

To: Mendocino County Board of Supervisors  
From: ***Ukiah Area Rural Residential Concerned Neighbors***  
Re: Prop 64-Recreational Cannabis Proposed Ordinance: Item 5a  
Date: March 28, 2017

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:

We want to start by acknowledging and thanking the Board for all the hard work and thoughtfulness that has gone into adopting common sense regulations that balance the interests of cannabis growers with the interests of the neighbors and the environment. Lack of regulation has created many problems that we are now trying to correct, including the proliferation of cannabis cultivation in neighborhoods where other types of intensive commercial activity is simply not allowed.

The Board of Supervisors gave direction on an ordinance to regulate Proposition 64, recreational marijuana, on Feb. 14. Except for minor clarifications, we strongly encourage the Board to reaffirm the direction you gave on Feb. 14.

We strongly support the Board's previous direction that outdoor recreational cultivation only be allowed on parcels that are 10 acres or greater in size. The existing setbacks from property lines and occupied dwellings have always been inadequate to protect neighbors from the strong odor of mature cannabis and that is why many of us have consistently called for not allowing cultivation on any parcel zoned RR-10 and lower. After much discussion the Board agreed to a complicated series of compromises that will allow medical cultivation on smaller parcels subject to a sunset provision and overlay zones. These are after the fact attempts to remedy a problem that could have been avoided from the outset.

We strongly support the Board's previous direction that recreational cultivation be limited to 100 square feet, whether it is grown indoors or outdoors. This is completely consistent with the "Medical Cannabis Regulation Safety Act" which limits the patient exemption to 100 square feet of cultivation. If the state legislature believes that 100 square feet of cultivation is reasonable for a medical patient then it should be reasonable for a recreational user also. Please remember that an indoor grower can be in almost continuous production and can have 4, 5, or even 6 harvests annually.

We strongly support the Board's previous direction that the same setbacks from schools and youth oriented facilities apply to adult recreational cannabis as apply to medical cannabis. We reiterate that except for a possible reduction in odor, if filtration systems are used, all of the other negatives associated with outdoor cultivation, including loss of quality of life and threats of home invasion, still exist.

We continue to support not allowing habitable space to be converted for commercial cannabis production because of the negative impact on housing. If the Board chooses to allow conversion of habitable space for recreational cannabis, that is another strong argument to set the limit at 100 square feet. Also, any indoor cultivation should be in a structure that meets code and is locked to prevent unauthorized access.

We encourage the Board to limit the cumulative amount of marijuana that can be grown without a permit to 100 square feet. Estimates of the percentage of cannabis produced in California that is diverted to the black market range from 50% to 95% or more.

The cannabis farmers who are stepping forward to embrace regulation are faced with sharply increased costs to come into compliance. It is not fair to them to allow the proliferation of recreational cultivation which can easily be diverted to the black market without any extra cost or regulation.

In conclusion, we strongly encourage the Board to confirm the direction that you gave on Feb. 14th.

Thank you for all of your effort and attention to this to this serious matter.

Sincerely,

***Ukiah Area Rural Residential Concerned Neighbors***

Cc: CEO, County Counsel

