

APR 11 2017

NEVADA COUNTY  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
EACH SUPERVISOR HAS

Nevada County Cannabis Alliance  
419 Broad Street, Suite C  
Nevada City, CA 95959  
diana@nccannabisalliance.org

April 11, 2017

My name is Diana Gamzon and I live in Nevada City, I am the Executive Director of the Nevada County Cannabis Alliance, an advocacy group working to promote collaborative cannabis regulation in Nevada County. We represent over 300 members who are eager to comply with reasonable cannabis regulations and who have been anticipating the process with MIG to begin.

We commend the Board of Supervisors and county staff for initiating the process of developing reasonable regulations that take into account the needs and desires of all community members. We support the approval of the MIG, Inc contract on today's agenda.

For nearly the past two years, our organization has been meeting with community leaders, elected officials, law enforcement and a variety of stakeholders to understand ways that we can create solutions together surrounding cannabis in our county. We believe in collaborative policy that addresses all concerns.

The Cannabis Alliance submits the following questions and recommendations for your consideration to ensure full transparency is part of the stakeholder process and that the will of the voters who defeated Measure W is being fully considered in the process.

- We noticed the resolution indicates that the long term ordinance will address cannabis cultivation and "other cannabis related activities". We would like to clarify the nature of these other activities. Will this ordinance address the county's regulation of dispensaries, manufacturing facilities, testing labs, or other businesses associated with the production of cannabis or distribution? We recommend that the stakeholder process assess all of the cannabis license types defined by state regulations.
- The county resolution identifies MIG as an independent professional facilitator. We are assuming that they are impartial but it is not clearly stated in the document. The contract requires MIG to act as an expert witness in any third-party action arising out of the contract. Could you clarify the intention of this provision?

- MIG has committed to having a balance of representatives on the CAG. How is balance being determined? The views on cannabis in our county are more nuanced than pro cannabis and anti cannabis. Election results of Measure W and Prop. 64, should be considered in determining the formula for what comprises a balanced CAG.
- It appears that the various CAG members will be together during the CAG meetings. Unless it is already a priority of the County and MIG, we believe that co-education of various stakeholders and the breaking down of stereotypes and misconceptions is essential. We look forward to the process of building bridges within our community together.
- Recommendations will be delivered to the BOS by the end of 2017. MIG is engaged until April 2018. What will their role be between delivering the recommendations and the passing of the new ordinance?
- We recommend that summaries of interviews with Community Interest Groups be published to the CAG members before the first CAG meeting.
- We recommend that in identifying presenters for CAG meetings, MIG and county staff select presenters from a balanced perspective.
- We recommend that documentation resulting from CAG Meetings be retained by the County for public audit.

Thank you.