

Dear Honorable Members of the Board:

Thank you again for remaining committed to getting this right and for opening the discussion of Cannabis Policy in Mendocino County to a full day of discussion.

Every action taken by the board has unintended consequences and I feel strongly that there should be a system in place to regularly review issues, receive feedback from the community, and make changes to the ordinance which result in more appropriate and fair policy governing the cannabis industry in our county.

As I have suggested in a previous letter to the board, **I think that this is the right time to create an Cannabis Advisory Group** (as Sonoma County recently has) which can carry some of the burden of this ongoing process and help us to more efficiently get through this work-in-progress phase of the ordinance. This should be done in conjunction with the launch of the Cannabis Department and hiring of a Cannabis Manager.

Many memos have been submitted outlining the specific issues currently facing us. I would like to take this opportunity to identify and highlight those which, in my opinion, have the greatest socio-economic implications to the most members of our community and have not received adequate discussion time in previous meetings.

1. Proof of Prior Cultivation should be assigned to the cultivator, and to a parcel, but not necessarily together. This limitation impacts many long-time cultivators in our county who need the support of the Board on this issue in order to be able to apply for the program and have the opportunity to succeed in this rapidly changing industry.

2. The Relocation and Extinguish process should not make it possible for one person to be able to extinguish the possibility for another person to continue cultivating, or relocate, as long as both people can prove prior cultivation on the origin site.

Additionally, in response to various county staff memos produced for today's meeting based on previous board direction I would like to suggest the following:

3. Ag-Exempt Structures should also include certain greenhouses and hoop houses in addition to drying shed facilities.

4. Road Easement Restrictions would cause a major ripple effect of unintended consequences for many cultivators already in the program who have made significant investment this year to come into compliance.

Lastly I would like to echo several points raised by Jed Davis in his letter to the board that have not gotten enough attention because they only effect people in specific situations, but which are extremely important and need to be discussed:

5. Limitations in Rangeland for cannabis cultivation are not appropriate. These parcels are large, non-residential, out of sight, and usually have areas appropriate for cultivation that do not require the cutting down of trees. It seems this would be the ideal zone and I would like to point out that rangeland was included in the initial assessment and made up a majority of the acreage assessed in the county.

6. Current Light Wattage Restrictions for Nurseries are contrary to cannabis nursery industry standards and practices and are unrealistic for nursery businesses in this county

7. The 35-Watt per square foot Indoor Cultivation Restriction is also contrary to industry standards. A 1000-Watt grow light is designed to cover a 4'x4' (16 sq. ft.) plant canopy and the limit should be increased to meet this industry standard.

Thank you again for your consideration of this changes and for your continued work to make it possible for the cannabis industry in Mendocino County to Succeed.

Sincerely,
Patrick Sellers

PatrickSellers23@gmail.com
[831-272-2323](tel:831-272-2323)