

Board of Supervisors - Chapter 20 component of Cannabis Ordinance

From: Corinne Powell <powellintl@aol.com>
To: <bos@co.mendocino.ca.us>
Date: 10/4/2016 9:06 AM
Subject: Chapter 20 component of Cannabis Ordinance

2016 OCT 4 PM 12 20
 EXECUTIVE OFFICE
 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
 MENDOCINO COUNTY
 CALIFORNIA

Dear Supervisors,

I'm told by a deputy clerk of the Board that you will only deal with the Cannabis Ordinance on the consent calendar today which does not allow transit time for me to address the Board in person at 9:00 a.m.

I want you to think very hard about the Planning and Building constriction of growing areas to **ONE SITE PER PARCEL**. At the last meeting you heard public input on this issue explaining that meeting all other requirement often means that gardens are located appropriately for growing conditions, including sun exposure, slope, proximity to water ways and wetlands, square footage allotments---the list goes on and on.

If current, approved garden sites meet all criteria for a legal permit this year, they should meet all requirement in the future with the exception of the single site constraint. I sincerely request that you either strike the single site requirement or acknowledge that any permitted multiple site gardens accepted by multiple inspections this year be grand fathered into the regulation you intend to pass.

Please recall that I asked you to consider not only you own exhaustive list of cannabis growing restrictions, but also the NCRWQCB regulation regarding square footage allowed for cannabis. The Water Board measures the fenced interior of a garden site and compiles the areas cumulatively. They include all paths, other species of plants contained in the fence, staging areas, etc. For example, my garden of 25 plants last year, if measured by the Water Board system, was more than 7500sf as all space between plants and from plant to fence was included.

So for this year's new regulations I've moved growing areas, refenced and am now compliant with both County and Water Board regulations. I've passed two inspections in total compliance and two sites occupy less than 10.000sf.

Single site garden restrictions will encourage more environmental destruction as growers take down trees to allow more sun, do additional grading to expand gardens, expand fencing and digging for the proposed ridiculous burying of fence material.

The single site restriction should be stricken or not apply to any permitted garden approved for the 2016 9.31 Exemption Program. Perhaps the County personel are lazy and fear walking a few extra yards to inspect, but I can see not reason to impose this additional restriction on the cultivators. When the exodus to Humbolt County occurs, you may only then recall my and other requests for sensible regulations.

It is the County in general that will suffer as you impose more constraints.. If the prohibitionists continue to destroy logic and reason in our process toward regulation, only the County leadership will be to blame. Think this through. PLEASE!

Sincerely,

Corinne Powell