

MAR 07 2018

NEVADA COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

License Categories

Category	Outdoor	Indoor	Mixed-Light
Specialty Cottage	Up to 25 mature plants	Up to 500 sq ft	Up to 2,500 sq ft
Specialty	Up to 5,000 sq ft or up to 50 mature plants	Up to 5,000 sq ft	Up to 5,000 sq ft
Small	5,001-10,000 sq ft	5,001-10,000 sq ft	5,001-10,000 sq ft
Medium (limited)	10,001 sq ft to 1 acre	10,001-22,000 sq ft	10,001-22,000 sq ft
Large (Not issued until 2023)	Greater than 1 acre	Greater than 22,000 sq ft	Greater than 22,000 sq ft
Nursery	No size limit defined in statute (no canopy)		
Processor	Conducts only trimming, drying, curing, grading, or packaging of cannabis and nonmanufactured cannabis products		

Julie Patterson-Hunter

From: Julie Patterson-Hunter
Sent: Tuesday, March 6, 2018 2:41 PM
To: All BOS Board Members
Cc: Rick Haffey; Alison Lehman; Alison Barratt-Green; Sean Powers; Mali Dyck
Subject: FW: Cannabis Ordinance

Importance: High

Dist 1

From: Ed Scofield
Sent: Tuesday, March 6, 2018 2:16 PM
To: Julie Patterson-Hunter <Julie.Patterson-Hunter@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: FW: Cannabis Ordinance
Importance: High

From: Rosemary Metrailler [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2018 11:24 AM
To: Ed Scofield
Subject: Cannabis Ordinance
Importance: High

Ed - As you know, I served on the CAG and have been a small business attorney with special interest in agriculture related clients for over 40 years. I'm writing you now because I'm unable to attend today's meetings and want to address one issue for your thinking today and going forward.

I am VERY concerned about the abrupt change from 2 to 3 acres as the minimum grow site for small licensees. After much deliberation, we on CAG came to majority agreement that 2 acres should be permitted. At the start of the last BOS meeting, even Richard Anderson started out saying he agreed with the 2 acre limit. Then at the very end of that discussion, it was abruptly changed to 3 acres. Some on the CAG had tried to do this also at the last minute, and I urge you to reconsider this.

Ed, we had many local farmers who come to our meetings over all these past months and pleaded with us to allow smaller grows and to keep this industry with the small farmers in our county. These are folks who have been farming here for many years and who desperately want to come into compliance. They urged us to recognize the critical difference in our county between 2 and 3 acres for small grows and 4 and 5 acres for slightly larger ones. As a local business attorney, I know how much these farmers bring to our local economy. I'm talking about local non-cannabis businesses, ones that support our families, groceries, restaurants, hardware stores, and all kinds of retail, arts and entertainment. I'm talking about their impact way before we even consider the taxes that authorized farmers could add to our public coffers.

PLEASE revisit this, remember to use the CAG after all our investment in that process, and reconsider allowing smaller minimums so that the folks who have tried so hard to be part of developing a good ordinance are rewarded for their dedication and courage in coming forward. Please don't let the BOS craft another ordinance that hurts local businesses, including our farmers. Please urge the BOS to support the small farmers!

Thanks for listening, and thank you especially for holding this morning's special meeting to get more community input.
Best regards, Rosemary

Rosemary Metrailer



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This E-mail is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 2510-2521 and is legally privileged. This E-Mail message may contain confidential and/or privileged information meant for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any review, disclosure, use, or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorized to receive for a recipient), PLEASE contact me by return E-Mail or phone at (530)263-7616 and delete all copies of this message and any attachment(s).

Julie Patterson-Hunter

From: Julie Patterson-Hunter
Sent: Tuesday, March 6, 2018 8:55 AM
To: All BOS Board Members
Cc: Rick Haffey; Alison Lehman; Alison Barratt-Green; Sean Powers; Mali Dyck
Subject: FW: Tuesday's meeting to "hear more from the community"

Dist 2

From: Ed Scofield
Sent: Tuesday, March 6, 2018 8:38 AM
To: Julie Patterson-Hunter <Julie.Patterson-Hunter@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: FW: Tuesday's meeting to "hear more from the community"

From: Norton Lehner [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2018 8:39 PM
To: Ed Scofield
Subject: Tuesday's meeting to "hear more from the community"

Hello, Ed,

This morning's Union announced the "Special cannabis meeting" tomorrow at 9:00 am at the Rood Center. I suspect that there will be a large contingent from the cannabis community to demand an ordinance that is lax, and is weak on penalty language.

The cannabis community will probably, as usual, outnumber the opponents, since most of the opponents are conscientious citizens who have real jobs. The pot community voices will undoubtedly overwhelm the others..

I will be unable to attend (I have a job), so would like to express my suggestions to the Board through you. I recognize that pot is here to stay, but I believe that we can control the detrimental impacts of the pot culture by:

- avoiding the severe problems being experienced by neighboring counties (Siskiyou, Yuba, Butte, Stanislaus, et al.).
- designing an ordinance that considers the impact on real neighborhoods, and protects our youth.
- passing an ordinance that imposes severe penalties (enough to negate the profit motive) for violation of the ordinance.

I also recognize that the Nevada County Board of Supervisors may be marching to the Prop 64 music, rather than acknowledging, from a Federal level, that:

- Marijuana is still a DEA Schedule I Controlled Substance
- Marijuana is still a dangerous and addictive drug
- Marijuana is still illegal

The pot community that has continually ignored the Federal, State and Local laws in the past, will continue to ignore them in the future, unless the consequences of their lawlessness negate their profits.

I hope that you, and the other Board members, will consider this message when considering the demands of the pot community.

Thanks,

Norton Lehner



Julie Patterson-Hunter

From: Julie Patterson-Hunter
Sent: Tuesday, March 6, 2018 2:44 PM
To: All BOS Board Members
Cc: Rick Haffey; Alison Lehman; Alison Barratt-Green; Sean Powers; Mali Dyck
Subject: FW: Commercial Cannabis grow in the Ranchos

Dist 2

-----Original Message-----

From: DEIDRA Head [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 6, 2018 2:43 PM
To: bdofsupervisors <bdofsupervisors@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: Commercial Cannabis grow in the Ranchos

To the Board of Supervisors.

My name is DEIDRA Head and I live in the Ranchos. I've been here for almost 3 years now. I am aware of the possibility of a commercial Pot grow in our neighborhood. I attended the last Board meeting a few weeks ago and my father Tom Head spoke against having pot grows in our neighborhoods. I was unable to attend the meeting today as I had to work. It's not reasonable to expect people to keep taking time off of work to attend the meetings to fight this. Every single person in our neighborhood is against this. We don't want the additional crime, traffic, and possible contamination of our ground water from pesticides and whatever other products the growers use. This is in addition to the massive waste of water they use to water their crops while we are in a severe drought. We already have enough crime and traffic with the house on Ramada around the corner from us. There are plenty of rural areas where the growers can grow and not disturb a neighborhood with many families and small children. The smell alone is a huge concern. We also have a school very close to us. Please do not allow any large scale grows in our neighborhood or surrounding areas.

Thank you
Deidra Head

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

Nevada County Zoning and Parcel Information:

		Percent of total
Total number of parcels in Nevada County	64505	100.00%
Total number of RA parcels with improvement value over \$50K	58,870	91.26%
Total number of RA parcels - over 5 acres	1806	2.80%
		2.79%
Total Percentage of RA Estate parcels as a percentage of RA parcels		
Largest: 136 acres, smallest .01 acres		
Number of RA parcels above 4000' in elevation:	2119	
Total number of RA parcels remaining above 5 acres, with improvement value above \$50,000, and below 4000' in elevation available for 95+% of cultivation:		
	215	0.33%
Total number of AG parcels	4204	6.52%
Number of other zoned parcels	1,431	2.22%

RECEIVED

MAR 06 2018

NEVADA COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors – Public Comment 3.6.18

Mark Schaefer

RECEIVED

MAR 07 2018

NEVADA COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Tier Minimum Parcel for State Licenses

CAG Recommendations:

For outdoor and mixed light on **Ag zones:**

Require a minimum parcel size of 3 acres for Specialty Cottage (25 plants)

Require a minimum parcel size of 5 acres for Specialty Outdoor or Specialty Mixed Light (5000 square feet)

Require a minimum parcel size of 10 acres for Small Outdoor or Specialty Mix light. (10,000)

Scaled down recommendations for Outdoor and Mix Light **Res Ag – Rural:**

No cultivation on less than 5 acres.

Require a minimum parcel size of 5 acres for Specialty Cottage (25 plants)

Require a minimum parcel size of 10 acres for Specialty Outdoor (5,000 square feet).

MAR 07 2018

NEVADA COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

March 6, 2018

I want to thank you for the support of the CAG process in the last year and your openness to regulating cannabis in our county. We are all encouraged by this dialog.

What I would like to comment on is the proposal of granting Commercial Medical licenses only in Nevada County's first ordinance.

First, it is important to understand the distinction between Non-remunerative medical growing and Commercial medical cultivation. I won't go into this differentiation at this point since it is or will be covered by other folks. What I would like to focus on are the two types of Commercial licenses granted by the state: Medical and Adult-Use.

Per legislation, State Commercial Cultivation Regulations are exactly the same for Medical and Adult-Use licenses. This includes security, water, track and trace, and testing requirements. It does not matter if you are growing for the Adult-Use market or for the Medical market.

The major distinction in the two Commercial license types is only where our product can be sold.

My farm grows THC and CBD strains. Both are needed by patients in the Medical market and both are desired by people in Adult-Use market - for mostly the same reasons. For example, a patient who has been diagnosed with PTSD uses a certain strain for anxiety. And my next-door neighbor rolls a joint of the exact same strain and takes a puff to relax after work. We would like our medicine to be available for both types of clients.

It is already difficult for small cultivators to compete in this new market, especially due to the removal of the one-acre cap. By limiting Commercial licenses to Medical only, small farmers will be excluded from a large segment of the market that will be fully exploited by large commercial enterprises. Right now, Medical is a 20-year established market with clear avenues of distribution. However, the University of California Agricultural Resource Center projects that within one year the Medical market will account for only 9% of total sales. **

<http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-pol-ca-pot-economic-study-20170611-story.html>

You may hear that Medical only will reduce the green rush. This is a false statement. None of us want the green rush. However, limiting the county permits to just Medical will only reduce market access for our local farmers. We can reduce the green rush by having residency requirements, limiting the size of allowably cultivation to only the small licenses types and also by limiting the number of licenses that one entity can hold to four.

We recognize that county staff is spread thin and are working diligently to have the ordinance completed in the Spring, At the last meeting staff told you that it would be better to put off Adult-Use to expedite the ordinance. In reality, allowing both Commercial Adult-Use and

Medical licenses will result in no additional resources, time or money. It comes down to a question of supporting measures that will help assure our local farmers are successful. Please do not create unnecessary barriers to entry into the marketplace for farmers. If farmers are allowed to grow but have additional barriers to enter the marketplace they won't be as likely to succeed, and the money and time the county has spent on this process will be a waste of taxpayer money.

We are requesting you to be forward-thinking and not limit our Nevada County cultivators to the Commercial Medical market only. By including Commercial Adult-use permits, you will give us a chance to diversify and to sell our product legally in all available markets. Without Medical and Adult-use licenses, the chance of unregulated cultivation is more likely. The incentive to enter the regulated market could be diluted by limiting our market share and may force some cultivators back to a gray/black market.

Thank you so much for the opportunity to voice these concerns and for your ongoing willingness to encourage our small farmers to enter the regulated market.

Patricia Rockwell
District 4