

Lelia Loomis

Dist 1

From: Julie Patterson-Hunter
Sent: Tuesday, January 09, 2018 1:12 PM
To: Lelia Loomis
Subject: FW: CAG recommendations

RECEIVED

JAN 09 2018

From: Jo Ann Rebane [<mailto:jarebane@msn.com>]
Sent: Monday, January 08, 2018 5:29 PM
To: Hank Weston; Richard Anderson; Dan Miller; Ed Scofield; Heidi Hall
Subject: CAG recommendations

NEVADA COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

cc: CEO
Counsel
CDA

Comments on draft marijuana ordinance – recommendations of Citizens Advisory Group
19dec2017 report

I have read the entire CAG Draft Recommendations Report. As a non-recreational marijuana (RMJ) person, I don't see that the CAG recommendations have anything for me. I don't notice any "accommodation" to the non-RMJ community. The recommendations distinctly favor RMJ growers and users.

I see no reason to encourage/allow RMJ to be grown outdoors on any R-1 or RA parcel virtually anywhere in the county.

Most regrettable is the recommendation to permit commercial cultivation and commercial activity with slight regard to the cost of the necessary regulatory and enforcement apparatus the county would require. If the past informs the future, there is no assurance that illegal grows will disappear.

There is no reason to rush into inventing commercial regulations while California as a whole is in the infancy of permitted personal use of RMJ. Let other jurisdictions experiment with commercial RMJ first and learn from their experiences. If Nevada County leaps in as a pioneer, we will no doubt discover mistakes that will need to be corrected later and be costly to correct.

Given the complex tapestry of federal and state laws, I think it would be prudent to let some of those knotty issues settle before proceeding with anything more than allowing 6 plants indoors for personal use.

Jo Ann Rebane
Nevada City, CA

Lelia Loomis

District 4

From: Julie Patterson-Hunter
Sent: Tuesday, January 09, 2018 1:11 PM
To: Lelia Loomis
Subject: FW: Marijuana regulations

RECEIVED

JAN 09 2018

NEVADA COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

cc: CEO
Counsel
CDA

From: Tom Wolfe [mailto:tom.wolfe@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, January 08, 2018 6:40 PM
To: Hank Weston; Heidi Hall; Ed Scofield; Dan Miller; Richard Anderson
Subject: Marijuana regulations

Dear Supervisors

First, I live in Rough and Ready so I have already sent several comments to the Honorable Supervisor Weston, however, now I feel the need to reach out to all of you.

I attended a couple of the pot meetings so I know that really these were pro-pot meetings. The sheriffs even let one of the pro-pot guys who sat at the table towards the hall entrance openly display a side carried knife. (I know it was short enough to be legal in California), but really? Allow normal citizens to be intimidated?

So I am urging you to consider the regs carefully as what you do will greatly influence the future of Nevada County. I am personally for legalization, but I don't want to see Nevada County transformed into the dope capital of California. I would love to see our valley rice farmers growing 1000's of acres with the price driven down so far that none of the home based (and illegal) businesses survive.

But - this will not happen for some years, if ever. So in the interim we need to consider a few issues. I live on a small one lane private road. I am already directly bordered by two large grows - well over the nominal 12 plant current limit and both infringing the current setback requirements and permits. There is a third grow on our road but probably within the 12 plant limit. The two larger grows operate processing facilities as well - with concomitant chemical smells at the end of each grow cycle. Neither have permitted facilities or the specified setbacks. Our zoning is AG-5. I realize that this means farming is permitted, but there is farming and there is commercial farming. Our road, like most around here, is one lane and funded by the residents - it costs about \$2-3000/year to keep up. The largest grower refuses to support the road, even though their workers speed by 3-4 times per day and their bulldozers and heavy equipment ruined sections of the road during the grow construction a few years ago. The constant weekly propane truck refilling their heaters contributes to this road damage and noise. The smell is overwhelming down the whole road.

So my question is - are you going to allow the rural quality of life to go away in Nevada County to become the pot growing capital of California? There will be large scale, federally illegal, businesses in neighborhoods. If someone wants a COMMERCIAL grow then they should put it in a real commercial area - like the Simply Country farm store. Not on a small, private road.

Plus - we need to remember that in Nevada County the AG zoning was really for people to have horses, a few cows or sheep, and maybe a hobby fruit or vegetable sales deal. Only with ~\$1,000/lb products can a five acre parcel ever be a profitable farm. When the zoning was developed no one contemplated 5 acre parcels producing a million dollars per year of crops. "AG (General Agricultural). The AG District provides areas for farming, ranching, agricultural support facilities and services, low intensity uses, and open space." We need additional rules if growers want to have large scale grows: like business licenses (the marijuana license), some limits on the number of trips per day, some required taxes via property tax for "private road supplements" that go to the road associations. Really though, why should we allow commercial operations on private roads at all? This is totally unfair to the other road owners and users.

btw - 50 plants * \$4,000/plant * 4 harvests/year with lights = \$800,000/yr. Could be 5 harvests/year or a \$1,000,000 dollars a year. Making honey oil raises the profits substantially. We grow so much already that export is the big destination for all this marijuana. But, for \$800K/year lets say there is \$400K profit. I will absolutely bet that almost none of these people pay any income tax, or give 1099's to the workers, or pay their share of FICA. At an AGI of \$400K the state and federal tax, plus Social Security and Medicare would probably reach close to \$100K. To bad we get none of this. One can only hope that Jeff Sessions will sick the IRS on these people for real. I don't believe any of you or any of the other 95% of Nevada County would ever think of hiding a million dollars in income year after year. Why should we let these guys get away with it.

The biggest issue I see is that Nevada County has a pretty good tech destination story right now and with Bay Area minimum rents at ~\$1,600/month for a shared room and \$4,000/month for a two bedroom apartment, we could really attract some tech businesses. But if we are the dope growing capital we will not get any more tech business and we will soon look like Butte County, who by the way is really clamping down on growing. One quick browse through Google Earth will tell a tech executive this area is not worth it for their attention and certainly not their business. Any chance for attracting more high tech businesses like Telestream will evaporate in the haze of pot smoke, the stench of pot plants, the low life trimmigrants hanging around, and the greatly impaired quality of residential life. These businesses would inject real money into the economy, not the questionable reports the pot councils put out on the positive cash flow to the community.

Enforcement - enforcement of the rules is a complete joke. Within 2 miles on Google maps in less than a minute I can find maybe 20-30 large scale grows right now (>40 plants), all well beyond regulations. The helicopters fly over and I know people have complained to the sheriff multiple times but nothing ever happens. If you are not going to enforce the new provisions either then why bother.

And another last issue - don't you think it is about time that real estate agents start having to disclose all the grows on the same road in a neighborhood and perhaps within a 1000 ft radius. That will get a lot of attention as realtors start whining that normal people won't want to buy in dope areas.

I urge you to:

1. Banish large grows (greater than the state max of 6 plants) to really big properties on county roads.
2. Don't let processing of marijuana into oils occur in rural areas - the temptation to cheat is simply too high and the danger of fire is very real.
3. ENFORCE the rules. Let sheriffs walk past a closed gate without a warrant to inspect if there are reports of growing at the location. Let them use Google Earth to trigger an investigation!
4. Let county inspectors make compliance checks for all reported grows then fine and shut down violators.
5. Make non-licensed operations really really expensive and report violators to the IRS and FTB.
6. Please make a web site where we can check to see if our neighbors really have a valid marijuana license.

Thank you,
Tom Wolfe

Lelia Loomis

District 4

From: Julie Patterson-Hunter
Sent: Tuesday, January 09, 2018 1:11 PM
To: Lelia Loomis
Subject: FW: Proposed CAG Regulations
Attachments: CAG COMMENTS TO THE BOS.docx

RECEIVED

JAN 09 2018

NEVADA COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

cc: CEO
Counsel
CDA

From: Wade Freedle [<mailto:wfreedle1@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 09, 2018 10:04 AM
To: Ed Scofield
Subject: Proposed CAG Regulations

Dear Supervisor Scofield

I am a resident of District 4 in Nevada County and have been following the issue of pot for several years. I have attached my comments regarding the CAG recommendations for your review.

Wade Freedle

Comments on proposed pot regulations based on the current public sentiment in Nevada County

- 1) No outdoor grows should be allowed – favored by over 80% majority
- 2) No commercial grows should be allowed – favored by a majority
- 3) No retail activities, especially in residential areas – favored by a majority
- 4) Protect neighborhoods by restricting grows to a maximum of 6 indoors, and no grows outdoors
- 5) Retain all present regulations regarding pot; do not expand its presence in any manner in Nevada County

Lelia Loomis

Dist 4

From: Julie Patterson-Hunter
Sent: Tuesday, January 09, 2018 1:11 PM
To: Lelia Loomis
Subject: FW: Nevada County Marijuana Regulations

RECEIVED

JAN 09 2018

**NEVADA COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

*cc: CEO
Counsel
CDA*

From: susan tomlin [mailto:ssn_tomlin@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, January 08, 2018 7:27 PM
To: Hank Weston
Cc: Richard Anderson
Subject: Nevada County Marijuana Regulations

Dear Members of Nevada County Board of Supervisors:

Having been informed regarding the proposed regulations re marijuana cultivation, I am steadfastly opposed to allowing this kind of marijuana cultivation in Nevada County. I am opposed not only for the views already expressed by our citizens who may be in close proximity to these marijuana fields, but also for the immoral absurdity of showing our impressionable children that we would vote for something that could ultimately harm them. Please stay strong and represent us in a manner that we all will be proud of. Please do not listen to the big money interests. They do not care about us or our precious children. Let us keep Nevada County clean and safe!

Thank you for listening! I care and I know you do also!

Susan Tomlin
19745 Chaparral Circle
Penn Valley, CA 95946

530-802-5066

Lelia Loomis

NEVADA COUNTY RESIDENT

From: Julie Patterson-Hunter
Sent: Tuesday, January 09, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Lelia Loomis
Subject: FW: Constituent Message

RECEIVED

JAN 09 2018

NEVADA COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

From: Jeffrey Thorsby
Sent: Tuesday, January 9, 2018 10:02 AM
To: Ed Scofield <Ed.Scofield@co.nevada.ca.us>; Hank Weston <Hank.Weston@co.nevada.ca.us>; Richard Anderson <Richard.Anderson@co.nevada.ca.us>; Heidi Hall <Heidi.Hall@co.nevada.ca.us>; Dan Miller <Dan.Miller@co.nevada.ca.us>
Cc: Julie Patterson-Hunter <Julie.Patterson-Hunter@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: Constituent Message

cc: CEO
Counsel
CDA

Honorable Supervisors,

I just received a voice message from a constituent that identified himself as Steve. He did not provide any contact information for himself or identify which district he is located in. His concern was that the Board should not approve any cannabis ordinance that allows 100 plant or more per property. Unfortunately, I was not able to explain to him that the Board is not taking action on this at this time but rather only hearing the recommendations from the CAG.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you.

Jeffrey Thorsby

Senior Administrative Analyst/Privacy & Security Officer
Nevada County Board of Supervisors
950 Maidu Ave
Nevada City, CA 95959
Privacy Office: 530-265-1632
Office: 530-265-7247
Mobile: 530-913-3578
E-mail: jeffrey.thorsby@co.nevada.ca.us



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.