

To the County Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to you regarding the proposed new cannabis cultivation ordinance: the Commercial Cannabis Activity Land Use Ordinance.

There is so much at stake here it is not possible to overestimate the potential impact and cost to our county:

- Our environment:

- The proposed ordinance opens the door for massive expansion of cannabis cultivation in the county and thus creates powerful incentives for large-scale commercial and residential development throughout the county's remote, rural, environmentally sensitive landscape. This will add to the multitude of known and unknown impacts already affecting the county's human and natural environments.

- In addition to opening the 738,000-acre rangeland zone to new cannabis operations, lifting the 10,000 sq. ft. cap on cultivation site size, and removing any limits on the number of permits per parcel, the proposed ordinance would allow up to **10% of a 10-acre or larger parcel in the Agricultural, Upland Residential, and Rangeland Zones to be converted to cannabis cultivation.**

- Would strip away prohibition on cutting trees to create a new cultivation site and thus create accompanying erosion

- Would impact our available water or better still, lack of available water to sustain such cultivation

At the very least, considering the magnitude of the expansion plan, the county should do a full Environmental Impact Review.

I ask you, who are you representing?

The **Farm Bureau does not support** this new proposal, the **small cannabis grower does not support it**, **our Sheriff does not support it**, and the **environmental community does not support it**. And this new proposal is NOT the Vision supported by the majority of citizens of this county, as evidenced by the fact that Measure AF, which proposed cannabis in almost every zoning district, went down to defeat in 2016.

This proposal wholly ignores the recommendations of the Mendocino Climate Action Committee regarding appropriate land use development to meet the need for greenhouse gas reduction and carbon sequestration goals.

To Whom it may concern,

We oppose the 10% rule. Due to drought and big cannabis corporations coming into our county and destroying small local family farmers. Thank you so much Sarah Anderson and Janette Smith