

January 10, 2023

Dist 4

Board of Supervisors
Nevada County California
950 Maidu Avenue Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959-7902

Sent via email: BOS.publiccomment@nevadacountyca.gov

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Danette Davis, and I am a registered nurse at [REDACTED] in Grass Valley. [REDACTED] is a skilled nursing facility that takes care of children and adults, with specialized medical needs, in a daycare-like setting. I am also a member of the American Cannabis Nurses Association and have completed the Medical Cannabis Curriculum for Nurses through the Medical Cannabis Institute.

My first real introduction into cannabis medication was with my experience providing nursing care for [REDACTED] whom I'm sure many of you are familiar with. His father, [REDACTED] has been a huge advocate for medical cannabis reform in Nevada County, speaking openly and publicly about his journey with his son and the huge impact medical cannabis has had not only in saving his son's life, but also in improving his quality of life, as well as the quality of life for his entire family.

His story is not uncommon when it comes to the life altering changes that can happen for a family with a child that has complex medical needs, when they are able to have consistent, affordable, and clean access to medical cannabis, in formulations that are accessible for the patient to use. Many times these children and adults that have multiple medical diagnoses that require them to have skilled nursing support, require cannabis dosages that are much much higher in concentration than the average patient. These large quantities can make it extremely cost prohibitive for families to purchase from local dispensaries, and it is additionally very difficult for families to find consistent supply in quantities that their child requires for therapeutic benefit.

As I'm sure you can imagine, these families are inundated with the day to day responsibility of caring for their child's complex needs, and the option of growing their child's own medication and processing it into a usable form can be overwhelming at best.

So, I am writing today in hopes of reminding us all of the critically important medical benefits of cannabis and the patient need that exists here within our community. The

medical patients I work with depend on cannabis medication to support their medical needs and improve their quality of life. For some patients, its the difference from having to be at home, isolated with constant hospital visits versus being an active participant in a community program where they have friends and are able to engage in social group without putting their health at risk. None of this would be possible for these families without the incredible Compassion Program created by the Nevada County Cannabis Alliance and its member businesses. The success and continued operation of our local cannabis supply chain is critical to these families' lives.

I am hopeful that the board of supervisors will adopt the proposed ordinance changes and the recommendations provided by the Nevada County Cannabis Alliance. Supporting these farmers in their success has ripple effects throughout our community that are often overlooked and go unseen. I hope I can be a reminder of some of these impacts and why this is so important.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kindest Regards,
Danette Davis

From: [Menkin Nelson](#)
To: [BOS Public Comment](#)
Subject: Proposed changes to ordinance 2467
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 3:17:44 PM
Attachments: [2023.1.09. Board of Supervisors Meeting public comment notes.docx](#)

Dist 1

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello Supervisors,

My name is Menkin Nelson and I have the pleasure of being a business owner, a home owner and voter, all within District 1.

Thank you for considering the proposed changes to the Ordinance. The intent to help the struggling small farmers in our community is evident, as well as the importance of the county's ascetics and working to protect our community from large, 'in your face' monocrop cultivation. I believe the changes proposed are in line with the community's needs and legal limitations of the established EIR18-0001 and appreciate the broad awareness towards the fledgling industry and the value it adds to our economy.

Some areas that I feel were left out, could be improved on, or should be thought about further in the proposed ordinance changes are:

Pg. 19, Section K-1) Micro Businesses with retail allowed 1000sf outside of the support area.

Proposed verbiage states that 1000sf of retail space would be considered as part of the support area, however the general plan already allows for retail on AG land, so why is it also proposed to be constrained to the limits of the cannabis specific Environmental Impact Review? Furthermore, site specific CEQA evaluations are required for the retail spaces under the Conditional Use Permit.

Many operating cultivation sites have already built their support buildings/areas to the 90% limit and are utilizing all the space for the support activities, as intended, and would hinder their operations if they removed the ability to complete those actions now. Additionally, retail spaces have different CA Building code requirements than storage, so many of the recently built cannabis support buildings would not meet the retail California Building Code requirements.

I believe that the county has a great opportunity to pull in retail dollars with micro licenses near county lines.

For example; In the case of a cultivator located next to the Yuba county line they could potentially pull a lot of retail into the county from the Yuba City/Marysville area consumers, who currently go to dispensaries in Palermo, Oroville or Chico instead of driving all the way across the county into Nevada City or Grass Valley. Those are lost dollars to the farmers and community.

Under the micro license, 1000sf retail spaces outside of the established support area would not only add revenue into both the county and the farmers pockets but would be compliant with environmental regulations and Project Use Permits.

Page 12; E.2) states:

The following setbacks apply to all Cannabis Cultivation sites regardless of purpose or Cultivation method: a. For all External, Non-shared Premises Property Lines: 100 linear feet measured from the edge of the Canopy Area to the adjacent property lines for canopy sizes under 10,001 square feet.

150 linear feet measured from the edge of the Canopy Area to the adjacent property lines for canopy sizes 10,001 - 20,000 square feet. 200 linear feet measured from the edge of the Canopy Area to the adjacent property lines for canopy sizes 20,001 - 40,000 square feet. b. For all External, Non-Shared Premises Property Lines: 100 linear feet measured from the edge of any Support Area to the adjacent property lines for canopies sizes under 10,001 square feet. 150 linear feet measured from the edge of the Support Area to the adjacent property lines for canopy sizes 10,001 - 20,000 square feet. 200 linear feet measured from the edge of the Support Area to the adjacent property lines for canopy sizes 20,001 - 40,000 square feet

The revised set back rules should only apply to new applicants, as they directly prohibit established cultivators from expanding, which in turn only gives the larger square foot benefit to new (not yet developed) cultivation sites. Newly proposed setbacks need to apply to new applications only. As a back-up option, the variance process should apply to farmers needing to meet new setback requirements.

I also believe there should only be a 100' setback to support facilities that are enclosed, have filtered ventilation and are non-light producing, as they do not show any exterior signs of cannabis use and already have a setback distance 3 times that of other non-descript commercial structures.

Independent EIR option)

An ability to conduct an independent Environmental Impact Review would help to move cultivation outside of AG zoning and away from already established neighborhoods. Independent EIRs meet the established CEQA requirements, verify the project, or group of projects, validity and allow for existing homestead growers who have been in our community for decades to participate in the legal cultivation program.

We must accept that the existing EIR18-0001 creates some limitations that make it implausible to compete with the size of cultivation sites across the state, and now country. Independent EIRs that could be conducted by regions, communities or large acreage landholders would allow for initiative to create new regionalized regulation. An easy example is the Ridge Region where many parcels are exempt because they are zoned TPZ, yet members of our community have cultivated away from sensitive neighbors for decades without drawing attention or conflict, while fiscally supporting the local economy; providing jobs and homesteading to increase the property values across the county. If a series of parcels was able to band together and complete an independent EIR, a lengthy and costly process, that verified their cultivation styles and locations were not detrimental to the environment or surrounding areas and gain CEQA approval, wouldn't we rather let these outcroppings of communities keep their livelihood and help us to thrive?

Allowing independent EIRs could open the possibility of influx and I would suggest creating this allowance only to those with pre-determined minimum requirements, that may include; existing land ownership, business ownership or established residency for defined term. Independent EIRs for our existing cultivators could also help navigate the conflict between a County wide increased square footage allowance that barely nudges a cultivator into the next State license type, typically about three times the price increase for the license fee. For many, especially in this tenuous market, any expansion would only make sense if you're able to maximize your costly state license fee dollars.

As always, thank you for your time and taking actions on behalf of your community members!

Sincerely,

Menkin Nelson



January 10, 2023

Board of Supervisors
Nevada County California
950 Maidu Avenue Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959-7902

Sent via email: BOS.publiccomment@nevadacountyca.gov

Hello Supervisors,

My name is Menkin Nelson and I have the pleasure of being a business owner, a home owner and voter, all within District 1.

Thank you for considering the proposed changes to the Ordinance. The intent to help the struggling small farmers in our community is evident, as well as the importance of the county's ascetics and working to protect our community from large, 'in your face' monocrop cultivation. I believe the changes proposed are in line with the community's needs and legal limitations of the established EIR18-0001 and appreciate the broad awareness towards the fledgling industry and the value it adds to our economy.

Some areas that I feel were left out, could be improved on, or should be thought about further in the proposed ordinance changes are:

Pg. 19, Section K-1) Microbusinesses with retail allowed 1000sf outside of the support area.

Proposed verbiage states that 1000sf of retail space would be considered as part of the support area, however the general plan already allows for retail on AG land, so why is it also proposed to be constrained to the limits of the cannabis specific Environmental Impact Review? Furthermore, site specific CEQA evaluations are required for the retail spaces under the Conditional Use Permit.

Many operating cultivation sites have already built their support buildings/areas to the 90% limit and are utilizing all the space for the support activities, as intended, and would hinder their operations if they removed the ability to complete those actions now. Additionally, retail spaces have different CA Building code requirements than storage, so many of the recently built cannabis support buildings would not meet the retail California Building Code requirements.

I believe that the county has a great opportunity to pull in retail dollars with micro licenses near county lines. For example; In the case of a cultivator located next to the Yuba county line they could potentially pull a lot of retail into the county from the Yuba City/Marysville area consumers, who currently go to dispensaries in Palermo, Oroville or Chico instead of driving all the way across the county into Nevada City or Grass Valley. Those are lost dollars to the farmers and community.

Under the micro license, 1000sf retail spaces outside of the established support area would not only add revenue into both the county and the farmers pockets but would compliant with environmental regulations and Project Use Permits.

On Page 12; E.2) states:

The following setbacks apply to all Cannabis Cultivation sites regardless of purpose or Cultivation method: a. For all External, Non-shared Premises Property Lines: 100 linear feet measured from the edge of the Canopy Area to the adjacent property lines for canopy sizes under 10,001 square feet. 150 linear feet measured from the edge of the Canopy Area to the adjacent property lines for canopy sizes 10,001 - 20,000 square feet. 200 linear feet measured from the edge of the Canopy Area to the adjacent property lines for canopy sizes 20,001 - 40,000 square feet. b. For all External, Non-

Shared Premises Property Lines: 100 linear feet measured from the edge of any Support Area to the adjacent property lines for canopies sizes under 10,001 square feet. 150 linear feet measured from the edge of the Support Area to the adjacent property lines for canopy sizes 10,001 - 20,000 square feet. 200 linear feet measured from the edge of the Support Area to the adjacent property lines for canopy sizes 20,001 - 40,000 square feet

The revised set back rules should only apply to new applicants, as they directly prohibit established cultivators from expanding, which in turn only gives the larger square foot benefit to new (not yet developed) cultivation sites. Newly proposed setbacks need to apply to new applications only. As a back-up option, the variance process should apply to farmers needing to meet new setback requirements.

I also believe there should only be a 100' setback to support facilities that are enclosed, have filtered ventilation and are non-light producing, as they do not show any exterior signs of cannabis use and already have a setback distance 3 times that of other non-descript commercial structures.

Independent EIR option)

An ability to conduct an independent Environmental Impact Review would help to move cultivation outside of AG zoning and away from already established neighborhoods. Independent EIRs meet the established CEQA requirements, verify the project, or group of projects,' validity and allow for existing homestead growers who have been in our community for decades to participate in the legal cultivation program.

We must accept that the existing EIR18-0001 creates some limitations that make it implausible to compete with the size of cultivation sites across the state, and now country. Independent EIRs that could be conducted by regions, communities or large acreage landholders would allow for initiative to create new regionalized regulation. An easy example is the Ridge Region where many parcels are exempt because they are zoned TPZ, yet members of our community have cultivated away from sensitive neighbors for decades without drawing attention or conflict, while fiscally supporting the local economy; providing jobs and homesteading to increase the property values across the county. If a series of parcels was able to band together and complete an independent EIR, a lengthy and costly process, that verified their cultivation styles and locations were not detrimental to the environment or surrounding areas and gain CEQA approval, wouldn't we rather let these outcroppings of communities keep their livelihood and help us to thrive?

Allowing independent EIRs could open the possibility of influx and I would suggest creating this allowance only to those with pre-determined minimum requirements, that may include; existing land ownership, business ownership or established residency for defined term. Independent EIRs for our existing cultivators could also help navigate the conflict between a County wide increased square footage allowance that barely nudges a cultivator into the next State license type, typically about three times the price increase for the license fee. For many, especially in this tenuous market, any expansion would only make sense if you're able to maximize your costly state license fee dollars.

As always, thank you for your time and taking actions on behalf of your community members!

Sincerely,

Menkin Nelson

