1. Portal Questions

A. Have you been told in an email or other method of communication what standards must be met for an application to be deemed 'complete'?	No
B. Have you been told in writing what the standards of proof are if you have to disprove a wrong assumption made by staff that could be the basis of a denial?	No
 Do you feel an error or incorrect assumption made by Staff has led to you being deemed incomplete'? 	Yes
C. Do you know what the policies and procedures of MCP are for the Portal?	NO
1. Do you know how to locate them?	NO
2. Did you understand the portal questions and instructions?	No
3. Were you able to upload the documents you needed/wanted to in the portal system based on the questions you were asked?	NO
D. Do you feel that you have been provided clear directions on how to address any incomplete items?	NO
 Are all the forms and instructions clear and without errors by the MCP? 	NO
Does the Portal allow you to attach the documents you thought you needed to attach?	YES
3. Did the instructions cause you confusion as to what items to attach in what location of the portal?	YES
4. Did you find that if you checked the box you thought was applicable, that you were not able to upload documents that you thought you would be able to upload because there was no place to do it unless you changed your answer?	YES
E. Have you been marked incomplete?	YES
F. Have you been marked incomplete more than once?	YES
1. Were any of those times due to MCP error or Portal Limitations?	YES
2. If you received multiple incompletes were the reviews consistent?	NO
G. Has MCP been effective in answering your questions about the	NO

2. Equity Questions

-	el that MCP & Elevate Impact have clearly informed you of procedures and standards of success versus failure for your n?	NO
from MCF	unclear on those policies, procedures and standards of success % & Elevate Impact, are they effective at providing clarity when ent them with questions?	NO
C. Do you fir Impact?	nd it difficult to get timely responses from MCP & Elevate	YES
	ebinars offered by MCP & Elevate Impact provide you with ear information?	NO
applicatio	e been required to make revisions to your specific grant n or budget, were you given all the corrections at one time or appen in small successive installments?	NO
	essive installments, do you believe that the information could n presented to you more efficiently?	YES
	el like the goal posts have changed during your grant n process?	YES

• 3. General Program questions

YES or NO

Α.	Do you feel that you have a clear understanding of MCP policies, procedures and standards of success versus failure for your permit or application?	No
В.	If you are unclear on those policies, procedures or standards for success in the program, how effective is MCP at providing clarity when you present them with questions?	No
C.	Do you find it difficult to get timely responses from MCP?	Yes
D.	Do the webinars offered by MCP provide you with useful, and meaningful way to obtain clear information?	No
E.	Do you feel like you can participate effectively in MCP webinars?	No

F. Do you know what the policies and procedures of MCP are?	No
1. Do you know how to locate them?	No
2. Are all forms you need on the website?	No
3. Are they in the location they should be for the task you must perform?	No

4. Additional Comments

- Please share any additional comments here:
 - Somehow, many of us feel the MCP is doing all they can to "eliminate as many legal cultivators as possible", they are no longer "helping" but judging to find as many and as much as they can to find faults and mistakes cultivators have been or are currently making.
 - 2. MCP "WAS" very open and friendly before with attitude of providing helping service to facilitate legalization...but, the current MCP is "cold and very unfriendly". Are they prosecutors ???
 - 3. They do not provide ample time to response to their notification nor do they provide explanations of their decisions.
 - 4. They are acting as "prosecutor and judge" instead of helping to facilitate proper processing of legal cultivators requirements per the County and the State.
 - 5. County's (MCP) requesting comments from CDFW on SSHQ (special species habitat questionnair) is done haphazard way. And, CDFW does not have enough staff to properly evaluate. CDFW staffs are sitting at their office and making broad judgemental comments based on satellite images only. There are not enough CDFW staff to conduct on-site inspections...so, they are making very general and broad comments that does not reflect a proper site's environmental scientific evaluations.
 - 6. Making broad comments to "cover any potential mistakes they could make". But, their broad comments may be very costly and non necessary Biological Reviews on AG40 parcels. AG40 are for agricultural activities encouraged by the State and County for Cannabis cultivation.
 - 7. In this difficult times of COVID-19 pandemic much patience and perserverance are necessary and required for all parties. MCP, because they have the "authority and responsibility" to properly facilitate the legalization of Cannabis cultivation they need to be

more open, friendly, eduational and "communication friendly" to many cultivators who are not familiar with internet ...etc.

- 8. More legal cannabis cultivation will continue to provide more revenue for the County and local economies. And, it will discourage illegal cultivators.
- 9. It seems there are as many now legal and illegal cultivators who were originally trying to get legalized. This is very sad reflection of the failure of the MCP...after 4 years of legalization process the County has tried.
- 10. The current MCP leadership has handful and somehow, she has created her "own" timetables and rushing through as best as she can. However, it is creating many cultivators leaving the legal process...giving it up. At this time, perhaps it is necessary for her to "loosen up" a bit and create more "friendly and open" MCP office...to encourage more to go through the legalization process.
- There seems to be no oversight from the Board re: MCP activities. We STILL NEED A CANNABIS STANDING COMMITTEE!