

Lenzi, Chelsea

Subject: FW: Regarding Board meeting tomorrow on Cannabis

From: valerie sherriff <rosecrans@inbox.com>
Sent: Monday, July 9, 2018 4:01 PM
To: Bozanich, Dennis <dBozanich@countyofsb.org>
Subject: Regarding Board meeting tomorrow on Cannabis

Hi Dennis,

Just had a comment ahead of tomorrow's Board Meeting.

I have some concerns about the amendment being proposed to ordinance 4991 tomorrow.

Other than a \$505.00 appeal fee paid by the person appealing a County decision, it is my understanding that at present the General Fund is being used to cover the rest of the costs of most of the appeals and that the amendment under consideration tomorrow would switch that burden on to a Cannabis applicant seeking a Cannabis permit.

While there is some reasonableness to this discussion there are also many pitfalls for a cannabis applicant as well. I know the County has been extremely methodical and considerate in the ways they have address the Cannabis issue and I am hoping the County is also seeing all sides of this amendment issue as well.

It appears the amendment being proposed just states the applicant will be billed for all costs on a monthly basis, there are no safeguards in the wording that would address the possibility that a Cannabis applicant will be unfairly treated and appealed. It appears the applicant will just have to throw themselves onto the mercy of a County with no skin in the game who will both determine the merits of an appeal and to a great degree the length of time that appeal will go on for.

How will an applicant be safeguarded against:

1. An unscrupulous person for only \$505.00 could unjustly hold up an applicant to a point of virtually stopping them by causing someone's fund to dry up and there is no incentive for the County to move as quickly as possible since the County has no skin in the game.
2. This would also be troublesome since the County has no skin in the game, if the applicant submitted the appeal themselves but at least a 3rd party would not be involved in that case.
3. It appears since they are the only ones paying, that an applicant will just have to throw themselves onto the mercy of the County, that may be okay to some degree today when we know the people who may be deciding the merits and the timeline of an appeal but what if there is a personnel or supervisor change, etc. and there are now people at the County who are less friendly towards Cannabis - then what? Even if you get a permit, this could also affect you in the future if you want to expand or ?
4. This seems onerous in its one sidedness, the County has no incentive to quickly come to a conclusion since there is not cost to the County and of course the appellant would love to drag things out as long as possible.

I am not sure the best way to make this process more two sided, perhaps some wording in the amendment that an applicant or even the County could point to that could diffuse an unjust appeal.

I am hoping there will be some discussion along these lines tomorrow.

Thanks so much, Valerie Sherriff