

**From:** marie myers <sweetwaterpotter@live.com>  
**To:** "bos@co.mendocino.ca.us" <bos@co.mendocino.ca.us>  
**CC:** marie myers <sweetwaterpotter@live.com>  
**Date:** 8/7/2017 11:46 PM  
**Subject:** August 8, 2017 agenda

County of Mendocino Board of Supervisors

Dear Members of the Board,

I recently received a copy of the letter that Casey O'Neil from Happy Days Farm sent to you on July 16 th 2017. I am fully in support of his requests and comments. In reading your agenda for tomorrow, I see that you have been and will be continuing to address some of the problem areas that may make it impossible for many of us to continue moving forward toward compliance. Thank you.

I will only add to that letter by asking you to further address three of the issues.

#### Drying Structures

I spoke with the building department today and they said that metal buildings are accepted as Ag. Exempt. I am guessing this will be acceptable for drying cannabis as well. Metal is not mentioned in your notes or on the application. Also, the application does not note wood floors and wood floors are acceptable in your notes. We use metal buildings to dry in, they are under 2000 square feet. And they have wood floors.

#### Septic

We are a small family farm and we live on the property. I am thinking that since we live on the property and our home has a septic we do not need a commercial toilet facility.

My final concern is about Small roads and single lane bridges. We live on rangeland property. Our "neighborhood " is culturally cannabis friendly. The average parcel size is 200 acres. There are approximately 15 parcels.

Prior to the cannabis ordinance, all of the property owners, except for two parcels produced cannabis. This area specifically was known for growing cannabis prior to the two parcels being sold to the two non-growers. The realtor that sold these two parcels was sensitive to the possible issues and was honest with the buyers. At the time The buyers saw the growers as an asset. They purchased their parcels over 15 years ago.

The single lane bridge that was put in was spearheaded by these two owners and served their personal business needs.

With the new ordinance in place there are a few disappointed and angry parcel owners. Property values on rangeland is continuing to go down. One parcel sold in 2016 to a man from Sonoma county. He purchased thinking he would be growing on it. He is pretty angry.

I am thinking if I need to ask these "angry" or self serving neighbors for "permission" to continue to use the road as I have been, they may not give their permission freely.

I think ethically In regards to noise or road use the burden should always be on the person making the complaint. Perhaps, Especially in regards to cannabis, because there is still bias against cannabis farmers in Mendocino county.

There also needs to be avenues to verify that the complaint is accurate and reasonable. Otherwise we can all be held hostage to any one individuals emotions, personal bias, or manipulations.

I am asking you the supervisors to consider the special characteristics of this district. There are many families in district 3 in our position. Cultural historians are busy documenting our district and the families unique to this area. Our neighborhoods are culturally cannabis friendly. Again, the burden needs to be on the person making the complaint.

Respectfully,

Tax paying, community service volunteer, responsible Third district citizen

P.s. There are publicly used single lane bridges in commercial and residential areas in Ukiah and throughout Mendocino county.

Sent from my iPad