

Dear Supervisors,

When was the last time this or the previous two Boards have revisited a passed ordinance with substantial, positive revisions? Certainly not in my tenure in Mendocino County.

I do hope you will consider the following asap.

Recommendation #8 in staff's comments to the Planning Commission currently read to allow a Use Permit to cover a nursery permit an outdoor cultivation, a mixed light cultivation and an indoor cultivation, "provided each type does not exceed the maximum allowed for the zoning district".

So, this language allows for each cultivation type to expand to the size of cultivation allowed in the zoning type. Or, three times the size currently allowed for cultivation on a parcel, plus nursery. IS THIS WHAT THE SUPERVISORS INTEND AS ALLOWED EXPANSION? Please clarify this language before voting on the ordinance.

Regarding water hauling, Sup. Williams' desire to immediately curtail legal water delivery is misguided if our collective effort is to encourage existent legal cultivation. In this extreme draught environment, a total prohibition is heartless. A tracked legal source like NorCal in Talmage and a certified delivery company can prevent unauthorized sources or shady delivery trucks if enforced.

As the Planning Commission identified in their discussion of this issue, even if a parcel is appropriate for a pond, the county permit, engineering contracting and finally construction around inclement weather cannot be accomplished in less than a year to eighteen months at the soonest!

Transitioning to on site water supply and storage should be supported by the Governor's \$18+M grant to the County, but even if many grants are approved, cultivators are compromised by the availability of services required. Please maintain on water supply requirements until January 2023 as proposed.

Please also understand that previously "tilled" land with past Ag activities will mostly likely have had "conventional" pesticides and chemical fertilizers used on the previously used area. Conventional AG products will not pass cannabis testing standards, rendering use of such previously tilled land for regulated cannabis unviable. Please consider a "contiguous" option of some kind to allow cannabis activities near previously tilled area, but beyond the plume of contamination.

Yesterday during the Program Manager's Information Session, Kristin was asked about how Phase 1 and 2 permittees would be able to transition to a Use Permit when there operation was existent and operational, not the situation of a Use Permit review in advance of project approval. She was apologetic, but said she had no plan...which means that during the entire time this Board has advocated for a Use Permit system, nothing has really been done to find the transitional pathway for currently licensed cultivators. This lack of direction from the Board, or attention by County staff is extremely disappointing.

We have labored for many months to design a new ordinance that does nothing to help permitted cultivators stay in business. Why is this? Fix it today and give staff unequivocal direction to come back immediately with a pathway, forms, guidelines, standards, criteria to transition the 250 or so of current, compliant, tax paying permittees.

The Program Manager also told the community yesterday that Appendix G, and other documents helpful to permittees looking to transition to a Use Permit system, have been removed from the Cannabis website, indicating there may be changes. How can we and our consultants comply with the CEQA designated procedure if we don't have access to what the County will accept and pass on the CDFA? If Appendix G or any other County requirement is changing, applicants need to know immediately. The Program need to be transparent, not so as of yesterday.

I hope you read this before your final vote. For some reason I was not recognized to speak today.

Sincerely,

Corinne Powell