

7.3 Public Comment

BOS Agenda 05/12/2020

Feedback received via publiccomment@lakecountyca.gov

From: Damien Ramirez **Sent:** Tuesday, May 5, 2020 8:35 AM

To: Public Comment <PublicComment@lakecountyca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL]Public Comment for Item 7.3

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I would like to begin by thanking Supervisor Sabatier and all other individuals who were instrumental in addressing some of the changes that we see presented today. Below are my thoughts on each proposed amendment:

Section 1 & Section 2 Tables:

I support as proposed.

Section 3:

While I truly appreciate that this Waterboard Enrollment Date is being addressed, I feel that this date should be earlier than what is proposed. Many will counter with the idea that it is not fair to cutoff potential applicants, however, any interested party paying even a small level of attention to the county's decisions as they pertain to cannabis cultivation would not be surprised by the re-enactment of an earlier Waterboard Enrollment date. I believe the Waterboard Enrollment date should be enacted sooner than later, June or July perhaps. The reasoning for this is as follows:

- Last year following weeks of thoughtful public comment it was decided by the BOS that a Waterboard Enrollment Date should be imposed. Although this was voted in favor of, it unfortunately never made it into the amended Ordinance. This has allowed ample time for the past year for newly interested parties to take the proper steps in securing property and beginning the stages of permitting.
- There is a large backlog of applicants in the process of being permitted. I count a total of 12 cannabis projects that have been in front of the Planning Commission since June of 2019. I have been told by a single planner that they personally have over 50 cannabis cultivation applications on their desk in various stages of processing. This shall help the hard working staff by alleviating some of the workload they have while they catch up to the large amount of work that is required of them already.
- Over the past year there has been substantial turnover in many divisions within the CDD, it seems only prudent to not inundate the staff (many of which are relatively new to their positions) with more and more cannabis cultivation applications while there are already so many on the table.
- With the County still feeling the effects of the Mendocino Complex Fire as well as this terrible Coronavirus it seems reasonable to help alleviate the workloads on CDD staff during these unprecedented times.
- Santa Barbara is a glaring example of the major community, agricultural, and legal issues that can arise when allowing too many cultivators to start projects at the same time. Until this industry is in place for a few more years and the cumulative positive and negative effects can be better understood, it seems reasonable to proceed with a bit more caution.

Section 4:

I appreciate this important matter being addressed. I agree with the proposed changes as it seems that it is definitely a step in the right direction. With that being said, I feel that when this issue is addressed again, I strongly feel that only owners and individuals with management responsibilities should be subject to the background checks. Cannabis cultivation has a seasonal work demand like many other

agricultural businesses and requiring background checks for even seasonal employees who are only working a couple weeks out of the year seems a little over-reaching and economically burdensome to the cultivators. The CDFA has approved certain companies to provide some of these seasonal services and I believe in the future we should look to align with the state when it comes to this issue.

Sections 5 & 6:

I support as proposed, seems very reasonable and much more realistic than the previous requirements of surveillance.

Section 7:

I support as proposed.

Thank you as always for your thoughtful consideration of my opinions,
Damien Ramirez

From: danielle fontenot **Sent:** Tuesday, May 5, 2020 9:35 AM

To: Public Comment <PublicComment@lakecountycal.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] regarding Supervisor meeting today - **regulations for cameras and background**

To whom it may concern,

I would like to express my sincere support concerning the regulations for cameras and background checks.

I support owners and salary employees having background check requirements, but not all employees. Employees could provide their own background checks if needed because in this industry they are a very mobile group and there is incredibly high turnover. With the high cost of the background checks this is a huge liability for a company.

I also believe that if there are not plants in the ground there shouldn't be a requirement for cameras. The cameras are supposed to keep an eye on and monitor on the plants. It also is added cost and energy that doesn't benefit anyone involved.

I appreciate all you have done with ordinances thus far and thank you for your time and consideration!

Thank you so much!

Danielle Fontenot
