Attachment 2
Summary of Community Input

Community input regarding the Cannabis Combining Districts and Cannabis Exceptions efforts occurred in three primary forms: community meetings held on July 26 and July 27; emails received through cannabisoverlay@mendocinocounty.org; and a community survey conducted for each of the proposed Combining Districts. Below are summaries of input received through each of these sources.

Community Meetings

On July 26 and July 27, Michael Baker International conducted four community meetings to solicit input from communities in which Cannabis Overlay Zones have been proposed. The format of these meetings included an introduction and overview of the Cannabis Overlay Zone concept, the efforts to date, and an explanation of how the Overlay Zones would affect cannabis regulations in the various communities. Following introductory remarks, Michael Baker staff responded to questions and accepted comments from community members. Community meetings were as follows:

- **Covelo – July 26, Opt-In Overlay Zone**
  Round Valley Public Library, 23925 Howard Street, Covelo

- **Mitchell Creek – July 26, Opt-In Overlay Zone**
  Caspar Community Center, South Room, 15051 Caspar Road, Caspar

- **Laytonville and South Leggett – July 27, Opt-In Overlay Zones**
  Long Valley Garden Club, 375 Harwood Road, Laytonville

- **Deerwood and Boonville Road/Woody Glen – July 27, Opt-Out Overlay Zones**
  County Administration Center, Board Chambers, 501 Low Gap Road, Ukiah

Provide below are summaries of comments shared by meeting participants, including verbal comments during the meetings and comment cards that were submitted to staff.

Covelo Community Meeting Notes – July 26, 10:00 a.m.–12 p.m.
Round Valley Public Library , 23925 Howard Street, Covelo
18 participants signed in/21 comment cards received.

Comments specific to Overlay Zone regulations:

- Near-unanimous support among participants to amend regulations to be more supportive of cannabis growers; some concerns regarding impacts to Native American tribes.
- Generally, the adjustments proposed under the Opt-In Overlay would be very helpful if applied to a broader area.
- Strong consensus that the proposed two small Overlay Zones are not adequate to help the majority of growers in the Covelo community.
- Covelo community is currently facing economic collapse; cannabis is currently the only viable means of income for many residents and local businesses.
- Largest single concern is sunset provision; local community analysis identified 135 growers (approximately 85% of growers) that would not be allowed under sunset.

Comment Card Summary	Times Mentioned
Need to substantially increase the Covelo Overlay Zone: • Proposed Overlay Zone is inadequate in area and does not help most growers. • Zone needs to be expanded to include much more area. • Covelo is a patchwork of zoning and land uses and small Overlay Zones don't address growers' issues. • Proposed Overlay Zones do not include 90% of growers in Covelo.	18
Concern that cannabis business do not benefit long-time residents. Consider impacts on children, animals, and land.	1
Reducing setbacks will make it possible for more parcels to be eligible.	2
Cannabis has contributed to the Covelo economy and helped support businesses and the community. Loss of cannabis income and revenue would be disastrous.	1
The current Overlay Zone approach is ineffective and does not meet the needs of Covelo residents.	3
Would like to see an Overlay Zone for facilities.	1
Reductions in (property line) setbacks are helpful; would like reductions from other setbacks (schools, churches, parks).	1
Overlays are a "band-aid"; the County cannabis ordinance does not work for Covelo.	1
Total Cards Comments	21

Mitchell Creek Community Meeting Notes – July 26, 5:00 p.m.–7:00 p.m.
Caspar Community Center, South Room, 15051 Caspar Road, Caspar
57 participants signed in (100+ participants)/31 comment cards received.

- General comment: The majority of meeting participants appeared to be supportive of grower accommodations (Opt-In regulations), but property owners in attendance that were not supportive felt they were underrepresented in the audience due to lack of meeting notice.
- Meeting discussion was roughly evenly split between individuals supportive of cannabis cultivation and individuals opposed to cannabis cultivation.
- Concerns over cannabis cultivation in Mitchell Creek included:
    - Impacts to water supply; crime resulting from cultivation activities; impacts to property values; proliferation of cannabis cultivation; commercial uses fundamentally incompatible with residential character of the neighborhood.
- Comments in support of Opt-In Overlay:
    - Some long-time Mitchell Creek growers have contributed to overall improvement of Mitchell Creek; cultivators are also members of the community who own property, raise families, want the Mitchell Creek neighborhood to be a good place to live; sunset regulations will force growers to leave and will cause property values to drop.
- Information provided by Michael Baker and County staff:
    - A thorough process of evaluating water supply is conducted by regional and state agencies in the cannabis permit review process.
    - The proposed Opt-In Overlay would not allow for an increase in current cultivation; it would only allow existing cultivation to continue.

Master Comment	Times Mentioned
Supportive of Overlay/Opt-In.	7
If a Mitchell Creek Opt-In Zone is established, would prefer Alternative 2 (smaller area).	4
Concerned about water use – potential for cultivators to impact available water supplies.	4
Supportive of Alternative 1 (larger area), which includes a greater area in the Opt-Out zone.	3
Supports Alternative 1; Alternative 2 would be detrimental to local businesses that provide jobs and support the local economy.	2
If no Overlay is established, some existing growers will be forced to leave Mitchell Creek and this would impact the neighborhood.	2
Individual comments from comment cards: • Consider limiting cultivation to indoor only. • Loss of cannabis growers would be detrimental to local economy. • Cannabis is a highly regulated crop and permitting process addresses environmental (water) issues. • Redwood Springs Drive should not be included in the Overlay Zone.	
Total Comments	31

Laytonville and South Leggett Community Meeting Notes – July 27, 10:00 a.m.–12 p.m.
Long Valley Garden Club, 375 Harwood Road, Laytonville
15 participants signed in/1 comment card received.

- Discussion of the petition process to qualify an Overlay Zone for consideration – comments that petition process is problematic and asked that other options be considered.
- Fence requirements – interest in relying upon existing perimeter fence as portion of the cultivation area fence.
- Request to expand the Laytonville Opt-In Zone eastward from Branscomb Road to include additional RR-1 zoned land.
- Request for flexibility on the 150-foot separation between cultivation area and adjacent house – no change to this requirement was proposed under the Opt-In or the Exceptions regulations at the time of the community meeting.
- Discussion of need for transferability of permits – Michael Baker staff responded this is outside the Cannabis Exceptions work.
- Question regarding how the Overlay will affect distribution/microbusiness/other commercial uses – Michael Baker staff responded that Overlay only applies to cultivation.
- Discussion on limitations of personal use cultivation – Michael Baker staff responded this is outside the Cannabis Exceptions work.

Comment	Times Mentioned
Please include all RR-1 to protect growers on the larger parcels from sunsetting out.	1
Total Comments	1

Deerwood and Boonville Road/Woody Glen Community Meeting Notes – July 27, 5:00 p.m.–7:00 p.m.
County Administration Center, Board Chambers, 501 Low Gap Road, Ukiah
29 participants signed in/10 comment cards received.

- Interest/concern regarding timing for new regulations to be considered by the Planning Commission – Michael Baker staff commented that likely three months to get to Planning Commission.
- Discussion of the process and implications of an Opt-Out Zone being repealed.
- For Deerwood and Boonville/Woody Glen, a petition process to demonstrate wide community support is feasible.
- Opposition to cannabis operations included that commercial operations in the affected neighborhoods just aren't appropriate.
- Interest in notifying potential property buyers of an existing or proposed Opt-Out Zone; avoid investment based on expectation to cultivate.
- Discussion of water regulations that apply to cultivators; regional and state agencies regulate water supplies and are involved in permitting cannabis cultivation.
- How will an application under review be affected by a proposed Opt-Out Zone?
- Residents in Lower Deerwood (subject to sunset and therefore not in the proposed Opt-Out Zone) are affected by cultivators in Upper Deerwood.
- Substantial majority of meeting participants were in favor of the proposed Opt-Out Zones. Show of hands resulted in the following:
    - 19 participants support Boonville Road/Woody Glen Opt-Out
    - 12 participants support Deerwood Opt-Out
- No one spoke in direct opposition to the proposed Opt-Out Zones, but comments were made regarding the fiscal impact of eliminating cultivation in Mendocino County.

Master Comment	Times Mentioned
Supportive of Opt-Out to preserve residential neighborhood.	10
Total Comments	10

Community Survey Results

Community surveys were conducted for each of the proposed Cannabis Accommodation and Cannabis Prohibition Combining Districts. Surveys were conducted using the online tool SurveyMonkey. Postcards were mailed to the owners of each property inside of or within 350 feet of a proposed Combining District. Each survey included a unique code associated with the property's Assessor Parcel Number. The surveys were, by design, brief and included a short explanation of the Combining District regulations, a map of the associated district, and a link with additional information. While it was possible for individuals to submit The survey was open from August 27 through September 17.

Response rates varied from approximately 12% to 49% of property owners within each District. Michael Baker's goal had been to generate at least a 20% response rate for each proposed district. Due to low response rates in Laytonville, Covelo, and South Leggett, a second postcard was mailed on September 7 to property owners in those communities, and surveys for those communities were held open for an additional week.

Upon completion of all surveys, the responses were filtered to exclude any responses that lacked a valid code. In one instance a respondent appeared to transpose two numbers on his/her code and that response was accepted. There were no other cases in which the response validity was in question.

Due to concerns over petitions, schedule and feasibility for larger proposed Combining Districts, the Community Surveys described herein are providing the basis for determining whether there is 60 percent support among landowners for the proposed CA (Opt-In) and CP (Opt-Out) Combining Districts. All proposed Combining Districts did achieve the 60% support threshold, except for the two Mitchell Creek CA Districts that were far below the required 60 percent support level.

Covelo Core CA District

Covelo Core area residents were asked the following three questions in their survey:

- Do you support the establishment of the Covelo Core Opt-In Combining District?
- Do you support allowing existing cannabis cultivators within the boundaries of the Covelo Core Opt-In Combining District to continue their cultivation activities provided they meet all state and County requirements?
- Do you support reducing setbacks (required distance from property lines) for cannabis cultivation sites within the boundaries of the Covelo Core Opt-In Combining District?

The number of yes and no responses to the three survey questions were identical:

- Response rate: 20%
- Support for District: 48
- Opposed to District: 11
- **Approval rate: 81%**

Covelo Fairbanks Road CA District

Covelo Fairbanks Road residents were asked the following three questions in their survey:

- Do you support the establishment of the Covelo Core Opt-In Combining District?
- Do you support allowing existing cannabis cultivators within the boundaries of the Covelo Core Opt-In Combining District to continue their cultivation activities provided they meet all state and County requirements?
- Do you support reducing setbacks (required distance from property lines) for cannabis cultivation sites within the boundaries of the Covelo Core Opt-In Combining District?

The number of yes and no responses to the three questions were identical:

- Response rate: 27%
- Support for District: 6
- Opposed to District: 4
- **Approval rate: 60%**

Mitchell Creek North CA District

Mitchell Creek North area residents were asked the following five questions in their survey:

- Do you support the general concept of establishing a Mitchell Creek Opt-In Combining District?
- Do you prefer the boundaries of Mitchell Creek Option 1 (larger area)?
- Do you prefer the boundaries of Mitchell Creek Option 2 (smaller area)?
- Do you support reducing setbacks (required distance from property lines) for cannabis cultivation sites within the boundaries of the Mitchell Creek Opt-In Combining District?
- Would you support the Mitchell Creek Opt-In Combining District if cannabis cultivation was limited to indoor cultivation only? Mendocino County defines Indoor Cultivation as cultivation occurring within a fully enclosed and secure structure that complies with the California Building Code (CBC), as adopted by the County of Mendocino.

The survey for Mitchell Creek included five questions to test preferences related to size of district and requirements for indoor cultivation. The number of yes and no responses to the five questions were very similar, with responses ranging from 87% to 94% in opposition to accommodating cannabis cultivation. The term “averaged” below refers to the average number of responses in support of and in opposition to the five questions:

- Response rate: 43%
- Averaged Support for District: 11
- Averaged Opposed to District: 101
- **Approval rate: 10%**

Mitchell Creek South CA District

Mitchell Creek South residents were asked the following three questions in their survey:

- Do you support the establishment of the Covelo Core Opt-In Combining District?
- Do you support allowing existing cannabis cultivators within the boundaries of the Covelo Core Opt-In Combining District to continue their cultivation activities provided they meet all state and County requirements?
- Do you support reducing setbacks (required distance from property lines) for cannabis cultivation sites within the boundaries of the Covelo Core Opt-In Combining District?

The number of yes and no responses to the three questions varied, with the lowest support for question 1 (25% support) and slightly higher support for questions 2 and 3 (37% support):

- Response rate: 15%
- Averaged Support for District: 2.66
- Averaged Opposed to District: 5.33
- **Approval rate: 33%**

Laytonville CA District

Laytonville area residents were asked the following three questions in their survey:

- Do you support the establishment of the Covelo Core Opt-In Combining District?
- Do you support allowing existing cannabis cultivators within the boundaries of the Covelo Core Opt-In Combining District to continue their cultivation activities provided they meet all state and County requirements?
- Do you support reducing setbacks (required distance from property lines) for cannabis cultivation sites within the boundaries of the Covelo Core Opt-In Combining District?

The number of yes and no responses were nearly identical for the three questions:

- Response rate: 12%
- Support for District: 33
- Opposed to District: 8
- **Approval rate: 80%**

South Leggett CA District

South Leggett residents were asked the following three questions in their survey:

- Do you support the establishment of the Covelo Core Opt-In Combining District?
- Do you support allowing existing cannabis cultivators within the boundaries of the Covelo Core Opt-In Combining District to continue their cultivation activities provided they meet all state and County requirements?
- Do you support reducing setbacks (required distance from property lines) for cannabis cultivation sites within the boundaries of the Covelo Core Opt-In Combining District?

The number of yes and no responses to the three survey questions were identical

- Response rate: 20%
- Support for District: 15
- Opposed to District: 2
- **Approval rate: 88%**

Deerwood CP District

Deerwood residents were asked the following question in their survey:

- Do you support the establishment of the Deerwood Opt-Out Combining District, thereby restricting commercial cannabis operations within the Deerwood Opt-Out Combining District?

The response to the survey was as follows:

- Response rate: 48%
- Support for District: 49
- Opposed to District: 3
- **Approval rate: 94%**

Booneville Road/Woody Glen CP District

Boonville Road/Woody Glen residents were asked the following question in their survey:

- Do you support the establishment of the Boonville Woody Glen Opt-Out Combining District, thereby restricting commercial cannabis operations within the Boonville Woody Glen Opt-Out Combining District?

The response to the survey was as follows:

- Response rate: 49%
- Support for District: 46
- Opposed to District: 4
- **Approval rate: 92%**

Email Messages – cannabisoverlay@mendocinocounty.org

A dedicated email address was established to receive input, questions and requests for support from community members. In total, more than 150 emails were received. Approximately 40 individuals posed questions or requested assistance with the Combining District Survey through this portal and direct responses to such messages were provided. Messages received through this portal have been organized by Combining District area and are summarized below.

Mitchell Creek Community *Total Emails Received:* 88

The majority of all emails received were in reference to the proposed Mitchell Creek Opt-In zoning overlay. Emails received related to the Mitchell Creek Districts were, overall, strongly in opposition.

MAIN COMMENTS	**Times Mentioned**
• Concern about water use and potential for cultivators to impact available water supplies for the surrounding residential area.	42
• Concern over potential rise in crime in residential neighborhoods due to commercial cannabis cultivation and operations.	29
• Road access and traffic impacts: Concern about wear and tear to roads from commercial trucks and increased traffic from activity of suppliers, employees, etc. Consensus that emergency access (ingress/egress) from Simpson Lane is inadequate. (Roads specifically mentioned include Simpson Lane, Turner Road, Shane Drive, and Redwood Springs Drive.)	23
• Noticing of the community meetings was not adequate to allow many community members to attend. (References made to Brown Act violation = 5.)	22
• Concern of overall incompatibility of commercial cannabis activity in a residential area (including but not limited to noise, lighting, odor, etc.)	20
• Concern over negative impacts to residential property values from allowing commercial cannabis cultivation and operations.	12
• Environmental concerns (pollution to land and waterways, etc.)	10
• Opposition to any type of commercial agriculture operations in this district due to water scarcity.	5
• Frustration expressed over “straw-vote” at community meeting being skewed due to lack of representation from opposition.	5
• Concern that a 20-foot setback requirement for cultivation from adjacent properties is inadequate.	5
• Request that an environmental impact report (EIR) be prepared to determine water usage impacts from cultivation activities on district.	5
• Frustration with “revolving door renters” that stay a short period of time and are unfriendly with the neighborhood.	2
• *Requested to be added to mailing list*: Roslyn Satten, Simpson Lane Daniel R. Barrett, Emerald Drive, danjane@mcn.org Mark and Kathy Bibbens, 16861 Hills O Home Lane Lin and Ginny Varnum, 17751 Redwood Springs Drive	

Input from those in favor of Opt-In overlay zone:

- Opt-In overlay will protect the livelihood of small farmers who have been cultivating cannabis for years without negatively impacting property values, the healthy balance of our ecosystem, or public safety.
- The county overlay project does not increase cannabis cultivation in the Mitchell Creek area. It supports continuation of low-impact farming practices through the most stringent, lengthy requirements and regulations ever imposed on any agricultural sector in this country's history. The County Requirements for Commercial Cottage Indoor Cultivation (which is the category of most cannabis farms in this area) consist of 28 detailed steps to reach compliance that must be taken by permit applicants. The state regulations are as onerous, consisting of 24 specific requirements which applicants must meet. These regulations come with huge permit and license application fees and other costs associated with securing approval of the Water Board, Fish & Wildlife, and other agencies.
- Over the last ten years, wells have not dried up at any greater rate as a result of cannabis farms. Cannabis farmers in the Mitchell Creek area have offered to meter their water use and enact cultivation practices that reduce water use significantly.
- The opt-in overlay zone will not change Mitchell Creek from a residential zone to a commercial zone. The existing zoning explicitly allows agriculture. The opening definition in our zoning code says "Rural Residential Zoning "…is intended to create and enhance residential areas where agricultural use compatible with a permanent residential use is desired."
- Cannabis cultivation is less of a safety issue than it was in the underground market. By requiring compliance with stringent county and state requirements, existing small farmers in the Mitchell Creek area will be more engaged in taking safe business and property precautions than ever before. They will be operating in the light of official and public scrutiny and are less likely to engage with or attract criminal elements to their farms. Public safety has been increased with legalization and regulation.
- Sustained commercial cannabis cultivation on a small scale has existed harmoniously with the community for decades. Many of the residents of this area are dependent on cannabis for their livelihoods and have built businesses and reputations from their cultivation sites in Mitchell Creek.
- The Opt-In Overlay for Mitchell Creek would not cause cultivators to be allowed to enter the area, it would simply allow them to stay and continue what they have already been doing.
- The assumption that Cannabis Cultivators have no concern for the environment or water supply is inaccurate and offensive. By implementing specific use parameters and a robust record-keeping requirement there would be essentially no risk to the water supply Mitchell Creek.
- Allowing commercial cannabis cultivation will provide more jobs to the community and will boost the local economy.

Number of emails received in favor of Opt-In Overlay	10

Questions:

1. What research, if any, has the California Water Board done to determine that commercial level water use in this zone will not have a negative effect on residential wells?
2. Was there any geological or hydrology research done on the area?
3. What are the legal issues of giving a small group of cottage industries exclusive rights to do commercial business in this densely populated residential zone?
4. What contaminants will be added to that aquifer. Will this be total organic gardening? No fertilizers? Who will monitor what goes into the aquifer?
5. Will our roads have to have more industrial usage? They are already not taken care of too well. Cal Trans will get extra money to make sure the extra industrial use is considered?
6. Property values? Who will be reimbursing us for the loss in sales?
7. How did this proposal originally get started? Can you please tell me how to find out more information on this?
8. Will I have a choice in my neighbors choosing to enter the production of pot? I wish to OPT OUT. How do I do that? I do not want to be next to any pot farms.
9. When we moved into this neighborhood 1999, there were covenant restrictions that prohibited commercial farming and livestock production. What are the legal issues of giving a small group of cottage industries exclusive rights to do commercial agricultural business in this densely populated residential zone?
10. By what date is the survey due back?
11. Providing only a digital response option is problematic; is there another, paper, option more familiar to most folks? There are most likely a good number of residents in here still without Internet access, or in the least, unfamiliar with online apps. One suggestion you might consider would be to set up 'labs' in our residential area with Internet and lap top access to assist those who need it to complete the survey.
12. Has anyone considered the fact that publishing a map of a cannabis zone is basically providing a map to criminal home invaders of the most "productive" areas to target?
13. Has the California Water Resources Control Board been engaged at all? Have any consultants been engaged to study water effects?
14. Concerning depletion of the water table in this residential zone
    a. What research has been done on the hydrology of the area?
    b. Will there be a baseline study on the water table in the area?
    c. Will commercial grows be metered for water use and required to pay into a remediation fund for the specific overlay area if granted?
15. Has CDFW been involved in this process at all? Has any thought been given to environmental effects? Has the effects of pesticides and other farm chemicals been considered at all for such a densely settled residential area?
16. Will current grows be allowed to expand?
17. What will happen when a permit owner sells his/her property?
18. Why is this area being targeted for commercial growing? How many other areas are being targeted?

Laytonville and South Leggett Communities *Total Emails Received:* 4	
MAIN COMMENTS	**Times Mentioned**
• Request for reduction of 50-foot property boundary setback requirement for smaller RR-1 lots in Opt-In Overlay. • No messages were received in opposition of the proposed districts.	1
Questions: 1. Can a better map be provided that shows how many parcels there are and what the average size of the parcel is within the range land zoning section of the Laytonville overlay map? 2. There is a religious facility (Jehovah Witness Kingdom Hall) within the boundary of the proposed overlay zone. Will the current set back requirements for religious facilities within the ordinance be maintained? 3. Are there any meetings regarding the overlay program in Laytonville scheduled that I can attend? I am also wondering why the proposed overlay district in Laytonville does not include my 1.3 acre property (zoned RR2) that seems to be a couple of hundred feet outside the proposed overlay zone?	

Covelo Community; Covelo Commercial Cannabis Accommodation (Opt-In) Combining District *Total Emails Received:* 2 No messages were received in direct opposition or support of the proposed Opt-In zoning overlay.
Question(s): 1. The proposed map for the overlay area is just north of the existing elementary school and not far from additional educational facilities. Has the Round Valley School District or Board of Trustees been contacted regarding concerns to the youth attending the local schools in the area in relation to the proposed overlay area proposal? 2. A tribal community member said that it is illegal for the county to be imposing the overlay on tribal land since the county does not have jurisdiction over land use on these property types. I was a member of the sub-committee that worked closely with the consultants (Michael Baker) to draft the proposed map and stated very clearly that Round Valley is a checkerboard reservation. Was this not considered when the final map proposal came out?

Deerwood and Boonville Road/Woody Glen Communities *Total Emails Received:* 17 (Deerwood) 11 (Boonville Road/Woody Glen) All messages received voiced support for the proposed Opt-Out zoning overlay.	
MAIN COMMENT	**Times Mentioned**
• Support for Opt-Out Overlay to prohibit commercial cannabis activity in these districts.	28