



**From:** Charles Quinnelly <chollyq@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <bos@co.mendocino.ca.us>  
**Date:** 2/14/2017 11:45 AM  
**Subject:** Comment Regarding Relocation of Grow Sites and Comment on Qualification to be Permitted

Dear Board of Sups,

First let me just say what a great job all of you have done, last weeks meeting went very well I feel. Staff has done a great job as well. I see this 'cultivation' issue coming together in a way that should make most folks happy. I've lived in Mendocino County since April 15, 1993 and can't think of any other place I'd call home.

Just a quick comment regarding 'relocation' of a existing grow site(s) in RL to another RL parcel. Why not encompass any and all request for 'relocation' under one guide line. An example would be a cultivator who was leasing on one spot in the past regardless of the zoning but now has a new lease on a different parcel or has recently purchased suitable zoned acreage and would like to relocate/abandon the old location. But, the word abandon means for the person moving, not the property owner who may want to cultivate or lease out again to someone different.

Also, the idea that a cultivator had to be permitted or had to be a permitted cultivator as of Jan 1, 2016 to be eligible for a permit in 2017 needs some consideration for the cultivators who wanted to be permitted but the County stopped issuing due to the law suit. Please considering issuing as many permits as the county can administer this year and do not limit permits to just the lucky ones who got in line first this past year.

I have a friend who owned land in 2012 and was permitted that year but due to the Federal challenges and the County halting the program this person sold their property and relocated to a small 25 non permitted plant grow on leased lands. There was discussion in the past that cultivators such as my friend would be given preference with permitting. This is the type cultivator who deserves to be permitted this year even if they didn't have a permit last year and they may be going onto a new location than where they were last year with 25 medical plants. One of the biggest obstacles to getting folks excited about permitting a site is all the unknowns at the county level and especially at the State Water Board level. Many of these folks that got thrown under the bus in 2012 have been gun-shy about stepping back into the light.

One other quick observation/comment is please be more clear on 'plant count' for outdoor grows verses 'square footage of canopy' in light of what the Water Board requires. My friend would like to grow as much cannabis as possible and doesn't know what is allowed out doors. Can 99 plants be spread out as far and wide as the parcel of land allows and still be under 10,000 sq ft?

And, last but not least, the discussion about transferring of permits to family members needs more thought. County counsel pointed out how the permits needed to be renewed every years so maybe this isn't an issue if a permit runs with the land, goes with the applicant etc. Consider if an applicant dies mid season or becomes injured, they/their estate can have another person step in and finish the season for the current application. A thought I have is take a look at the Fish and Game Sea Urchin Limited Entry Permits and how those are transferable/sold and how a holder who is injured can have another diver work their permit. Also the two year sun set provision idea may work as well! Again, thank you all for a great effort.

Thank you vey much,

Charles T Quinnelly  
Owner/Broker Charles Quinnelly Real Estate  
CBRE Lic. 01207431  
707-533-0001