

Dear Supervisors,

It is difficult to know exactly what the Ad Hoc is proposing in staff reports on this item.

As a Phase 1 cultivator, permitted since 2016, located in Rangeland and maintaining the same 10,000sf operation, in compliance with all state regulatory agencies and facing expensive and time consuming CEQA review, it is imperative that the County not unnecessarily burden cultivators in my situation with an additional Use Permit process.

As Supervisor Haschack proposed in recent meetings, I recommend all Phase 1 permittees be "grandfathered" into a Phase 3 context without a Use Permit review. Those applicants who have not been fully permitted, those holding embossed receipts and those who have not responded sufficiently to the county permit process and adequately responded to PBS requests, for what ever reason, would not qualify for the streamlined, automatic Phase 3 permits.

Regarding the requirements of permittees assuming all burdens of CEQA review, please clarify if property owners or permit holders/applicants are required to seek use permits and CEQA approval. As you know our current ordinance only requires a property owner give written approval for cannabis to be cultivated on their property.

I again record my strong objection to the 10% expansion allowance as irresponsible in size without known and adequate environmental impact and review, adequate water use and unknown impact on near small, Phase 1 cultivators. Large cultivations, some for biomass only, down grade the County reputation for quality flower and threaten to destroy small cultivators due to the anticipated price drop on the local cannabis industry.

I recommend the Board seriously consider the recommendations of the MCA pertaining to the approvals requested today.

Thank you for your consideration.

Corinne Powell