

MINUTES OF THE SOLANO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting of January 19, 2017

The regular meeting of the Solano County Planning Commission was held in the Solano County Administration Center, Board of Supervisors' Chambers (1st floor), 675 Texas Street, Fairfield, California.

PRESENT: Commissioners Rhoads-Poston, Walker, Hollingsworth, Castellblanch, and Chairperson Cayler

EXCUSED: None

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Yankovich, Planning Program Manager; Karen Avery, Senior Planner; Davina Smith, Deputy County Counsel; and Kristine Sowards, Planning Commission Clerk

Chairperson Cayler called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with a salute to the flag. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

Approval of the Agenda

The Agenda was approved with no additions or deletions.

Approval of the Minutes

There were no minutes available for approval.

Items from the Public

There was no one from the public wishing to speak.

Regular Calendar

Item No. 1 -

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING, no action or formal recommendation is anticipated, to collect public input on how the County should regulate indoor and outdoor personal and caregiver cultivation of medical cannabis and non-medical marijuana in all zones that allow a residence; and to collect public input on whether the County should consider allowing three types of commercial marijuana activity in the manufacturing and industrial zones: 1) cultivation indoors up to 10,000 sq. ft., 2) non-volatile-solvent marijuana manufacturing, and 3) marijuana testing laboratories; and prohibiting all other commercial marijuana activities in the unincorporated county. Receive presentations from the Solano County's Department of Agriculture and Department of Public Health; and Consider designating one or two representatives of the Planning Commission to assist staff in collecting cannabis/marijuana data and report back to the full Commission. (Project Planner: Karen Avery)

Karen Avery gave a brief introduction to staff's written report. The report noted Solano County is

considering adopting regulations for personal cultivation of medical cannabis and nonmedical marijuana. The draft regulations are to reflect both the Medical Cannabis Regulation and Safety Act (MCRSA) and the Adult Use of Marijuana Act (AUMA) both of which allow local jurisdictions to further regulate cannabis/marijuana. Currently, the focus is on personal cultivation as indoor personal cultivation cannot be prohibited by local jurisdictions per AUMA.

The staff report explained that the Board of Supervisors considered this issue and directed staff to develop an ordinance on personal cultivation. Staff prepared and presented a draft ordinance to the Planning Commission on November 17, 2016. After listening to input from the public and after discussion amongst the Commissioners, the Planning Commission meeting was continued to January 19, 2017. The Planning Commission wanted additional time to evaluate personal cultivation regulatory options and in particular additional options in regards to outdoor cultivation.

Ms. Avery noted that Robin Cox and Felicia Flores-Workman will be speaking on behalf of the Solano County Public Health Department about how the new laws may affect Health and Social Service programs, and Agricultural Commissioner, Jim Allan will be speaking on behalf of the Solano County Agriculture Department giving an agricultural perspective of the new laws and how they may affect the Agriculture Department's operations.

Robin Cox's presentation included an overview of public health impacts of marijuana use, public health and mental health responsibilities and what the impact of Prop 64 is likely to be on the need for services and increased services in county health and social services, specifically around public health and mental health. Ms. Cox's presentation also touched on regulation considerations. She said the Department's mission is to protect public health and to look at the community as a whole.

Commissioner Castellblanch noted that Prop 64 just passed in the State of California with Solano County voting 58% in favor. He commented that he did not want to sit here and debate the public health consequences. He said the commission is here to decide on matters of cultivation in the unincorporated areas of this county and what the appropriate practices are. Mr. Castellblanch said he did not feel the public health presentation to be germane to the question of cultivation and whether or not people can grow marijuana in their backyard or in their homes.

Davina Smith, deputy county counsel, explained that what is happening tonight is a process. She said that because this is a process the idea is to get a variety of perspectives. Additional information on a variety of topics relating to marijuana is being sought and staff is hoping to get input from the public tonight as well as from public health and the ag commissioner about various topics relating to both commercial marijuana, cultivation, commercial marijuana businesses, if they are right for the county, if they are not right, if we should have them, and if we do, what kind of regulations would be appropriate.

Commissioner Hollingsworth asked if the smoking rules in California are the same for marijuana as for tobacco. Felicia Flores-Workman stated that related to where someone cannot smoke, it would be the same. She said for example the City of Fairfield does not have an ordinance that says a person cannot smoke in the downtown area, so someone could walk by the businesses and smoke, but a person is not allowed by state law to go outside and smoke marijuana. Ms. Flores-Workman said in terms of prohibitions, places the state has barred someone from

smoking like smoke free parks and tot lots, neither would be allowed. She commented that it is a hard question to answer outright because smoking tobacco and cigarettes can be done unless a jurisdiction has specific policies around it.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston said she would like to see some comparisons and contrasts between marijuana and alcohol. She mentioned that a statement was made that 17% of persons who use marijuana are more likely to become addicted. She questioned if those persons would have become addicted to anything, or would have become addicted to alcohol at some point as well. She said she would also like to see the difference between the benefits and the downside of marijuana and alcohol use. Ms. Rhoads-Poston noted that alcohol is legal but there have been many documentaries and studies about how people drive under the influence of marijuana vs alcohol. She said she would also like to see any studies on how marijuana helps medicinally.

Robin Cox stated that there is not a tremendous amount of youth and teen studies because the substance was illicit. She said the Food and Drug Administration(FDA) and Environmental Protection Agency(EPA) did not grant many researchers the ability to experiment with an illicit substance on humans, so most of the data available is from people who were already using. Ms. Cox commented that she attended a health conference recently and met a father of a child with a rare form of epilepsy and his son has found benefit through cannabis. Ms. Cox reiterated that her presentation tonight is about the community at large and not about trying to interfere in the medical space between a patient and their doctor.

Commissioner Walker commented that it would be interesting to see the updated 2016 Colorado Department of Public Health report as edification. He said the commission's role tonight pertains to land use authority and jurisdiction recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. He commented that social policy and what works and does not work in the county is in the hands of the Board to decide.

Davina Smith clarified for the commission and for the audience that the current legal status of the county with regard to medical marijuana dispensaries is that they are not allowed by ordinance. Given the fact that Prop 64 came into effect and then MCRSA, it is uncertain if that is something the Board will want to revisit. Ms. Smith said at this point staff is trying to gather information and obtain public comment. The interest expressed by the Board is to deal with the personal cultivation aspect first, then commercial second, and third, dispensaries.

Commissioner Walker asked about the impact of the passing of Measure C. Ms. Smith stated that Measure C is the taxation measure that would be applied if the county were to adopt any commercial marijuana businesses in the unincorporated county; the Board would be able to set a tax limit on the gross profits. She said the impact is that it is in place in the event the Board decides to allow those commercial opportunities in the county.

Chairperson Cayler thanked Ms. Cox and Ms. Flores-Workman for sharing their information because when it comes time to decide where the county is going to allow these plants to grow, the effect on the population is an important piece of the consideration.

Jim Allan, county agricultural commissioner provided a White Paper from his professional association that largely speaks to the regulatory impacts to ag commissioners once the

cannabis industry is fully realized, the areas that currently have regulatory authority, and how those would be impacted as cannabis is rolled out in different jurisdictions. The paper also talks about the rolls of the department. Mr. Allan's main purpose in being here tonight is to be a subject matter expert for the commission on the horticultural and botanical aspects of cannabis, and if so desired, the agricultural aspects of industrial hemp. Mr. Allan provided an overview of the items he described. He noted that when he approached the Farm Bureau and the Ag Advisory Committee their main concern centered around security and environmental issues not agricultural or horticultural issues.

Mike Yankovich said that in the forthcoming months staff will be bringing other speakers from other areas of interest to also give the commission a baseline from which to work from when deliberating on this matter.

Ms. Avery finished up staff's presentation by reminding the commission about the personal cultivation comparisons with regard to MCRSA and AUMA and she briefly reviewed the list of regulatory goals which included theft and trespassing, preventing access to underage and unauthorized people, health risks, neighborhood impacts, electrical improvements, water usage, compliance with building, electrical and fire codes, and organic marijuana.

Since there were no further questions of staff, Chairperson Cayler opened the public hearing.

Dante De La Cerna, 185 Hastings Avenue, Vallejo, stated that he works at Fighting Back Partnership in Vallejo and coordinates the Vallejo Community Change Coalition which strives to create a healthy environment for Vallejo kids and families where the negative impact of alcohol, tobacco and other harmful products are minimized. He said he is also a member of the Solano County Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs (ATOD) prevention collaborative. He said the collaborative is a countywide group of stakeholders working to reduce ATOD use among youth in Solano County. Mr. De La Cerna urged the commission to encourage responsible and thoughtful regulation of medical and recreational marijuana activities to honor the health and safety of the entire community. He spoke of the increase of marijuana use coinciding with the proliferation of marijuana dispensaries. The ATOD prevention collaborative urged the planning commission to recommend to the Board to prohibit the delivery of marijuana, prohibit outdoor cultivation of marijuana, prohibit commercial cultivation of marijuana, prohibit commercial or retail sales of marijuana, and regulate personal indoor cultivation of marijuana.

Toni Tucker, 742 Laurel Way, Rio Vista, said that she is an ATOD prevention coordinator for the Rio Vista Alliance. She said their mission is to work on limiting access of marijuana to their youth. The ATOD collaborative recommends prohibiting personal outdoor cultivation as well as commercial cultivation due to safety impacts, quality of life, and environmental impacts. Cultivation is a challenging activity for communities to consider and Ms. Tucker said it will be difficult to regulate and monitor yet can easily impact surrounding properties. Given that the new laws allow for prohibition of outdoor cultivation and commercial cultivation the ATOD collaborative strongly urges the county to err towards the side of caution and safety in protecting its citizens from those harms that these activities shall bring, particularly in lieu of successful examples within the state.

Cathy Dacanay-Rader, 523 El Camino Drive, Fairfield, stated that she works for the Suisun Recreation Department. She is also the coordinator for the Suisun ATOD prevention coalition

and a member of the Solano ATOD collaborative. Ms. Dacanay-Rader said she is very concerned about public safety and quality of life in the neighborhoods. Given that the personal indoor cultivation of non-medical marijuana cannot be prohibited under the AUMA, the ATOD prevention collaborative urges the county to adequately regulate indoor cultivation of marijuana. She provided a document to the commission entitled Position Statements on Marijuana and in that document it provided a list of 14 policy recommendations based on research from jurisdictions both within California and from other states to better protect residents, youth, and the environment from the harm brought about by indoor marijuana cultivation.

Darrell Ogden, 960 Rolling Green Drive, Rio Vista, voiced concern with the effects on the children living in the home where there is an indoor cultivation of marijuana. He believed that indoor grows should comply with building, fire, and electrical codes and there should be inspections that would allow the county to confirm the grower has safely complied. This would keep any youths living in the home safe and also the health and safety of fire and police that may need to go inside. Mr. Ogden said sometimes houses and other buildings used to grow marijuana contain high levels of mold which could pose a health threat to residents living there and to law enforcement agents investigating them. To help prevent this he encouraged the commission to require ventilation and filtration systems. These systems would also keep the odor from getting outside and becoming a public nuisance. Mr. Ogden said these permits and inspections are not meant to control what the grower is doing, but to help make sure that our community youth are safe.

Thomas Lamothe, Rio Vista, stated as a former recreation commissioner and chairman of the recreation commission in Rio Vista, he totally agreed with the ATOD collaborative that marijuana should not be readily attainable to the youth. He explained that the endocannabinoid system is something that was never mentioned by public health even though it is the most revolutionary discovery in biological science. He stated that the research that was presented was not conducted by a scientific community; it was mostly by government. He commented that the use is here to stay regardless of what the county implements.

Zach Ortiz, 5317 11th Avenue, Sacramento, is the recreation supervisor for Suisun City and also a member of the Suisun City ATOD. He stated that his main concern is for the youth of Solano County. Mr. Ortiz spoke to several facts focusing on the dangers of the decreased and perceived harm of marijuana and its increased access to youth.

Patrick Byron, Rio Vista, spoke with regard to the presentation made by public health staff and the remarks about product packaging of marketed edibles. He stated that there are sections in Prop 64 that specifically prohibit advertising on products that are marketed toward children, as well as advertising that looks like other existing products. He said it is no secret that the majority of people in attendance tonight and the majority of people in this state support safe access to medicine. He said although there are known risks, we also need to understand how those risks are related to a regulated and unregulated market. Mr. Byron said that in reading Prop 64, MCRSA and the Compassionate Use Act it is very clear what the intent and purpose of those acts are. He said the intent is for regulation of the activity. Many people who have this need cannot grow. He said it is not as easy as one may think to grow medical grade products, so by limiting safe access you are forcing patients into an unregulated market and that market is supplied by unregulated growers who are not following the rules. These are criminal organizations that do not care if they damage the environment. He asked the commission to

please consider personal use outdoor cultivation; personal use indoor cultivation with reasonable restrictions; permitting of micro-business, permitting of cultivation, and permitting of the retail sale of cannabis products either from a delivery or dispensary. Mr. Byron said that the county needs to look at what they are doing and reconsider this prohibition because they are inviting criminals to take over this billion dollar market.

Frank Grouziano, 755 Sequoia Drive, Fairfield, commented that over the thousands of years of known marijuana use there has not ever been one known death attributed to marijuana. He asked that the commission not trample on the rights of medical marijuana users. He said those rights were voted upon and passed and people are here still fighting for those rights to be upheld. Mr. Grouziano commented that others can brew alcohol in their own homes but he cannot grow his own medicine. He noted that most dispensaries are well run they follow the law and provide high quality medication. Mr. Grouziano said that it is important to have a safe place to get medicine.

Crystal Roe, 1208 Mayfield Circle, Suisun, stated that for her and her husband marijuana is medication. She said that some of the regulations the county is proposing are over the top. She said they do not want to have to dedicate a special room for growing their marijuana or pay for additional electricity or worry about possible fire hazards. She said they just want to be able to have their medication and develop the strain that helps them which they can grow outdoors. There should be safe access for everyone. Ms. Roe commented that folks are already growing their medicine and no one is going to follow these regulations except for commercial institutions who are trying to turn a profit. Ms. Roe stated that she hoped the commission will take a less crazy approach and realize that they are parents and know how to talk to and protect their kids.

James Hinton appeared before the commission. He said that he is speaking on behalf of the Vallejo Patients Coalition. Mr. Hinton noted that two years ago Vallejo had the first successful referendum in the history of Vallejo and for the last year the City of Vallejo has been successfully taxing and regulating the medicine which has been an economic blessing to the city. Mr. Hinton said that he had the opportunity to tour a large licensed hydroponic farm in Washington State and it was an amazing and clean operation. He said that by having commercial grows in the county there is an opportunity to create jobs. He said the Vallejo Holistic Health Center is a union dispensary with over 30 employees. If there were a commercial cultivation site somewhere in Solano County there could be more union jobs and tax revenue. Mr. Hinton said that the county is going to see a lot of people try to grow indoors to make up for their economic short comings and there will be more risk associated with that.

Since there were no further speakers, Chairperson Cayler closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Castellblanch stated that this has come down to some serious issues, particularly within Prop 64. He said there is the age limit that has to be dealt with if the county is going to be regulating cultivation and commercial and personal use. He said the consideration of keeping it away from people under 21 is a germane issue for the commission to discuss and seems to fit within the law and the commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Castellblanch said if there is some definite harm such as it makes it easier for people under 21, or turns out that odor is an issue to the extent that there are substantive issues of nuisance or violations of state law that fall within the jurisdiction of the commission then he believed they should deal with it. But generally, Commissioner Castellblanch said he did not believe the commission should be

making up laws to deal with problems that are not apparent and in front of the commission and demonstrated. He did believe that Solano County should observe what the people in California and Solano County have voted in favor of.

Commissioner Walker referred to Attachment B of the staff report which listed the possible regulations of personal grows. He wanted to know the intent of item S where it states the authorized grower shall not participate in other cultivation sites in any other locations within the county. Davina Smith responded by saying that the idea is to not have the cultivation occur in multiple places. Mr. Walker also inquired about item A which proposes a requirement for a water catchment system and he did not understand why this system would be necessary.

Mike Yankovich stated the proposed regulations are only suggestions for the commission to consider and are not necessarily being encouraged. He said the idea behind item A is that the county has a no net increase rule in terms of water leaving one property and impacting another. In this instance the requirement is to make sure there is a catchment system so that the water remains on the property and does not cause problems downstream.

Chairperson Cayler speculated that the issues that can occur around organic farming where a farmer is concerned with neighboring properties who use pesticides that can contaminate irrigation water may have played a part in the consideration of item A.

Commissioner Walker said that would make sense when talking about a large scale operation, but for six to twelve plants he could not imagine on the parcel sizes that are being considered that it would be an impact. Commissioner Castellblanch agreed that he did not see the point of requirement A.

The commission at this point decided to consider and discuss each regulation separately.

Item B) If lights are used to cultivate marijuana, the lights must be CFLs or LEDs, or the cultivator must have alternative energy system (such as solar or wind) to alleviate electrical loads.

Commissioner Hollingsworth stated that he did not see the reasoning in this requirement. Mr. Yankovich stated that it is to recognize the reduction in energy usage.

Commissioner Castellblanch commented that he felt it to be an overreach. Commissioner Walker said that he felt the commission could certainly suggest it as part of the climate action goals for both the county and the state, but it should not be a requirement.

Item C) Total lights must be kept under a maximum wattage.

Mike Yankovich said this is a safety related requirement. Once a total load is achieved it is important that it is on an adequate electrical system. Commissioner Rhoads-Poston commented that she sees this as the same as monitoring what someone is plugging into their outlets.

Item D) No maximum size on reflectors; Item E) No burning of any substance in the grow room.

There were no negative comments made by the commission on these two items.

Item F) No use of CO2 generators in the grow room.

Commissioner Castellblanch said that he did not see the need for this requirement.

Item G) Outdoor grows must be inside an opaque, locking fence.

Commissioner Walker said he felt this meets the suggestion that was discussed in the past that if it were going to be contemplated to allow people to grow outside then it needed to be screened from public view and protected from minors.

Item H) No marijuana may be visible from outside the room or fenced enclosure it is grown in.

Commissioner Walker commented that this goes along with the spirit of the previous condition. Commissioner Castellblanch said an opaque locking fence is an added cost that could become a problem, but if the idea is to keep it away from the kids in the neighborhood then it could make sense.

Item I) Indoor cultivation room must be secured with a lock.

The commission all seemed to agree with this suggestion.

Item J) No other activities may take place in the indoor cultivation room beyond cultivation and processing of marijuana.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston said that she sees this as an extreme and did not think it should be regulated or required. If someone is going to have a grow room and it has a lock then that would be safe.

Chairperson Cayler said that she could see this as one of those things where a room may not be used very often such as a media room and a grow room all in one and it becomes a special room that is seldom used. She felt this is probably some of the things the regulation is geared toward and believed it should be something the commission should pay attention to.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston said she sees this on the same lines of having to have alcohol confined to a separate room or maybe poisonous plants, etc. so that children are not around these things. She said this would be something that would start to interfere with basic parenting responsibilities.

Item K) - No use of any fertilizers/pesticides/rodenticides/fungicides/herbicides that are not approved for use on marijuana.

Commissioner Hollingsworth said he understood that the EPA does not have a list of products that can or cannot be used. He questioned if a product that is safe to use on tobacco would also be safe to use on marijuana.

Jim Allan, county ag commissioner, reappeared before the commission He said the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act governs all the pesticide laws in the country and it

basically says that the label is the law for pesticides. He said the EPA has only pesticides for certain commodities. Currently because the label is the law and there are no products labeled specifically for cannabis the products allowed to be used are the substances like rosemary or cedar oil, the very generic things that have broad use across all plants.

Commissioner Hollingsworth questioned how the county can require folks not to use something if there is nothing that can be used. Mr. Allan agreed saying that is probably unnecessary since it is already against existing law to use something in conflict with its label.

Item L) Any alterations to the structure or electrical system or the means of ingress and egress of a grow room must be done pursuant to current adopted code and have a finalized permit.

The commission agreed with this regulation.

Item M) Indoor cultivation room must have a working air filtration system sized to insure that odors are not detectable from the exterior of the structure the grow room is located in.

To clarify this regulation, Mr. Yankovich stated that the intent is for the room itself and not the entire home. Ms. Smith further clarified that the system would have to be sized to the room, it would have filters that would need to be changed regularly, and it would necessitate putting a hole in either an exterior wall or through the roof.

Commissioner Castellblanch stated that he remains to be convinced that odor is an issue. He commented that there are other odors that exist and that are a nuisance, but there are no laws prohibiting them. He said this regulation strikes him as being a potential barrier just in the expense, and it is not clear to him that it is even necessary.

Commissioners Walker and Rhoads-Poston agreed that such a system would not be necessary for only six plants.

Chairperson Cayler said that she would be in favor of the condition because odor could permeate the entire house.

Commissioner Hollingsworth said if this condition is to remain then it needs to be made more specific. He said every home that has a central heating and air system has an air filter system and so it needs to be defined better. He commented if it is going to be restricted to just that room, then a central air conditioning system is going to pull the air and comingle it with the rest of the house.

Item N) Outdoor cultivation may not occur within 50 feet of any property line or easement for road traffic or pedestrian access.

Commissioner Castellblanch commented that he lives in Solar Village in Benicia and he did not believe there is any part of his lot that is 50 feet from the fence line. He said there are a lot of lots in the county that are small and he thought the 50 foot rule is arbitrary and would be unfair to folks that have less lot to utilize.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston said that this requirement almost seems redundant if the grow is

already required to not be visible from any point.

Commissioner Walker mentioned that this condition might have been to address some of the comments from the last meeting where there were concerns about odor.

Chairperson Cayler stated that there are setback rules that apply when a landowner builds a structure on their property and so this concept is not a new one. She said that maybe 50 feet is extensive but some type of rule should be required.

Item O) Outdoor cultivation may not occur on any parcel under 2.5 acres.

Commissioner Walker noted that the conversation the commission had at the last meeting about acreage prompted staff to generate the maps that were contained in the staff report. He said the commission talked a lot in general about the large size of parcels in the county and that most are 2½ acres or larger, which in his mind mitigates issues people had with respect to outdoor cultivation so long as it is screened. Mr. Walker commented that there are some neighborhoods such as Homeacres and old Glen Cove in unincorporated Vallejo where numerous parcels are under the 2½ size and would directly be impacted by the limitation of acreage size.

Commissioner Castellblanch said that he believed this should go back to the basic idea of keeping the product out of the hands of children and doing what is necessary. He commented that 2½ acres is a big lot and the limitation should be based around the purposes of preventing people under 21 of getting ahold of the product.

Commissioner Walker noted if the minimum acreage requirement is eliminated then the discussion of setbacks would need to be revisited.

Chairperson Cayler said she would be in favor of a setback similar to that required of a swimming pool which is probably 10 feet. She said the commission may want to stick with acreage of some variety, or if it is a smaller lot a conditional use permit might be the way to approach it.

Davina Smith noted that currently there is no permit requirement to grow six plants recreationally or for 100 square feet for personal use as a medical patient or up to 500 square feet for a caregiver. She said if you are a person who is a medical marijuana patient or caregiver then a recommendation is required from a physician or possession of a medical card from Public Health.

Chairperson Cayler reiterated that she still felt some restrictions are needed. Commissioners Walker and Rhoads-Poston both felt that the issue has been addressed with a requirement of setbacks and screening.

Item P) Require all cultivation sites within the unincorporated county to register with Resource Management or Public Health and declare under penalty of perjury that they comply with all local and state regulations.

Commissioner Walker stated that he would absolutely not support anything that includes a registration. He said there may be an entirely different ideology starting soon with the incoming administration and it is not known if the Department of Justice is going to start coming at

counties and cities in the state and require them to provide their lists of registrants.

Commissioner Castellblanch also commented that it is not known what the new administration is going to be doing and if the county is setting up registries to facilitate that then a bad mistake would have been made.

Chairperson Cayler spoke about code enforcement as it relates to electrical and safety codes and that there is no way to get totally around that. She said she would like to support a registration concept, but being uncertain about the upcoming administration she thought the commission probably should not require it.

Item Q) Require all grow sites registered with the County provide proof of property ownership or approval for cultivation from property owner.

Chairperson Cayler looked to Commissioner Walker for his opinion due to his experience in the real estate business. Mr. Walker stated that this could become a civil issue between the property owner and the tenant. He said that his real estate association's leases specifically state no smoking which means no smoking of any substance. Mr. Walker commented that the members of his association are currently discussing this topic and have been for several months. He said their generic lease template will be modified so that the owner has the right to opt in or out.

Item R) The authorized grower shall reside full-time in the residence where the cultivation occurs.

The commission had no negative comments with regard to this item.

Item S) The authorized grower shall not participate in other cultivation sites in any other location within the county.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston made a suggestion that this may need to be made clearer. Ms. Smith explained if someone is cultivating for themselves the idea is to cultivate at their residence and to keep it in one spot. For example, if someone were to have 100 square feet it would not be in a bunch of different locations. The idea is to keep track of it and to keep it in one place. Ms. Smith said it is up to the commission's discretion if they would like the idea of allowing for multiple sites and dividing up part of the caregiver portion.

Chairperson Cayler asked if that regulation could be more refined.

Item T) If cultivation occurs within residence, the residence shall primarily be maintained as a residence.

There was agreement among the commission.

Mr. Yankovich stated that staff will now go through and take stock of the comments made by the commission, repackage it, making sure everything is compliant with the new law and bring this back to the commission sometime in March.

Commissioner Hollingsworth inquired about staff's request in their report that the Commission designate one or two representatives to assist staff in collecting cannabis/marijuana data.

Ms. Avery said staff was just wondering if there was interest among the commission to help draft the ordinance and possibly attend several tours that have been set up.

Each planning commissioner voiced their desire to attend any field trips or help out as time would allow.

ANNOUNCEMENTS and REPORTS

There were no announcements or reports.

Since there was no further business, the meeting was **adjourned**.