

ORDINANCE NO. _____

**ORDINANCE REPEALING CHAPTER 7.126 OF THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY CODE
AND ADOPTING NEW CHAPTER 7.126 PROHIBITING THE COMMERCIAL
CULTIVATION OF CANNABIS**

The Board of Supervisors of Santa Cruz County hereby finds and declares the following:

WHEREAS, in 1992 the voters of the County of Santa Cruz enacted Measure "A", adding Chapter 7.122 to the Santa Cruz County Code which declared support for making cannabis available for medical use; and

WHEREAS, in 1996, the voters of the State of California approved Proposition 215 (codified as California Health and Safety Code section 11362.5, and entitled "The Compassionate Use Act of 1996"); and

WHEREAS, (1) the intent of Proposition 215 was to enable persons who are in need of cannabis for medical purposes to use it without fear of criminal prosecution under limited, specified circumstances; (2) the proposition further provides that "nothing in this section shall be construed to supersede legislation prohibiting persons from engaging in conduct that endangers others, or to condone the diversion of cannabis for non-medical purposes"; and (3) the ballot arguments supporting Proposition 215 expressly acknowledged that "Proposition 215 does not allow unlimited quantities of cannabis to be grown anywhere"; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors added Chapter 7.124 to the Santa Cruz County Code which implemented provisions of Proposition 215 by establishing a medical cannabis identification card program operated by the County; and

WHEREAS, in 2004, the Legislature enacted Senate Bill 420 (codified as California Health and Safety Code sections 11362.7 *et seq.*) to clarify the scope of Proposition 215, and to provide qualifying patients and primary caregivers who cultivate cannabis for medical purposes with a limited defense to certain specified State criminal statutes; and

WHEREAS, Health and Safety Code section 11362.83 expressly allows cities and counties to adopt and enforce ordinances that are consistent with Senate Bill 420; and

WHEREAS, following enactment of Senate Bill 420, Chapter 7.124 was amended to establish local guidelines consistent with the new State law for the possession and cultivation of medical cannabis used by qualified patients and caregivers; and

WHEREAS, (1) the Federal Controlled Substances Act, 21 U.S.C. §§ 801 *et seq.*, classifies cannabis as a Schedule I Drug, which is defined as a drug or other substance that has a high potential for abuse, that has no currently accepted medical use in treatment in the United States, and that has not been accepted as safe for use under medical supervision; (2) the Federal Controlled Substances Act makes it unlawful, under federal law, for any person to cultivate, manufacture, distribute or dispense, or possess with intent to manufacture, distribute or dispense,

cannabis; and (3) the Federal Controlled Substances Act contains no exemption for the 0004 cultivation, manufacture, distribution, dispensation, or possession of cannabis for medical purposes; and

WHEREAS, (1) Proposition 215 and Senate Bill 420 primarily address criminal law issues, providing qualifying patients and primary caregivers with limited immunity from state criminal prosecution under certain identified statutes; and (2) Proposition 215, Senate Bill 420, the relevant provisions of the Santa Cruz County Code, and the Attorney General's August 2008 Guidelines for the Security and Non-Diversion of Marijuana Grown for Medical Use adopted pursuant to Senate Bill 420 do not provide comprehensive civil regulation of premises used for cannabis cultivation; and

WHEREAS, (1) on May 6, 2013, the California Supreme Court unanimously ruled in *City of Riverside v. Inland Empire Patients Health and Wellness Center, Inc.* (“*Inland Empire*”), that California’s medical cannabis laws do not preempt local ordinances that ban medical cannabis facilities; and (2) the Court found that the local police power derived from Article XI, section 7, of the California Constitution includes broad authority to determine, for purposes of public health, safety, and welfare, the appropriate uses of land within a local jurisdiction’s borders, and that “[n]othing in the CUA or the MMP expressly or impliedly limits the inherent authority of a local jurisdiction, by its own ordinances, to regulate the use of its land, including the authority to provide that facilities for the distribution of medical cannabis will not be permitted to operate within its borders”; and

WHEREAS, (1) the unregulated cultivation of cannabis in the unincorporated area of Santa Cruz County can adversely affect the health, safety, and well-being of the county and its residents; and (2) comprehensive civil regulation of premises used for cannabis cultivation is proper and necessary to avoid the risks of criminal activity, degradation of the natural environment, obnoxious smells, and indoor electrical fire hazards that may result from unregulated cannabis cultivation; and

WHEREAS, on December 10, 2013, the Board of Supervisors adopted an ordinance deleting then reenacting Chapter 7.124 of the Santa Cruz County Code, which prohibited medical cannabis businesses, but also granted a limited immunity from enforcement for such businesses that did not violate the restrictions and limitations added by that Chapter; and

WHEREAS, on February 25, 2014, the Board of Supervisors adopted an ordinance enacting Chapter 7.126 of the Santa Cruz County Code, which prohibited medical cannabis cultivation businesses, but also granted a limited immunity from enforcement for such businesses that did not violate the restrictions and limitations added by that Chapter; and

WHEREAS, after the enactment of Chapter 7.126, County staff documented a sharp rise in illegal cannabis cultivation sites that constitute a public nuisance by degrading the environment, improperly diverting natural resources, creating fire danger, and negatively impacting the quality of life for residents of Santa Cruz County; and

WHEREAS, (1) the limited right of qualified patients and their primary caregivers under state law to cultivate cannabis plants for medical purposes does not confer the right to create or

maintain a public nuisance; and (2) by adopting the regulations contained in this ordinance, Santa Cruz County will achieve a significant reduction in the aforementioned harms caused or threatened by the unregulated cultivation and dispensing of cannabis in the unincorporated area of the County; and

WHEREAS, (1) it is the purpose and intent of this ordinance to implement State law by providing a means for regulating the cultivation of medical cannabis in a manner that is consistent with State law and which balances the needs of medical patients and their caregivers and promotes the health, safety, and welfare of the residents and businesses within the unincorporated territory of Santa Cruz County; and (2) the intent and purpose of this ordinance is to establish reasonable regulations upon the manner in which cannabis may be cultivated, including restrictions on the location of cultivation activities and the amount of cannabis that may be cultivated in any location or premises, in order to protect the public health, safety, and welfare in Santa Cruz County; and

WHEREAS, (1) nothing in this ordinance shall be construed to allow the use of cannabis for non-medical purposes, or allow any activity relating to the cultivation, distribution, or consumption of cannabis that is otherwise illegal under State or federal law; and (2) no provision of the Chapter created by this ordinance shall be deemed a defense or immunity to any action brought against any person by the Santa Cruz County District Attorney, the Attorney General of the State of California, or the United States of America.

NOW THEREFORE the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Cruz ordains as follows:

SECTION I

The Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by deleting existing Chapter 7.126 in its entirety.

SECTION II

The Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by adding new Chapter 7.126 to read as follows:

Chapter 7.126 Prohibition On The Cultivation Of Cannabis

Sections:

- 7.126.010 Purpose.**
- 7.126.020 Definitions.**
- 7.126.030 Prohibited activities.**
- 7.126.040 No vested or nonconforming rights.**
- 7.126.050 Limited severability.**
- 7.126.060 Enforcement.**
- 7.126.070 No duty to enforce.**

7.126.010 Purpose.

The purpose of this Chapter is to prohibit the cultivation of cannabis by anyone other than qualified patients or their caregivers.

It is also the purpose of this Chapter to mitigate the negative impacts and secondary effects associated with ongoing cannabis cultivation activities including, but not limited to, demands placed on law enforcement and administrative resources; neighborhood disruption; robberies; burglaries; assaults; drug trafficking and other violent crimes; and the damage to the natural environment resulting from destructive cannabis cultivation activity.

This Chapter is not intended to conflict with Federal or State law. It is the intention of the County that this Chapter be interpreted to be compatible with Federal and State enactments and in furtherance of the public purposes that those enactments encompass.

7.126.020 Definitions.

As used in this Chapter, the following words and phrases shall have the meanings respectively ascribed to them by this section:

- (A) "Cannabis" shall be construed as the term "marijuana" is defined in California Health and Safety Code section 11018 and further shall specifically include any product that contains cannabis or a derivative of cannabis.
- (B) "Cultivation" or "cultivate" means the planting, growing, developing, propagating, harvesting, drying, processing, or storage of, one or more cannabis plants or any part thereof in any location, indoor or outdoor.
- (C) "Enforcing Officer" means any employee duly authorized to investigate violations of and enforce Chapter 19.01 of the County Code, or any peace officer.
- (D) "Indoor" or "indoors" means any location that is contained within a fully enclosed and secured permanent structure that contains walls, a roof, and access to utilities, that is reasonably intended to prevent unauthorized access. Other structures of a temporary or moveable nature, including but not limited to moveable greenhouses, tents, and hoop houses, are not considered "indoor" or "indoors" for purposes of this definition.
- (E) "Location" or "parcel" means that unit of land assigned a unique Assessor's Parcel Number by the County Assessor, whether vacant or occupied by a building, group of buildings, or accessory buildings, and includes the buildings, structures, yards, open spaces, lot width, and lot area. Where contiguous legal parcels are under common ownership or control, such contiguous legal parcels shall be counted as a single "location" or "parcel" for purposes of this Chapter.

(F) "Outdoor" or "Outdoors" means any location that is not "indoors" as defined in this Chapter.

(G) "Residence" means a fully enclosed structure or structures, including any attached or detached garage or ancillary structure, used as a primary dwelling unit.

(H) "Structure" means any secure building constructed or erected, supported directly or indirectly on the earth, the interior of which is protected from the elements and meant to be occupied by people or property. "Structure" does not include a greenhouse, tent, hoop house, vehicle, carport, or other structures of a temporary or moveable nature.

(I) "Vehicle" means a device by which any person or property may be propelled, moved, or drawn upon a street, sidewalk or waterway, including but not limited to a device moved exclusively by human power.

(J) When used in this section, the term "Qualified patient" means a person who possesses or cultivates cannabis for his or her own personal medical use upon the written or oral recommendation or approval of a physician, as set forth in California Health and Safety Code section 11362.5(d).

(K) When used in this section, the term "Primary caregiver" means the individual designated by a qualified patient who has consistently assumed responsibility for the housing, health, or safety of that qualified patient, as set forth in California Health and Safety Code section 11362.5(e).

7.126.030 Prohibited activities.

(A) It is unlawful and shall constitute a public nuisance for anyone other than a qualified patient or that qualified patient's designated primary caregiver to cultivate cannabis. A qualified patient, or his or her designated primary caregiver, may cultivate medical cannabis solely for the patient's personal use as long as the cultivator is in full compliance with the following provisions:

(1) Cultivation can only take place on a parcel that includes the residence of the patient or caregiver, and cultivation is limited to one resident per parcel.

(2) Other than those qualified patients subject to additional limits as set forth in Section 7.124.070(d) of the County Code, the amount of cannabis grown cannot exceed one hundred (100) square feet of planted area.

(3) If the parcel is located within that area defined by section 2.04.030 of the Santa Cruz County Code, outdoor cultivation of cannabis is prohibited.

(4) If cultivation takes place outdoors, evidence of cultivation shall not be visible from any public right-of-way.

(5) If cultivation takes place indoors: (i) lighting for cultivation purposes shall not exceed 1200 watts unless a written certification is first obtained from a licensed electrician that the cultivation site has all necessary electrical permits required by the California Building Codes to ensure that the growing operations can be carried out safely; and (ii) exterior evidence of cultivation (including odor emanating from the premises) is prohibited. 0008

(B) The extraction of chemical compounds from cannabis by way of a solvent-based extraction method utilizing compressed flammable gases or alcohol is prohibited.

(C) A cultivation site granted an exemption by the Planning Director pursuant to Santa Cruz County Code section 13.10.670(g) as enacted by Ordinance No. 5090, is not subject to section 7.126.030(A), so long as the area subject to cultivation is not expanded or enlarged beyond what existed at that location on January 1, 2012.

7.126.040 No vested or nonconforming rights.

(A) This Chapter prohibits the cultivation of cannabis. Neither this Chapter, nor any other provision of this Code or action, failure to act, statement, representation, certificate, approval, or permit issued by the county or its departments, or their respective representatives, agents, employees, attorneys or assigns, shall create, confer, or convey any vested or nonconforming right or benefit regarding the cultivation of medical cannabis. Any immunity or benefit conferred by this Chapter shall expire permanently and in full upon repeal of this Chapter.

7.126.050 Limited severability.

(A) If any provision or clause of section 7.126.030 of this Chapter is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall invalidate every other provision, clause and application of the invalidated section, and to this end the provisions and clauses of section 7.126.030 of this Chapter are declared to be inseverable.

(B) Except for the inseverability of the provisions, clauses and applications of section 7.126.030 on the terms set forth hereinabove, if any other provision or clause of this Chapter is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect those provisions, clauses or applications of this Chapter which can be implemented without the invalid provision, clause or application, and to this end the provisions and clauses of this Chapter other than section 7.126.030 are declared to be severable.

7.126.060 Enforcement.

(A) This Chapter shall be considered a land use regulation for purposes of Section 19.01 of this Code. Enforcement of this Chapter may be pursued by one or more of those alternatives set forth in subsection (A) of County Code section 19.01.030. It shall be a separate offense for each and every day during any portion of which any violation of, or failure to comply with, any provision of this Chapter is committed, continued or permitted.

(B) Whenever the Enforcing Officer determines that a public nuisance as defined in this Chapter exists at any location within the unincorporated area of Santa Cruz County, he or she is

From: Kurt Yeager [kyeager@galvinpower.org]
Sent: Tuesday, April 07, 2015 4:31 PM
To: Zach Friend
Subject: Fwd: Second Vote New Ordinance – Exhibit A

April 7, 2015

2nd District Supervisor, Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors

RE: Second Vote New Ordinance – Exhibit A

Dear Supervisor Zach Friend:

Thank you so much for your thoughtfully positive leadership and vote for Exhibit A of the New Ordinance prohibiting the commercial cultivation of Cannabis. This eliminates what has been a major threat to the residential neighborhoods in Santa Cruz County. As we emphasized before the March 24th Board of Supervisors' Meeting, based on our 15 years of residence in Larkin Valley, Exhibit A of the New Ordinance will securely maintain the integrity of our beautiful neighborhood and all other neighborhoods throughout the County.

We will be on business and family travel and unavailable to attend on April 14th, but you have our full support for your positive New Ordinance – Exhibit A second vote at this next Board of Supervisors' Meeting. Please let us know if there is anything we can provide in our absence to help ensure your most effective leadership at this Meeting and throughout the future.

Sincerely and best regards,

Kurt Yeager & Regina Yeager
Wildwood Drive
Larkin Valley

From: vicki rose [vicki@ridgemarkfarm.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 07, 2015 8:07 AM
To: Bruce McPherson; Zach Friend
Cc: John Leopold; Ryan Coonerty; tony.gregorio@santa-cruz.ca.us
Subject: Ridgemark Farm and the Medical Marijuana Ordinance

Dear Supervisors-

I wanted to thank you for voting to ban the commercial growing of medical marijuana two weeks ago. My horse training business is the one that has been so negatively impacted by the proposed grow in Larkin Valley.

Unfortunately, 4 of my clients decided to move their horses from my business prior to the meeting due to their discomfort with the property owner and his intended use of the farm. This financial hit, as well as the bleak outlook for attracting future clients, put me in a position where I was no longer able to afford the rent (as I paid a per-stall fee on 18 horses, whether I had a horse in that stall or not), and therefore decided to close my business there and move to a different facility.

Again, I sincerely applaud your efforts to keep the medical marijuana industry from impacting the community. I moved here in 1988 to go to UCSC, building Ridgemark Farm from the ground up beginning in 1992. My husband and I have since bought a home and raised our two high school age boys in Soquel. Santa Cruz has changed so much-but not for the better.

I tell you this for two reasons. First, the fact that I am forced to close and move my business in Larkin Valley does indeed impact my ability to pay my mortgage and continue to support my family's needs in Soquel. Second, once our boys have graduated, my husband and I have decided to move to another, less marijuana friendly, community. It is very sad to feel as if the Santa Cruz we came to love has been taken over by out of town businessmen whose practices diminish our enjoyment of and ability to afford living in such a special place.

Moving forward, I hope that the Supervisors as individuals can keep in mind that what happens in another district can certainly affect their own constituents. Please work together as a group to do what you can to value and protect Santa Cruz.

Thanks so much for listening,
Vicki Rose
Ridgemark Farm, LLC

Alicia Murillo

From: cdbbosmail@co.santa-cruz.ca.us
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2015 11:30 PM
To: CBD BOSMAIL
Subject: Agenda Comments

Meeting Date : 4/14/2015

Meeting Type : County
Board of Supervisors

Item Number : 10.00

Name : Russ Mackey

Email : Rmackey411@comcast.net

Address : Bonny Doon

Phone : Not Supplied

Comments :

RE: April 14 Agenda, Item 10, Cannabis Cultivation Ban

Dear Supervisors and Staff,

Thank you for documenting the environmental damage and the stress on residential communities inflicted by out of control commercial cannabis cultivation, and for voting to ban commercial cultivation in Santa Cruz County.

Please vote unanimously to confirm the ban on April 14.

Please send a loud and strong message that Santa Cruz County neither supports nor condones commercial cannabis cultivation beyond the limits established in the County Code.

We appreciate all your efforts to date and look forward to continued elimination of the damage to the environment and our neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Russ Mackey

Alicia Murillo

From: cdbbosmail@co.santa-cruz.ca.us
Sent: Friday, April 10, 2015 2:17 PM
To: CBD BOSMAIL
Subject: Agenda Comments

Meeting Date : 4/14/2015

Meeting Type : County Board of Supervisors

Item Number : 10.00

Name : Courtney Reif

Email : Courtneyreif9@gmail.com

Address : Not Supplied

Phone : Not Supplied

Comments :

As a resident of Bonny Doon, I wish to express my concerns regarding the potential new ordinance regarding marijuana cultivation in Bonny Doon. I do not support the proposed ordinance, as I feel it will cause and enhance the problems it is designed to eliminate. I have noted from various community discussions that those who support the ordinance seem to have little understanding of the current ordinances as well as the basic systems and principles involved in cultivating marijuana. Most of the concerns in regard to the current system of marijuana cultivation revolve around the undesirable practices of operations that are already operating illegally under current ordinances, therefore the new ordinance will only apply to those who operate conscientiously and legally. Many of the ordinance's supporters cite the grow operation that was shut down for sourcing water from a local stream as a reason why marijuana should be banned altogether, however they fail to recognize the fact that their actions were already highly illegal and frowned upon. None of the common concerns are inherent issues with marijuana cultivation, and all could be addressed with ordinances that dictate the manner in which it may be cultivated, rather than banning it outright. For instance, many residents expressed concerns over potential pesticide use in the cultivation of marijuana, however they do not realize that this could be addressed with ordinances that require all Bonny Doon grows to be organic, which would benefit residents and patients alike. Some express displeasure with the smell that appears for 2-3 weeks towards the end of the growing season, and yet again they do not realize that this could be addressed with an ordinance that requires growers to not let the smell exceed their own property, rather than an outright ban. Another concern of my own is that only the good growers who put the time and effort into the ensuring that they operate within current ordinances will be affected by this. The good growers are the ones that nobody knows about as their practices are not destructive or disruptive to their neighbors. Many of these growers are lifelong Dooners who rely on the extra income from their gardens. If this

10

ordinance is enacted, these individuals may be forced to choose between operating underground or giving up the income that allows them to hang on to their beloved property. Another concern of mine is that such an ordinance may lead growers to continue their operations indoors, where homemade electrical set ups may be sub-par, creating a very serious fire danger. This will be an inevitable result, as Santa Cruz dispensaries are required to source their products from within Santa Cruz County, and taking away their legal, ordinance-compliant sources will force them to purchase from underground growers. Enacting this ordinance would be comparable to allowing steak restaurants to operate in Santa Cruz, requiring them to source their beef from Santa Cruz County, but then banning the raising of cows. The difference is that marijuana is a medical necessity for many. Creating a climate in which only commercially-sized grows can operate only increases the incidence of deforestation and pesticide pollution, as it is not the locals who will be controlling such operations. The most fundamental disgrace that this ordinance poses is that it bans cultivation from properties that are zoned for agricultural use. Agricultural land should not be restricted from behaving differently than purely residential land, otherwise the different designations are meaningless. Those with agricultural land have the fundamental right to engage in agricultural behavior, and this ordinance ignores that fact. This political debate is troublesome, as rule-abiding growers fear to stand up for themselves as many feel that it creates a target on their backs in the case that this ordinance is enacted and enforced, meaning one side is grossly underrepresented. If this new ordinance is adopted, the effectiveness of all previous ordinances that intended to create a harmonious relationship between growers, the environment, the residents, and the patients will go out of the window, and all progress will be lost. When boiled down to the core, the question that you all must ask yourselves is this: there will be marijuana cultivation in Bonny Doon regardless of the decision that is made. Do you want to be able to regulate it to protect the environment and safety of residents, or do you wish for it to become an unregulated, underground industry? I, as a resident of Bonny Doon, request that you make the sensible decision by choosing to keep the industry legal so that it may be regulated for the protection of the environment and public safety. As we should all know from a quick look at the alcohol ban of the 1920's, prohibition doesn't work.

Alicia Murillo

From: cbdbosmail@co.santa-cruz.ca.us
Sent: Sunday, April 12, 2015 10:26 PM
To: CBD BOSMAIL
Subject: Agenda Comments

Meeting Date : 4/14/2015

Meeting Type : County Board of Supervisors

Item Number : 10.00

Name : Bob Strickland

Email : Not Supplied

Address : 123 McGivern Way
Santa Cruz, CA

Phone : Not Supplied

Comments :

Board of Supervisors:

Please pass the option A to disallow commercial grows yet allow personal and caregiver grows within Santa Cruz county. This is a simple ordinance that gives Santa Cruz a clean start into legalization of marijuana growth. Earlier attempts to jump directly to the end-game resulted in a disaster for the county. After cleaning up the mess created by the earlier ordinance, any deficiencies the new ordinance may be addressed at a later time.

Thank You,
Bob Strickland

Alicia Murillo

From: cbdbosmail@co.santa-cruz.ca.us
Sent: Saturday, April 11, 2015 12:09 PM
To: CBD BOSMAIL
Subject: Agenda Comments

Meeting Date : 4/14/2015

Meeting Type : County Board of Supervisors

Item Number : 10.00

Name : Gail Conover

Email : Not Supplied

Address : Not Supplied

Phone : Not Supplied

Comments :

Please reconsider passing the new ordinance for Cannabis cultivation.

The thousands of patients that will be affected is criminal.

Do not pass this new ordinance.

Thank you for your services,

Gail

From: Alexis Jenkins <ajglitter@comcast.net>

Date: April 10, 2015 at 10:41:44 AM PDT

To: Zach Friend <Zach.Friend@santacruzcounty.us>

Subject: Please support the ban on commercial cultivation of cannabis

Dear Supervisor,

I would greatly appreciate a ban on the commercial cultivation of cannabis in Santa Cruz County.

I personally have been surrounded by various attempts of nuisance pot growing both personal (supposedly) and commercial. Properties in my neighborhood have been purchased by outsiders for the purpose of profit making pot grows. It has been horrible for our community and we support the direction of the Board based on the last Board meeting.

I do have some concerns about the large allotment for personal grows and think a number of plants option would make more sense especially for enforcement.

However, for the time being, I'd appreciate a strong message that Santa Cruz County is not another Humboldt County.

Thank you.

A. Jenkins

10

Alicia Murillo

From: cdbosmail@co.santa-cruz.ca.us
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 8:19 AM
To: CBD BOSMAIL
Subject: Agenda Comments

Meeting Date : 4/14/2015

Meeting Type : County Board
of Supervisors

Item Number : 10.00

Name : steven nader

Email : snader76@gmail.com

Address : po box 600 felton ca
95018

Phone : 831-234-7879

Comments :

I am a santa cruz county resident for 20 years and i oppose the new cannabis ordinance. Its unfair and prohibits patients who live on the same property from having equal access to growing their own medicine. It also is unfair to patient collectives who share garden space.

Alicia Murillo

From: cbdbosmail@co.santa-cruz.ca.us
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 11:15 AM
To: CBD BOSMAIL
Subject: Agenda Comments

Meeting Date : 4/14/2015

Meeting Type : County
Board of Supervisors

Item Number : 10.00

Name : Kathlean J Perlin

Email : rubyeveryday888@gmail.com

Address : PO BX 1381
WATSONVILLE

Phone : 8317404520

Comments :

Patient Cultivators*make this be a separate issue! Few bad growers causing a co. wide Board Action.I could not agree more PG&E ought to be alerting our FIRE DEPARTMENTS of high "suspicious" use. I could not agree more these new to our area growers are causing neighbors grief & concerns we all should be kept abreast of. Medicinal Marijuana is necessary to many ill residents. Those who pay their mortgages by cultivating to make the ill feel better are at risk of losing their homes if this is past. Please reconsider the IDIOTS v the HUMANITARIAN VOCAL minority. God Bless Ya, Kathlean J Perlin

10

Alicia Murillo

From: cdbosmail@co.santa-cruz.ca.us
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 12:37 PM
To: CBD BOSMAIL
Subject: Agenda Comments

Meeting Date : 4/14/2015

Meeting Type : County Board of Supervisors

Item Number : 10.00

Name : Melissa Thompson

Email : Not Supplied

Address : Not Supplied

Phone : Not Supplied

Comments :

Please vote to ban commercial marijuana grows on residential properties. We have been negatively affected by marijuana being grown nearby. We are concerned about the amount of water required to grow it, the smell at harvest time and the use of all night lighting in greenhouses. 100 square ft per property is a sufficient amount for personal medical marijuana use. Please vote for stricter regulations and the staff to enforce them. Thank you.

Alicia Murillo

From: cbdbosmail@co.santa-cruz.ca.us
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 12:17 PM
To: CBD BOSMAIL
Subject: Agenda Comments

Meeting Date : 4/14/2015

Meeting Type : County Board of Supervisors

Item Number : 10.00

Name : Phyllis Strickland

Email : Not Supplied

Address : Bonny Doon

Phone : Not Supplied

Comments :

I support a ban on commercial cultivation of medical cannabis. However, when you make a mess you need to clean it up. With at least 145 documented illegal sites in the county I urge the board to publicly address a strategy and time frame for shutting them down. Without a vigorous effort to reverse the damage to rural environments and neighborhoods you send a message to the large scale growers new and old that they have nothing to lose by continuing their illegal grows here. You also send the message to rural neighborhoods that they have been abandoned without recourse.