

Emailed Comments Received through May 11, 2017

Susan Reynolds

Andrew Goodwin

Mark Hermes

Roger Strong

Wanda and Don Baggett

Jeff Richards

Kathleen Prout

Janice Hamp

Kim Thompson

Peter Cobabe

Mike Griffin

Patty Lawrence

Dora Cividino

Danielle Dao

Comments submitted after May 11, 2017

Shelley Salvatore

Lynn Wilson (submitted news article)

Char Andrews

Nevada County Cannabis Alliance

From: Susan Reynolds [mailto:susanbr@sierraemail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 4, 2017 11:38 AM
To: Amy Wolfson <Amy.Wolfson@nevadacityca.gov>
Subject: Last night

Hi Amy,

Thank you for your intention to staff each opinion stations with staff only. FYI at the 2 stations I was most interested in and where I spent all allotted my time (law enforcement and location) that did not happen. The man at law enforcement kept rolling his eyes, and argued several times - only with Diana Gamzon's urging, did he write anything down that I was saying. Yes, she obviously shadowed my friend and I all night...ok, 'cause she knows the lingo and actually helped me be articulate a couple of times. At the Location Station, the woman is a dispensary owner, but was very helpful and cooperative, which I appreciate.

So now what for so many of us who do not want to live with lots, or any, more cannabis businesses in addition to the dispensary that will soon be located in our town.?

A question I would appreciate you answering is -- will you honor all the many sincere, well-thought-out written comments re: the dispensary to carry over to this new proposed ordinance? Clearly those who oposed a dispensary were voicing the fact that they did not want a cannabis business in Nevada City.

Now do we all have to do it all over again because we only thought we had to give our opinion on a dispensary, not foreseeing that this all would escalate so quickly to include additionally 4 other types of cannabis businesses?

What about the petitions containing about @120-130 people who signed under the heading "We do not want a Medical Marijuana Dispensary inside Nevada City limits"? Clearly, these are the same people who don't want a cannabis businesses in Nevada City.

Also, another questions --- in the article I sent to Brian Hamilton that appeareed in the Union on Wednesday, he changed a number without my permission - I had written that the new proposed ordinance says there is 0 feet distance required between proposed cannabis businesses and residences or other businesses, etc. but a a 600' distance requirement school, parks, etc.

Brian changed the 0 feet distance to 50' -- I see no mention of 50 feet at all in the proposed ordinance. He did not inform me he was changing it, nor has he replied to my emails asking why he did that, and without my permission.

I want to be accurate and know the truth - did he talk to you about this? Is there something I don't know re: a 50 ' distance?

Thank you,
Susan Reynolds

From: Drew [mailto:andrewgoodwin@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, May 5, 2017 9:14 AM
To: Amy Wolfson <Amy.Wolfson@nevadacityca.gov>
Subject: Commercial Cannabis Businesses

As a cannabis advocate I see no reason to have cannabis business in such a small congested area as Nevada City ... All I foresee is competition problems for space and nuisance issues due to traffic. It could also increase in property value for the areas allowing such businesses decreasing available space for conventional business even more... These types of businesses should be set up in the county and unincorporated parts of Nevada County.

Andrew Goodwin

ASA-NC Web Master

.....

From: Debbie Hermes [mailto:hermesdebbie@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 9, 2017 5:59 PM
To: Amy Wolfson <Amy.Wolfson@nevadacityca.gov>
Subject: Re: Cannabis comments

Thanks. My name is Mark (Debbie's husband), Comments on cannabis manufacturing proposal:

1. You need to allow extraction by ethanol. Why?

A higher quality cannabis is produced. Thus patient's will benefit.

Good quality labs will not move their operation to your city leaving lower quality operation to stay.

Lower quality means less business means less tax revenue.

Safety concerns can be mitigated by implementing strict measures. I believe CA requires labs working with ethanol to have type 7 license. This is expensive but will weed out the small fly by night type labs.

I'm a Ca state licensed Clinical laboratory Scientist helping one of these operations to meet these strict requirements. I presently work at a hospital that has been extracting human cells for molecular DNA bone marrow typing using ethanol. Ethanol is used in many labs in the US to extract .DNA safely.

Mark

.....

From: roger strong [mailto:rogerstrong1@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 9, 2017 5:47 PM
To: Amy Wolfson <Amy.Wolfson@nevadacityca.gov>
Subject: Cannabis Ordinance

Amy,

I have family members who need to use CBD and other salves for their skin conditions.

It would be very helpful for me, if these types of remedies could be produced here locally and be easily available through a dispensary in town.

I think that having the full range of infrastructure here with farming, manufacturing, testing labs and distribution would be a real asset to our community.

Anything you can do to help facilitate this at the local level would be most be highly appreciated not only by myself but many other people I know.

thank you,

--
Roger Strong

11760 Cement Hill Rd.
Nevada City, CA 95959

.....
From: donwanbaggett@sbcglobal.net [mailto:donwanbaggett@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2017 11:02 AM
To: Amy Wolfson <Amy.Wolfson@nevadacityca.gov>
Subject: Opposition to new proposed ordinance for 5 new types of cannabis businesses

Hi Amy, Please register our strong opposition to the new proposed ordinance for 5 new types of cannabis businesses in addition to the dispensary, inside Nevada City limits.

We don't want to open up that gate. You know all the reasons given.
Thank you for passing on this message.

Wanda and Don Baggett
11455 Marjon Drive
Nevada City, CA 95959

From: Jeff Richards [mailto:jeff.richards@nccsda.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2017 4:53 PM
To: Amy Wolfson <Amy.Wolfson@nevadacityca.gov>
Subject: Re: Opposed to new businesses

TO: Nevada City Planning Commission and the Nevada City City Council.

I am opposed to the first marijuana business, but if Nevada City wants to proceed, I will accept that.

However, I strongly urge that we take this slow and steady, **and not approve any new mairjuana related businesses until we can access the impact of the first marijuana dispensary.**

Let's give this a year or two of seeing how one marijuana business will affect the community, before we open the water gates to add 5 new businesses.

Doesn't that make sense? See the impact of one business before you add 5. It's much easier to hold back permission than it is to retract permission for settled businesses.

Sincerely,

Jeff Richards
Resident of Nevada City county

From: Kathleen Prout [mailto:ksprout@me.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2017 4:54 PM
To: Amy Wolfson <Amy.Wolfson@nevadacityca.gov>
Subject: Cannabis businesses in Nevada City

May 9, 2017

To: Amy Wolfson, Nevada City City Planner

To: Members of Nevada City Planning Commission

To: Members of Nevada City City Council

RE: Forum of professionals re: proposal to allow cannibis businesses within Nevada City limits

During the former procedure of the Planning Commission with regard to recommending a change in the city's ordinance on medicinal marijuana, I and others called for a forum wherein professionals from the fields of education, medicine, law enforcement, social services, psychological services, real estate, and others could make informed and scientific presentations. At no time did the Planning Commission nor the City Planner make such opportunity. Further, upon receipt of the proposed ordinance, the City Council also neglected such a forum.

Now that the City is moving to consider even wider availability and distribution of the substance, I call upon the City Planner, Planning Commission, and the Council to establish and orchestrate such a forum as described above.

The health hazards associated with the proliferation of the distribution of marijuana are widely known and documented. As a progressive community we cannot allow the demise of standards which support the health and welfare of not only Nevada City but the entirety of western Nevada County and beyond. As

other communities have warned, ours will regret the day we allow mind altering substances to take hold of our populous.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Prout

Nevada City CA

From: Janice Hamp [mailto:j.hamp@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2017 4:52 PM
To: Amy Wolfson <Amy.Wolfson@nevadacityca.gov>
Subject: 5 businesses for marijuana

Deae Amy Wolfson,

Thank you for representing SO MANY OF US who do NOT want to have these marijuana businesses in our community.

Thank you.

Janice Hamp

From: Kim Thompson [mailto:Kim@twincitieschurch.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2017 5:14 PM
To: Amy Wolfson <Amy.Wolfson@nevadacityca.gov>
Subject: opposing the new cannabis ordinance

Dear *Nevada City Planning Commission and the Nevada City City Council*,

I am writing to oppose the new proposed ordinance for 5 new types of cannabis businesses in addition to the dispensary, inside Nevada city limits.

This open door for "business" in our community is leading to a dangerous downward slide of brain health for the next generation.

It is alarming to me.

Thank you for helping our community protect its citizens.

Diane K. Thompson

From: Peter Cobabe [mailto:cobabeconsulting@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2017 5:06 PM
To: Amy Wolfson <Amy.Wolfson@nevadacityca.gov>
Subject: Medical Cannabis Manufacturing Ordinance

Amy and Commissioners,

Thank you for taking the time and energy to create ordinance to effectively regulate and tax this emerging industry. It is my request and recommendation of our city representatives to do their best to pattern ordinance after our State's process and efforts regarding Medical Cannabis Manufacturing business types and all Cannabis related business.

Nevada City Draft Ordinance No. 2017-6 as it stands prevents our community from capitalizing on the States efforts in a number of ways. Including limits to the permittee selection process, limits to land use, and limits to license types allowed.

It is my suggestion that we expand the allowable space from Light Industrial to that of like businesses and not locally regulate Cannabis beyond any other plant extract or plant infusion business.

It is my suggestion that we model state license types across the board in order to create a cohesive industry free of regulatory gap.

The State Department of Public Health has gone to great length and expense to draft reasonable regulation that establish licensing schemes, set minimum manufacturing practices and standards as well as establish packaging and labeling standards for manufactured cannabis products.

This legislation can be found here

https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Documents/OMCS_Initial_Text_DPH-17-004.pdf

Regulation efforts are meant to be encouraging and inviting in order to bring these operations out of the quasi-underground as remarked in the Department of Health Statement of Reasons.

From the Initial Statement of Reasons for Medical Cannabis Manufacturing by the CA Department of Public Health

https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Documents/OMCS_ISOR_DPH-17-004.pdf

“Regulated Market and Prevention of Diversion In addition to product safety, a key goal of the proposed regulations is to minimize the diversion of cannabis from the regulated market to the underground market. Through the Compassionate Use Act (CUA), California has had a thriving quasi-, underground market for many years. The Act, and subsequently the Adult Use of Marijuana Act, has the policy goal of establishing solid regulatory oversight in a legal marketplace. However, the Department is well aware that the underground market has not been

eliminated in California and is still flourishing outside of the state. The Department, therefore, approached the drafting of these regulations with the intent of creating a strong foundation for the protection of public health and safety, without making regulatory compliance so onerous that manufacturers of medical cannabis products would choose to remain in the underground market.”

Please carefully reconsider each section of the draft ordinance to integrate the streamlined structures outlined by the State.

Thank you again for your considerations and efforts,

Peter Cobabe

502 Factory Street,
Nevada City, CA 95959

From: Mike Griffin [mailto:mike@sierrapres.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2017 4:59 PM
To: Amy Wolfson <Amy.Wolfson@nevadacityca.gov>
Subject: Input on Additional Cannabis Businesses

Amy,

I am writing as a concerned citizen about the additional cannabis businesses Nevada City is now considering. While I believe that a medicinal cannabis business as previously approved can have some benefit, I have only been concerned about location, I don't see any redeemable value in approving additional cannabis businesses. Frankly, opening up the floodgates to several different types of business and the seeming desire to make our city a hub for cannabis businesses will kill our community and drive out those who have enjoyed living in the beauty of our area but do not desire to see it driven by cannabis business. Please... strongly consider allowing the one medical dispensary to be a test case for how cannabis businesses are received in our community and push pause for a year before proceeding with caution.

Thank You For Your Consideration, Mike Griffin

Pastor

Sierra Presbyterian Church

From: Patty Janette [mailto:padaddylove@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2017 4:57 PM
To: Amy Wolfson <Amy.Wolfson@nevadacityca.gov>
Subject: medical cannabis businesses ordinance

Patty Lawrence

211 Mill Street

Nevada City, CA

May 10, 2017

Amy Wolfson

Nevada City Planner

317 Broad Street

Nevada City, CA 95959

Regarding the medical cannabis businesses draft ordinance, I suggest several considerations and changes. Each recommendation falls under one or both of two themes: (1) the rules treat the medical cannabis business differently and with more restrictions than businesses of any other industry, and (2) the rules are redundant to or in conflict with the new state regulations under MCRSA for medical cannabis businesses, and create complications for the business operators with no benefit to the consumers nor local citizens.

Please consider the following changes:

1. **Define how long the City has to provide or deny a permit to the applicant.**

2. **Remove all labeling requirements.** There is nothing in that section that is not covered by the new state law (California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Division 1, Chapter 13), and some of the ordinance requirements would require irrelevant or redundant information to be provided on our precious, and often small, label space. I.E. the ordinance requires to mark the weight of cannabis in a package, but state law requires, and patients typically want, to know the weight (in milligrams) of active cannabinoids, as pharmaceuticals are dosed by active ingredients, not by the weight of the pill. (I'm not saying cannabis is a pharmaceutical product, but it is psychoactive and bioactive, and doses are important). Furthermore, it seems highly unusual (and I question the legality) for any city to be legislating what goes on the label of a consumer product that is for all/mostly/sometimes export from city limits.

3. **Remove Light Industrial limitation and replace with consistent city zoning laws.** The new requirements for medical cannabis manufacturing require meeting extensive safety requirements, and make our operations far safer than most homes and industrial businesses in Nevada City. A medical cannabis business would have to meet all the same noise, aesthetic, traffic, nuisance, etc. requirements as any other business in the zone.

4. **Allow ethanol in manufacturing.** To obtain and retain our California state license, we will have secured facilities, meet four national and international fire safety standards, our equipment must be commercially manufactured and safety certified by licensed

engineers, maintained, operators must be trained and follow precise protocols. Meanwhile, in many kitchens, there are knobs on stoves within easy reach of children that can allow flammable gas to flow out unburned, and create very dangerous situations.

Again, California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Division 1, Chapter 13, which deals with Medical Cannabis Manufacturing Licenses, is extremely thorough in providing for public and personnel safety. We have two breweries in Nevada City, one of them is right downtown, in a popular restaurant. Our manufacturing operations will be as safe or safer. We have homes, as I mentioned, where children have access to controls of volatile and flammable gases; our labs will be safer than our homes. We have bars where people drink alcohol (ethanol) and smoke cigarettes at the same time. I presume that the auto repair shops, the dentist offices, veterinary office, gas stations, herb shops and other operations in our town do use volatile compounds, and medical cannabis manufacturers should not be excluded from operating safely.

It is inconsistent to allow exclusively medical cannabis businesses, but disallow an essential ingredient used in its manufacture. Ethanol is particularly good at extracting medicinal components of plants, which is why it is used to as the main solvent for herb tinctures. My work is in medical cannabis manufacturing, and although I am an advocate for personal choice regarding adult cannabis use for medical, emotional, spiritual, or other reasons, the people using our product always do so for serious physical conditions, and these physical challenges demand access to products that provide relief.

Thank you for your reasonable considerations.

Signed,

Patty Lawrence

.....

Dear Ms. Wolfson,

I am hoping you will take this voice in opposition to the additional cannabis stores in Nevada City. Having spent 10 years as an advocate for abused and neglected children, I can tell you that most of the children were hopelessly locked in conditions where their parents were users of marijuana first, progressing to drugs of higher potency, combined of course with intoxicants.

Some of these children have been marked for life with multiple dysfunctional scars. Some of their parents have died early, become homeless or have become a burden to society.

Please give your attention to all those who have written in opposition. We know greed supersedes reason and those in favor will inundate you with all manner of coercion to support their cause.

Thank you.

Dora Cividino

"Weakness of attitude, becomes weakness of character". Albert Einstein.

Greetings,

I apologize for the excessive emails! I need to correct my last link.
It is page 27 on this link:

http://www.bmcr.ca.gov/laws_regs/mcrsa_ptor.pdf

On Thu, May 11, 2017 at 10:11 PM, Danielle Dao <daostudios@gmail.com> wrote:
Greetings,

I found the part of the California regulation draft for a bit more information for you.
It begins on page 27 from this link:

<http://www.nevadacityca.gov/files/documents/DraftordCana-business1324043445042117PM.pdf>

Thank you
Danielle

On Thu, May 11, 2017 at 10:02 PM, Danielle Dao <daostudios@gmail.com> wrote:
Greetings,

I regards to the main difference between having a Nursery versus cultivation is the following:
Nurseries have no limits on plant numbers as none of them are flowering ever or mature. Therefore the plant count of cultivation would not apply to a nursery license type.
Thanks for your time,
Danielle Dao

On Thu, May 11, 2017 at 9:54 PM, Danielle Dao <daostudios@gmail.com> wrote:
Greetings,

Thank you for all of your hard efforts and research on this topic. I was present at the public input meeting last week, and I was very grateful to meet you all and see the draft of the ordinance. I wanted to comment on a topic left out of the current draft in regards to permits for the Nursery license type. A cannabis nursery provides consistent small cuttings (clones) for farmers to ensure organic, pure, non-systemic pesticide, free and clear genetics. This type of business requires little electric output, minimal if no odor, no finished or "flowering" plant material, or any volatile substance for operation. I believe it is important for our County/ State to be able to secure and produce acclimated clean genetics for all medicine that goes out to the dispensaries and patients. Most of the cloned genetics available on the market today are testing positive for highly toxic chemical pesticides. This includes some of the biggest Nurseries in California such as Dark Heart and Queen Bee. I appreciate your consideration.
Thank you,
Danielle Dao