

From: [Damien Ramirez](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Cc: [Bruno Sabatier](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments for 7.2 Consideration of Ordinance Amendment
Date: Monday, August 3, 2020 6:38:42 PM

To whom it may concern:

I would like to begin with a resounding thank you to the Board of Supervisors for attempting to clarify a very important subject.

The intent of the overall exclusionary mapping of cannabis cultivation sites is to create areas within the county that are considered the optimal areas to cultivate cannabis. The areas deemed permissible to support cannabis projects are in places where there is a minimized level of potential public nuisances due to odor complaints, lessened exposure to youths, and abated threats to public safety.

It seems that the intention of this amendment is to ensure that these cannabis gardens remain a safe distance from the public, not to create an unneeded nuisance to members of the community attempting to enjoy all of the outside beauty and activities that this great county has to offer. The wording of the amendment clearly states the definition of Public Lands so there is no confusion between actual **developed** public lands that invite the public to visit (such as a campground or state park) and other public lands, such as extremely remote BLM areas that are simply zoned Open Space.

Open Space zoning was created to provide a zoning district to preserve, protect, and enhance public and private lands for their resource production potential and environmentally sensitive animal and plant habitat and are primarily used solely for habitat conservation. Many of these public lands zoned "O" are simply that; areas of open space that disallow any development, and in fact, are in place to simply preserve and improve the natural environment in the area.

I truly hope that a clear distinction is made by the BOS on the differences of these types of Public Lands. I hope to hear acknowledgement from BOS members as well as members of the CDD so a clear, concrete interpretation is made on the record as to not create unnecessary and or unclear barriers of entry into an industry that already possesses regulatory challenges that can be extremely challenging to navigate through.

A clear consensus from all applicable departments on how this amendment is interpreted is paramount for the success of the cannabis industry within this county.

Once again, thank you for your thoughtful amendment which I can only hope will be another step in providing investors and growers of cannabis a clear path towards which properties are deemed permissible to engage in such activities.

Sincerely,

Damien Ramirez