



MENDOCINO COUNTY *MEMORANDUM*

Date: August 22, 2017

To: Mendocino County Board of Supervisors

From: Supervisor McCowen

Subject: Additional Issues for Discussion

The purpose of this memo is to address a limited number of additional issues related to agenda item 5(a). I do not anticipate we will resolve all of these issues today but I believe they merit our early discussion and direction.

Cannabis Advisory Board

Everyone agrees there is a need for an improved process to enable the Board, staff and community stakeholders to more efficiently discuss and resolve key issues that need further resolution. Instead of the proposed Cannabis Advisory Board, which would be a broad spectrum approach, I believe the suggestion by CEO Angelo to have frequent conference calls and/or the formation of Working Groups focused on a single issue or a series of closely related issues will be an more effective and efficient way of achieving the desired result. For example, I believe the following issues are possible topics for discussion by a Working Group that would include relevant staff and stakeholders:

- 1) Requirements for use of buildings including Greenhouse; Hoophouse; Ag Exempt; Class K; ADA requirements;
- 2) Track and Trace;
- 3) Overlay Zones, Exceptions, and/or Exclusion Zones;
- 4) State license requirements and/or potential amendments to State law.

I am sure there are other issues that will benefit from the same approach. I do believe the conference call/Working Group approach will be more flexible, fast paced and effective than appointment of a more formal committee dealing with multiple issues.

Good Standing

Although we are optimistic that the pace of issuing permits will accelerate as a result of the recommendations by staff and the Board for an improved process and/or ordinance amendments, it is foreseeable that not all qualified applicants will be fully permitted by the time state licenses become available. For that reason it is important to determine the criteria by which applicants will be considered to be in good standing. Possible criteria include submission of a complete application, completion of an initial site view, and no glaring issues that appear to jeopardize eventual issuance of a permit.

Tiered Permit Fees

I believe the Board has given direction for a tiered permit fee structure where the cottage level growers would pay less than full cost recovery, at least initially, as an incentive to apply; and likewise for a greatly reduced fee schedule for a second permit application on the same legal parcel. I believe it is worth adopting revised fees out of the normal cycle so that potential applicants know what to expect.

Definition of “cycle” and Number of Inspections

Staff has identified the need to define cycle to avoid penalizing cultivators who have plants in several stages or “cycles” of growth at any one time. Again, this is an issue that ought to be resolved sooner rather than later to provide guidance to staff and certainty to applicants and potential applicants. The number of inspections is similar to the issue of cycles because some inspections are tied to “cycles.” Perhaps these issues are another candidate for a Working Group.