with Finding #5 re: the overconcentration of cannabis production especially in the Carpinteria Valley on our two 4 mile stretches of roadways? We are already dealing with too much (currently 23 addresses) and there are many more applications (about 10 more) in the pipeline. Unless the greenhouses are sealed, there needs to be a reduction! According to the 9/1/2020 report there are currently 67 acres of active licensed cultivation in Carpinteria. No one knows for certain how many more acres those currently growing will be asking for in their permits. There are many growers who have unpermitted greenhouses and through the permitting process are being allowed to get permits for many of these. There are limits to how many greenhouses are to be permitted in the Area A and Area B of the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District and if all these unpermitted greenhouses are given permits the limit will be exceeded. Who is looking at that, when permit applications are done in a piecemeal approach? 186 acres in our small valley is way too much!

Recommendation 4a: It's nice to state that there have been changes made to the Land Use Development Code and Article II, the Coastal Zoning Ordinance, but there have been NO CHANGES made to Coastal Zone. "Preserve all existing requirements in the Coastal Zone of the unincorporated area of the county." As we are one of the areas most affected, and most densely populated, why are we left out? Remember the CDPs granted are PERMANENT!.

PLEASE AGREE TO MAKE SOME CHANGES TO YOUR RESPONSES TO THE GRAND JURY REPORT!

Thank you,
Anna Carrillo

Development Interacti...

[Click here to review the Adopted Cannabis Land Use Ordinances](#)

