

## CANNABIS COUNTY ORDINANCE WORKSHEET #2

### Preliminary CAG Comments and Directions

#### Observations from CAG Worksheet #2

Worksheet #2 was distributed at CAG Meeting #6 on August 8 and CAG members were asked to submit their responses by August 22. CAG members were asked to reflect on potential revisions of the cannabis ordinance and provide comments and directions. The intent was to provide an opportunity for CAG members to continue to formulate opinions and determine their level of agreement with various topics that could be included in a revised ordinance. The level of agreement was based on the following scale:

#### Level of Agreement Scale

6 = I fully agree

5 = I find it acceptable and believe it is the best option available

4 = I can live with this direction, but I am not that enthusiastic about it

3 = I do not agree, but will go with the wisdom of the group and not oppose this

2 = I do not feel we have any unity of opinion on this topic and more discussion is needed

1 = I disagree with this direction

For each of the 12 topics included in the worksheet, CAG members provided a broad range of comments and suggestions concerning zoning restrictions and regulations for cannabis cultivation and indicated their level of agreement. We have highlighted some examples of comments that can inform our discussion topics. Please note: the statements below represent the initial opinions and include a sample of the comments. They do not represent any level of real or implied agreement nor do they represent initial recommendations of the CAG. A summary by topic is provided below. The full transcription of the worksheets follows this section. Please note that CAG members did not always indicate a level of agreement for each topic or provide a written comment so the number of responses and comments per topic varies. Also, the scale should not be used to suggest an average or median response that relates to the level of agreement.

**Topic 1: prohibiting outdoor activity in R1, R2, R3.**

- In favor of prohibiting in R2 and R3, need more discussion about R1.
- This prohibition is considered unwise.
- Agreement with existing ordinance.
- Need to distinguish commercial and noncommercial activity.
- Must consider property owner rights.
- Consider allowing 3 outdoor plants in certain circumstances, for example in R1.

Level of Agreement	1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of responses	2	3	1	1	2	7

**Topic 2: designating select areas where cultivation is allowed**

- Agree if total square foot area limits are added.
- Zoning should be primary consideration.
- Duplicative of existing regulation.
- Need more discussion.
- Land use and zoning are best tools to determine cultivation areas.

Level of Agreement	1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of responses	2	4	2	0	1	5

**Topic 3: requiring permit for personal grows beyond 6 plants**

- Very appropriate requirement.
- Should be sensitive to costs to discourage noncompliance.
- Depends whether indoor or outdoor.
- Permit should also be issued for 6 plants.
- Growing more than 6 plants should not be allowed.
- Permit should only be required for grows beyond 500 sq/ft.
- Requiring a permit for under 6 plants would be a burden on county staff.

Level of Agreement	1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of responses	2	5	1	2	0	5

**Topic 4: requiring residence on cultivation site**

- Not a necessary nor reasonable requirement.
- Agree and the owner should be the holder of the grow permit.
- Depends on the zoning requirements for residential areas.
- Agree because guarantees the grower's responsibility vis-a-vis the community.
- Should be a way to discourage more development.
- Residences help with sanitation, security and commitment to the community.
- May need more nuanced provision allowing for some flexibility.

Level of Agreement	1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of responses	0	5	2	0	2	7

**Topic 5: allowing a transition period for construction of a residence**

- Opposed to transition period – residence should be built first.
- Those in favor of allowing a transition period, most agree that 2 to 3 years is reasonable.
- Should be allowed to encourage growers to come into compliance.

Level of Agreement	1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of responses	5	1	0	1	3	6

**Topic 6: maintaining 600 ft setbacks from school bus stops, school evacuation sites, churches etc.**

- Setbacks don't make sense for school bus stop or evacuation sites – should be reduced.
- Setbacks should consider slope, natural and manmade barriers etc.
- Larger setbacks would be more appropriate, for instance 1000 ft.
- Advertising restrictions should be in place.
- As long as visibility and security requirements are addressed, agree with 600 ft. setbacks.

Level of Agreement	1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of responses	4	3	1	1	0	5

**Topic 7 – County should conduct an environmental capacity analysis**

- Study would rest on many assumptions and estimates.
- In agreement, essential to have more data on the subject.
- Important, especially to better understand water use.

Level of Agreement	1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of responses	1	2	2	1	2	8

**Topic 8 – limiting the number of medical use cultivation permits**

- The limit should be determined by the number of sites that can be pro-actively enforced.
- Concerned with the level of limitation.
- Compliance with state regulations and other restrictions should limit this naturally.
- Opposed because it will discourage growers from coming into compliance.
- Limiting the number of permits is important for the community.

Level of Agreement	1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of responses	3	5	0	2	2	4

**Topic 9 – limiting the number of adult use cultivation permits**

- Many comments similar to those for topic 8.
- In agreement for commercial application.
- No commercial licenses should be allowed in NC.

Level of Agreement	1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of responses	0	5	1	1	2	6

**Topic 10 – developing a permit allocation process**

- General agreement with permit allocation process based on residency.
- Residency requirements might be unconstitutional.

Level of Agreement	1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of responses	1	4	1	0	0	9

**Topic 11 – establishing a permit fee and fine structure for non-compliance**

- If there is a reasonable path to compliance.
- Fines must be high to be effective and discourage non-compliance.
- “Short timeframe” for self-compliance needs to be defined.

Level of Agreement	1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of responses	0	4	2	0	2	8

**Topic 12 – identifying potential funding sources for public education programs**

- Funds should be raised by fees and taxes related to cannabis activity.
- Public education programs are important and should be industry funded.
- Such programs are already funded by state cannabis revenue.

Level of Agreement	1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of responses	2	4	2	0	1	6

## Full transcription of worksheet responses by item

### TOPIC 1 - The County should consider prohibiting outdoor cannabis activity (medical and adult use) in areas zoned R1, R2 and R3.

Level of Agreement	Comments
6	
2	I think we need further discussion on all of these but will respond with my current positions. On this specific topic, I think it should be prohibited in R2 & R3. Not so sure about R1.
2	Especially for medical cannabis folks, this seems extremely unwise; should be other ways to protect neighbors' sensibilities and allow reasonable activity where possible, neighbors don't mind, etc.
6	The highest concentration of nuisance reporting will always come from the greatest concentration of people and residences. I strongly believe outdoor grows should be prohibited from these zoning designations. Neighbors DO NOT want this.
6	I agree with NC existing cannabis ordinance. Nevada County cannot keep up with existing compliance checks due to neighbor nuisance calls, assess to theft, environmental impact. Water use, effects of water diversion, waste discharge, and ground water is my biggest concern.
1	The differentiation is not between medicinal and adult, both are responsibly grown the exact same way. The distinctions that need to be made are with commercial and noncommercial. Noncommercial, personal use must be allowed for medical reasons.
6/2	The smell from those who are non-compliant continues to be a major problem in several areas in our communities. This should apply to all "R" zoned areas.
2	Need more discussion around personal grows on R1. Would agree outdoor should be prohibited on R2/R3.
6	Property owners should be aware of zoning regulations when they purchase their property. It would be unfair to change these regulations "after the fact." We must consider property owners rights.
5	
4	I think this is very reasonable in a lot of cases, especially in higher density neighborhoods with smaller parcels. However, I could see allowing R1 1+ acres to grow a small amount of cannabis outdoors with the proper size constraints.

5	It makes sense to consider some appropriate circumstances for people to grow at least some of their allowable 6 plants outdoors in low density areas. Considering the roadblocks NID was willing to impose to make it extremely difficult and cost prohibitive to grow indoors (which have thankfully been retracted) and considering the environmental impact of growing indoors, some outdoor plants may make sense. Of course neighbor impact and security would have to be taken into consideration. I could see allowing at least 3 outdoor plants in certain circumstances (for example, R1 at least ¼ acre).
6	The BOS directed the CAG the CAG to recommend an ordinance for medical cannabis
1	I believe that our recommendations should be very specific for residential zoning, with sensitivity for close neighbors; also that cultivation for private use in R1, R2, and R3 should not be prohibited, nor restricted to the degree that people will not be able to do it.
3	I think it has to do more with the size of the parcel, such as the proximity to neighbor's house and property lines than just a blanket zoning ordinance. Some properties in these areas are on larger parcels, while some parcels in Forest or Ag are 2 acres or less.
6	

**TOPIC 2 – The County should consider designating select areas of the County where cultivation for medical and adult use cannabis would be allowed based on land use and zoning.**

Level of Agreement	Comments
5	Agree as long as the land use and zoning regulations limit the total land use to say 5000 or 10,000 square feet and block multiple growers from cobbling together de facto Medium and Large parcels.
2	The corollary to this seems to be prohibiting in other areas, regardless of zoning. That strikes me as not appropriate. I think zoning should be the primary consideration.
3	Way too "Big Brother" and duplicative of state regs, local codes, agricultural and environmental constraints that already exist.
6	Just as an Auto body shop is not an allowed use in certain areas, cannabis should be restricted to certain least impactful areas of the county. ALL businesses and activities are held to this standard, why would cannabis be treated differently?
2	I have heard many times we should be keeping with Ca. state law which allows persons to cultivate on private property no more than 6 marijuana plants for personal consumption. It does not require it be outdoors. I do not sanction commercial grows in NC.
1	This is a broad question, of course zoning should be taken into account. But not black and white "yes or no" policies. What is appropriate for the zone should be considered.
6/2	Maybe there could be a secured fenced area of many acres far from residences provided by the county for growing in compliance and parcels leased out to growers.

2	Needs more discussion. Land use and zoning would be the best tools to use to determine commercial cultivation areas. I'm unaware is this is what is meant by select areas.
6	This is fine as long as there are no end runs to change current zoning. We need to protect the rights of the current property owners who purchased their homes/property with established zoning in place.
1	
3	I think that the limitations by setback and parcel size will address nuisance issues and will make it difficult enough as it is, therefore keep it as open as possible. However, for those contested properties with smaller acreage I think this is a great solution, particularly for under 5 acres where an entire neighborhood is growing.
6	Even though the CAG members have not had much directed conversation about what our recommendations will be, it seems clear from the discussions so far the most members are not opposed to allowing medical cultivation based on land use and zoning. We still need to have a deeper discussion about the benefits and risks of expanding this to allowing cultivation for Adult Use. Since the state standards will most likely be exactly the same for medical and adult use, and in order to encourage the most number of farmers to seek state licenses and get out of the black market, I believe allowing local cultivation of both is in our best interest.
6	this is planning 101 zoning parcel size buffer. No significant impact
6	With the exception (above) of personal use.
1	We can't have property owners suddenly finding themselves in a 'weed' zone (thereby negatively affecting their property values and resale potential) while others are suddenly designated 'weed' free. Cultivation should be spread out to include all zones of the County, not just concentrated in certain areas. Consider limiting the number of cultivation permits to reduce negative property value impacts throughout County.
2	

**TOPIC 3 – The County should consider requiring a permit for any personal grows (medical and adult use) beyond 6 plants.**

Level of Agreement	Comments
6	
6	This seems very appropriate to me.
3	Feel this may be a bit "Big Brother," but if so, should be close to state regs on this and sensitive to costs to discourage noncompliance.
6	Certainly. Should a personal use grower have objection, the choice is clear, either get the required permit or limit the grow to 6 plants. If it is a matter of personal interpretation, the required permit answers the "how much is enough" question.

2	This statement does not state if more than 6 plants are grown indoors or out. I do not think indoor grows need be permitted, inspected, nor have any criminal background checks.
4	This is acceptable if they take into account commercial vs cannabis that receives no remuneration. People cultivating for the sick and dying and not receiving payment should not pay commercial permit prices.
1/2	A permit must be issued for 6 plants also to assure that the building codes are met and that the county knows how much is being produced. Inspections could then be random or complaint driven for compliance.
2	Perhaps not a permit, but a way to know what is being grown and where it is destined for.
1	Six plants for personal use should be more than enough. More than that means that the personal use is going to be used for profit.
6	
4	I think the only time a permit should be required is if there is considerable impact to public health and safety, the environment, or neighborhoods. Personal grows beyond 500 sq/ft would probably need a permit, otherwise they're pretty insignificant.
N/A	The way I understand the state regulations, any grow over 6 plants will either be commercial (not personal) or must be done by a "primary caregiver". The threshold for qualification as a primary caregiver is high. I do not believe it makes any sense to require a county permit for personal, six plants or less. This would be a huge and unnecessary burden on county staff. I could see requiring a qualified care giver that is growing more than 6 plants for up to 5 patients to obtain a county permit or registration of some sort.
2	Everyone should register. If a patient needs more than 6 plenty, maybe a minor permit is possible.
6	
2	While this sounds interesting, it's going to be impossible to enforce and will lead to people's growing in unsafe situations. I find the number '6' a strange and arbitrary number. Somehow it's ok to grow 6 plants per parcel with no permit, but not 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 plants. When do the number of plants become a big enough number to start regulating?
2	

**TOPIC 4 – The County should consider requiring that a residence be located on cultivation sites.**

Level of Agreement	Comments
5	
2	I do not think this is a necessary or reasonable requirement. The alleged experience that grows without a residence have the most problems predates any attempt at prior permitting and should not be used to justify this requirement. Requiring a permit based on a detailed plan should strongly mitigate against poor practices on land without a residence.



2	If oversight by responsible person is basis of concern, there are many other ways to provide that.
6	And the resident/owner should be required to be the holder of the grow permit.
2	
2	This is not a black and white decision. This depends on the zoning requirements for residential areas. If the county bans cultivation in the majority of residential areas, it must relax the requirements for cultivation in other areas, this may include residence requirements to ensure patients are not unintentionally harmed.
6/2	Without ownership of a residence and occupancy the grower has no responsibility or consideration to those around him or for the welfare of the land.
5	This could ensure we aren't encouraging out of county investors and monopolies to come in and produce in the open space regions of the county. There should be a way to discourage more development and allow small cottage licenses and medium outdoor grows on smaller acreages than they currently are.
6	In researching this particular topic, I have found that this is what is done in Yuba and Placer counties. I agree with this for several reasons. This is certainly one way to protect the property rights of people who may be renting out property. Vacant or unprotected property would have a much higher propensity for criminal activity (theft, etc.).
6	
3	I believe that residences help with sanitation, security, and a commitment to our community. However, I think that in the case there's an adjacent property to that with a residence (they own or control the parcel next door) they should have the possibility to use that land to cultivate.
3	There are several scenarios where a residence need not be required. One example is where a cultivator owns or leases an undeveloped parcel adjacent to another parcel they own or lease that does have a residence. It may also be appropriate to allow cultivation on property with no residence if the owner/cultivator is in the process of permitting and building a residence. This would be subject to appropriate security measures and sanitation.
6	A legally permitted residence
2	This is still a difficult point for me. We may have to recommend a more nuanced provision but I am still researching and considering.
6	Absolutely. For the safety of neighboring residences who may be the target of crime stemming from a cultivation site, there needs to be a permitted residence clearly associated with each cultivation site. Also for fire prevention there needs to be a person on site in case of emergency who will notify officials.
6	

**TOPIC 5 – The County should consider allowing a transition period for a residence to be constructed if none exists at the cultivation site (if yes, determine if transition period should be 1, 2 or 3 years).**

Level of Agreement	Comments
5	1-2 years with a formal commitment and a financial incentive to be completed within this timeframe.
6	This assumes that the requirement of a residence on the parcel is retained. As noted above, that in itself is arguable. I think 2 years is a reasonable compromise position. 3 seems too long but many things can make it difficult to go from nothing to a habitable residence in 1 year.
6	2 years IF this is required, and adjacent or nearby residential presence should eliminate this requirement if so - again, flexibility and consciousness of reality should be key.
1	Absolutely not. This will only serve growers to jump from one property to another every few years. If this is a long term endeavor worth building a residence on, the residence should be built first.
2	
6	Anything that helps bring the as much of the cannabis community as possible into a regulated market is a wise idea.
6/2	One year. That is enough time to prepare for compliance to any ordinance.
5	2 year period. Regular check ins and time when permits must be pulled for home construction.
4	I could make this concession; however, construction should be completed within no more than two years.
1	
6	I fully believe a transition period is necessary and it should be 3 years. Many farmers will be drastically changing the nature of their entire enterprises as they work to come into compliance with state laws, organize their business practices, and work towards local compliance. It's a lot of work, meanwhile you have to build a house on top of that and work through the permitting and construction process and timelines. One year will not be enough, two years would help, but three is realistic.
5	See #4 above. If security measures and sanitation concerns are addressed, this should be allowed 2-3 years is a reasonable period. More importantly, the county should consider allowing a transition period for "as built" code compliance on other land use and building code matters. In doing so, the county would be encouraging operators to move forward with bringing their properties into compliance. The harder the county makes it's "as built" process, the less likely people are going to engage in the process. Regardless of cannabis cultivation, there is a large amount of work being done in the county without permits. The county should reconsider the difficulty and expense they put people through to obtain permits or as-built permits. So many people do not even want to bother trying when the process is so difficult.
1	Growers should be vested in the community, build the house first

6	3 years. The county really needs to be supportive of those whose intentions are to live here, contribute to the community, and follow a path to compliance. So much has been said about “good players” and “bad players” and we need to have systems set up to reliably make that distinction and fully support those who are working hard to comply.
1	For the past several years it has been County ordinance to have a permitted residence located on the cultivation site. There has been enough transition time for those wishing to cultivate to get their construction approved and built.
1	

**TOPIC 6 – The County should consider maintaining setbacks of 600 feet from cultivation sites to any active School Bus Stops, School Evacuation Site, Church, Park, Child Care Center, or Youth-Oriented Facility.**

Level of Agreement	Comments
6	Use State setback if more than 600 feet.
2	I am not so sure this setback parameter makes sense for school bus stops. I assume there are a large number of these and staying 600 feet away from all of them may be too great a restriction to be practical.
1	The setback distance requirements should be related to slope, presence of natural and manmade barriers, fencing options, not just # of feet.
1	1200 feet seems more appropriate. If for no other reason than to attempt to buffer the nuisance odor.
1	State recommendation is 1000 feet. Again, is this outdoor cultivation sites? Restrictions on personal use of cannabis should be the same as tobacco use which is 1000 feet which includes schools, youth centers, and any other public place. Advertising restrictions should be in place and prohibition on industry sponsorship of sporting, music, and other events where youth make up the majority of intended audience.
3	There is some concern with allowing non-tax-paying private institutions to influence where tax paying responsible businesses to be located.
6/2	I think it should be a thousand feet.
2	Don't agree with items listed here. Agree with school, child care centers.
1	The further away from schools, child care, youth centers, etc. the better. Young people under the age of 18 have enough challenges and temptations thrown at them from every direction. If they are looking to experiment with cannabis, 600 feet does not make for much of a deterrent. This also exposes them to the people who are cultivating and selling.
1	1000 Ft

2	State regulations mandates 600 feet from K-12. I think Child Care Centers and Youth-Orientated Facilities are appropriate as well. However, school bus stops and evacuations sites are unnecessarily cumbersome. All gardens should be fenced with security and not accessible to the general public. At that point anyone in the garden is trespassing and potentially burglarizing. It's of the best interest of the licensee to make sure unauthorized personnel do not enter into their workspace.
6	But for churches and parks, this is in line with what the state regulations will require. I do not support requiring setbacks from churches or parks. As long as visibility and security requirements are addressed, this should be enough. One important thing of note is that school bus stops should be "active". There are a large number of inactive yet identified bus stops. Requiring setbacks from these bus stops has no rational basis and will discourage cultivators from seeking a state license and lead to the potential for black market cultivation.
6	What is state law? Let's mimic state law
6	Still a little confused on this one as I believe the State regulation is 1000' and counties can only make county ordinances more stringent, not less.
4	600 feet seems a bit excessive. 300 feet perhaps? Why only make this applicable to youth and religious specifications? Why not select a setback that acts as a buffer and is applicable to all NON cultivation activity, such as from neighboring property lines, businesses, government facilities, grocery stores, libraries, trailheads, parking lots, etc.
2	1000 ft.

**TOPIC 7 – The County should consider conducting an environmental capacity analysis to determine the level of cannabis activity that can occur within the County while avoiding significant and unavoidable impacts.**

Level of Agreement	Comments
6	Assuming environmental study uses reasonable criteria and aren't a de facto ban on cultivation (at least for medical).
4	Seems to me this question is equally valid with regard to many types of agricultural activity. Anything farmers and ranchers produce requires land, water, etc. Pushing for this only in the context of cannabis production seems suspect to me. Such a study would be a major undertaking and would necessarily rest on a myriad of assumptions and estimates.
1	Remember 2020 hysteria? This is too invasive of public privacy rights.
6	The more data collected the more helpful it will be to best determine future impacts.
6	This may provide justification of limiting cannabis production in this county. Water and other environmental concerns have been mentioned that we know of already happening in NC.
3	This has just been done by the state and it showed no impact.

6/2	Limited grows should be controlled in our county to stop underground activity caused by a glut in production and abandoning of unprofitable grow sites. Otherwise we will lose more land needed for farming of crops and cattle.
2	Personal, medical, recreational should be separate studies
6	I think that this is essential, but I'm not sure how this would be handled. Who is going to decide who is going to grow and who is not. There is a good deal of talk about keeping big business out of Nev. Co., and this is clearly designed to protect the profit margin for the smaller farmers. Who is going to take care of inspections and enforcements since the law enforcement community seems to be so overwhelmed with the current status.
5	
3	I think this information would be extremely useful, but would very likely stall out the process. If we have to wait 6-9 months for the results we'll only continue the status quo and will likely see even more negative impacts. Most of these impacts can be immediately addressed by having farmers adopt regulations. At that point the permitting process can determine whether or not they're of significant impact.
6	This is not an easy question to answer. So much depends on the ordinance that the county comes up with and what can be anticipated in terms of environmental impact. The state has done a Programatic Environmental Impact Study and state law and regulations are addressing most environmental impacts. The county will have to take into consideration the amount of cultivation currently going on in the county, how it currently affects the environment and how the ordinance will affect the amount of cultivation. Other considerations are the areas where cultivation is occurring and where it will occur under the new ordinance and how environmental impact will change. There is also the reality that each individual cultivation site will need some independent analysis for things such as historic designations or tribal burial sites. The CAG should consider, as best as we can, what affects our recommendations will have on the environment.
6	But if we enact an ordinance that reduces the impacts to a level that is less than significant, then I am #1
6	This is of critical importance. The growers I speak with and who speak up at the CAG meetings insist they are growing in environmentally compatible ways, and I am not convinced that all of them even know what that means. I have strong concerns about water use, even if legally sourced. (Not just citing illegal diversions, etc). Also strong concerns about non-organics AND excessive organic compounds in the soil.
5	I asked about this in a previous meeting and think it would be a wise investment. Figure out the sustainable cannabis cultivation 'carrying capacity' of our County's land and water resources. I am concerned there is not enough time time nor the money to do this so late in the game, however I encourage data collection whenever possible. Making decisions based on no data is making a decision to fail.
2	

**TOPIC 8 – The County should consider limiting the number of medical cultivation permits.**

Level of Agreement	Comments
6	The "limit" should be predicated on the number of sites that can be pro-actively enforced(Vs complaint driven) and not an arbitrary number.
4	My main concern is the level of limitation. If severe, this could just become another line of de facto banning. However, I don't think it is in the interests of the county and its residents to have massive cultivation so some numeric limits may well be appropriate.
1	Economy, geography, and other constraints re compliance with state regs should limit this naturally.
6	This appears to be a simple supply and demand issue and can be periodically adjusted accordingly.
2	If there are more medical cultivation permits, everyone will be cultivating under the auspices of growing medical cannabis vs. recreational.
2	Commercial or non-commercial? This question fails to differentiate between the two and therefore is unanswerable.
4/2	OK as long as it is for the 6 plant limit and does not impact the communities residents.
2	Need more discussion from CAG group
5	If there are no regulations, then cultivation in the name of "medical marijuana" will lead to widespread abuse (in order to get around other restrictions).
5	
2	Why? There's enough limits through zoning, land-use, and setbacks, not to mention regulation that it will make it difficult enough to obtain a permit. Let the free market decide. Limiting the number of permits will likely create a hostile competitive atmosphere between cannabis businesses. It will also favor those with more money and resources and will likely encourage out of county investors to compete. Also, by limiting permits we're encouraging folk who can't get them to stay in the black market and continue the practices that negatively impact us most as a community.
1	It is my firm belief that the county should be encouraging as many of the current growers as possible to move forward with state licensing. This is the best way to assure that environmental issues and neighborhood impact are addressed. Cutting out existing growers may result in continued un-regulated or black- market activities. It may make sense to place a moratorium on any new farms that cannot show that they have been cultivating in the county in some capacity for at least the last two years.
1/2	Why? The medical growers are the ones who will more than likely come into compliance first. Why are we not talking to adult? Should we limit adult permits?
6	This is of critical importance. The growers I speak with and who speak up at the CAG meetings insist they are growing in environmentally compatible ways, and I am not convinced that all of them even know what that means. I have strong concerns about water use, even if legally sourced. (Not just citing illegal diversions, etc). Also strong concerns about non-organics AND excessive organic compounds in the soil.

1	Throughout this CAG process, we have heard from those who truly do rely on cannabis as medicine. Further, I have learned more about the ongoing research in developing CBD strains that have the potential to have game-changing effects in saving lives, and in increasing quality of life for those with debilitating and life threatening diseases, AND that many of these patients are children. I think it is imperative of the CAG that patients and patients rights are given utmost consideration and protection in our recommendations.
6	Regardless if medicinal or adult use cultivation, there needs to be a limit on the number of grow sites in NC. I am seriously concerned about Nevada County's continued perception caused from lack of enforcement of current regulation, as a 'wild west frontier' for growing <b>to the exclusion</b> of other business ventures, future residents and recreational lifestyle. Cannabis activity needs to be a PART of Nevada County, not ONLY or EXCLUSIONARY.
2	

**TOPIC 9 – The County should consider limiting the number of adult use cultivation permits.**

Level of Agreement	Comments
6	The "limit" should be predicated on the number of sites that can be pro-actively enforced(Vs complaint driven) and not an arbitrary number.
4	My main concern is the level of limitation. If severe, this could just become another line of de facto banning. However, I don't think it is in the interests of the county and its residents to have massive cultivation so some numeric limits may well be appropriate.
1	Assuming we follow state regs re up to 6 plants for personal use and related constraints on environment, neighbor courtesy, etc., should not be necessary.
6	Certainly for a commercial application.
6	I do not think Nevada County would benefit from any commercial Cannabis state license categories offered by the state. As our adjoining counties have restricted outdoor cultivation, Nevada County has already been impacted by growers buying property for cannabis cultivation in anticipation NC will allow. I do not want Nevada County to become a tourist destination for marijuana. On site consumption and delayed response is a concern for motor vehicle safety as well
2	No comment
6/2	Limited grows should be controlled in our county to stop underground activity caused by a glut in production and abandoning of unprofitable grow sites. Otherwise we will lose more land needed for farming of crops and cattle.
2	Need more discussion from CAG group
5	If there are no regulations, then cultivation in the name of "medical marijuana" will lead to widespread abuse (in order to get around other restrictions).
2	

3	Why again? There's enough limits through zoning, land-use, and setbacks, not to mention regulation if allowed that it will make it difficult enough to obtain a permit. Let the free market decide. From a grower's perspective half of them are happy to stay in the medical market, the other half feel they need to enter into the adult-use if they are going to survive in the future marketplace.
2	In line with my answer to # 8 above, I believe we want to bring as many growers into the fold as possible. I know that the county BOS and many CAG members have been discussing "medical only" but we should have an honest discussion about what this means. The state standards for quality of product, security and diversion measures are no different for medical or adult use. If more small businesses can become regulated and be forced to adhere to measures that protect the environment and public safety, we should not discourage this because a license has an "M" or an "A" in front of it.
6	We should write the medical ordinance first. Then I would be a #2 on limiting the adult permits
5/2	With preference to county residency established 3 years or more.
6	Regardless if medicinal or adult use cultivation, there needs to be a limit on the number of grow sites in NC. I am seriously concerned about Nevada County's continued perception caused from lack of enforcement of current regulation, as a 'wild west frontier' for growing <b>to the exclusion</b> of other business ventures, future residents and recreational lifestyle. Cannabis activity needs to be a PART of Nevada County, not ONLY or EXCLUSIONARY.
2	

**TOPIC 10 – If you agree to limit permits, the County should consider developing a permit allocation process based on criteria consistent with County policy for cannabis cultivation. For example, give preference to farms owned by County residents.**

Level of Agreement	Comments
6	Agree in principle but would need to know the full range of criteria in the County's policy.
6	I agree with this example. I may agree less with other yet unspecified issues and would expect further explication of these before committing.
6	IF required, then County residency=best criterion, at least that we've discussed so far.
6	
2	
3	Residency and permit limits are two separate subjects. Most support residency.
6/2	We have too many outsiders ( live elsewhere ) who do not have a stake in the well-being of the county or its residents. Therefore, the profit from their grows is being spent elsewhere and not benefiting the county.
2	
6	If this is the direction taken, then preference should absolutely be given to farms owned by county residents. This would at least build in a few checks and balances.



6	
2	I don't agree that we should limit permits. The permitting process and ordinance should include the criteria consistent with County policy for cannabis cultivation. If you can't fulfill the criteria you don't get a permit. If you fulfill the criteria you get a permit. Keep it simple.
1	The Alliance has sought input from outside counsel on the issue of requiring residency. We were told that the courts are finding these requirements to be unconstitutional. I don't support limiting permits. At the most I would consider support for placing a moratorium on issuing licenses to growers that cannot prove they have been growing in some capacity in the last two years.
2	Farms? This is an industrial crop(product) not ag. i.e. amber morris, Nevada County Ag will not accept cannabis.
6	The example given is helpful and is indicative of the specificity I believe this issue requires.
6	One of the concerns of all involved is the influx of large corporate grows which would push out the 'little' guy. This is going to happen, no matter our efforts. (Little guys can work/sell to large corporations - happens with tobacco now). However, we need to make every attempt to ensure the cultivators have some 'skin in the game' in terms of being contributory to the neighborly feeling and lifestyle in NC. Being County residents, registered NC voters, paying property taxes, contributing to private road funds (if applicable), having legal housing for temporary employees, remediation of road traffic and noise, etc are all paramount to maintaining the type of lifestyle that attracts non-cultivators and tourism to our area.
No answer	

**TOPIC 11 – The County should consider establishing a permit fee and fine structure for non-compliance that is effective and timely but allows a short timeframe for self-compliance.**

Level of Agreement	Comments
6	Also need funding sources to assure pro-active compliance by the County and Sheriff and not rely solely on being complaint driven.
6	Begs definition of "short".
5	But "short" must also be reasonable in circumstances of each situation.
5	
2	
2	Only if there is a reasonable path to compliance.
6/2	To me a short time for compliance is 2 days. The growers are just as smart as anyone and can read the rules and count their plants. Fines must very high to be effective. Currently the growers know that so many are out of compliance that there is a great possibility that they won't be caught and the penalty is a part of doing business.
2	I agreed until seeing the 'short timeframe'. What does that mean? Needs more discussion.
6	This should fall somewhere in the range of 48 to 72 hours.
6	

3	This doesn't make sense. What would a permit fee for non-compliance look like? There should be a permitting process with a fee. There should be a fine structure for non-compliance. If you're going through the permitting process and are out of compliance there should be a process to remediate the issue in accord to the severity of the transgression with corresponding fines, just as any other business. If you're not going for a permit, and therefore automatically out of compliance then yes, fines and a short time frame for self-compliance.
6	I do believe the penalties have to be strong enough to discourage non-compliance. However, I am not in favor of the implementation of fines or penalties without a reasonable cure period for at least the first offense. Most criminal penalties increase after a prior offense. We should keep this model.
6/2	How short, need more detail
2	What is a "short" timeframe? I believe people who are committed to compliance deserve and need time to comply and should to be supported in their efforts, and that the timeframe should be reasonable and reachable.
6	SHORT timeframe is key, not what we have now which is not widely enforced (if at all per NC Sheriff deputies who did a presentation to us at a recent meeting) and often this timeframe becomes the entire grow season - allowing the out of compliance cultivators to still reap the monetary rewards while their bad practices negatively affect those around them. This in fact rewards them for their choice to be bad actors. I recommend 5 days maximum for self compliance with fines issued and collected on site.
3	

**TOPIC 12 – The County should consider identifying potential funding sources to implement public education programs on: (i) the responsible use of cannabis by adults; and (ii) the potential harmful effects of cannabis use by those under the age of 25.**

Level of Agreement	Comments
6	
6	These seem reasonable things to do with funds raised by fees and taxes related to cannabis activity, in addition to offsetting permitting and compliance staffing costs.
1	Our local Health Dept., school systems, and the new state laws already provide this; should not be county task beyond what currently done by Health Dept. etc.
1	This funding should be added to and/or built into the license and permit fees required for cannabis cultivation. Public education programs should be mandated and mostly industry funded.
2	Law enforcement appears to be the most affected by being underserved. County Agricultural commissioners are going to need more funding. State law states 70% of taxation will go to youth prevention, but the reality is it will go to fund Medi-Cal through the Department of Health Services. It will not go to the schools directly. At least as it is written at this time.

2	There is no credible science on risks to youth under 25. If the science is not in, we should not spend money propping up the same bad information that has convinced adults to put it on this questionnaire.
3/2	There is a lot of information out there provided by the government and other sources. There are few who take the time to read it and the propaganda from the growers organizations tries to disprove and attack the information with half truths and misinformation. I don't think the return on the investment is worthwhile since it is already available.
2	Isn't this already done at schools? I think funding should go towards after school programs and fun activities for teens to be engaged in.
6	We "don't know what we don't know" about the adverse effects of marijuana. Logically speaking, ingesting anything into the lungs (for example) via smoking will produce health problems. We hear about some of the benefits of medical marijuana; however, the science is still inconclusive regarding the harmful side effects. We know that THC negatively impacts the frontal lobes of the teenage brain. All of the education in the world cannot erase the harmful impacts of a school-aged person using this product. It seems as though we are creating one problem in order to solve another.
6	
5	Education around drug use is always important, especially with the fact that it is now legal and will be more accessible to the public. It would be a great idea for the county to be proactive. A local tax on cannabis businesses is a potential source of funding.
6	I fully support any measures we can take to educate adults and children about both the risks and benefits of cannabis. Education is power.
6/1	Nice idea but we need enforcement and compliance first. All towards enforcement and compliance.
6	
3	This seems redundant considering that 60% of State cannabis revenue (after State admin costs) are mandated to address these concerns. Instead, I recommend the County identify potential funding sources to enforce current and future regulations and permitting processes.
2	