

ESPARTO and MADISON CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEES
MEETING MINUTES – Approved 07/17/18
06/04/18

Attending (for Esparto): Susan Cooper, Pat Harrison, John Hulsman Jr, Randy Jacobs,
Giacomo Moris, George Pennebaker, Sandie Reed

Attending (for Madison): Cheryl Barnett, Rachel de la Cruz, Bonnie Stormont

Absent (for Esparto): Babs Beckwith, Cynthia Havstad

Absent (for Madison): Carla Phillips

PUBLIC FORUM

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- 1) **Cannabis Update.** This was not a standard citizens advisory committee meeting but rather a presentation led by Leslie Lindbo, Yolo County Planning Department to the citizens advisory committee members and the public. Also attending for the County were: Susan Strachan, and Angelina Espinosa. Leslie and Susan presented the slides attached starting at 7:00 p.m.
 - a) Slide 8
 - i) G. Moris – public noticing distances 1000 ft? Go bigger due to odor.
 - ii) J. Hulsman – do alcohol & other business have to go through the same licensing background checks? Cannabis is now legal, why single it out?
 - iii) If tax measure does not pass, cannabis cultivation would end (sunset provisions – to 2019 for outdoor, 2021 for example for indoors).
 - b) Slide 11
 - i) Most comments received were about odor. Threshold levels at property line criteria taken from Denver’s experience.
 - ii) Public – are you looking at concentration of growers? Two growers near her, can’t be outside in the summertime. They have to spray at night. (noise of operations).
 - iii) Right to farm does not apply to cannabis per Susan.
 - iv) What kind of chemicals are they spraying? Leslie and Susan did not know specifics but chemicals approved by Ag Commissioner. As part of use permit process, they would have to disclose what they are spraying, hours of operation.
 - v) Original 67 licenses got in before this ordinance, but they will have to go through use permit process and eventually comply or relocate. They won’t be grandfathered in.
 - c) Slide 14
 - i) No minimum parcel size, no max number that can collocate on one parcel.
 - d) Slide 20
 - i) Density approved through BOS through resolution based on CAC areas. If more populated area, less growers to be allowed.
 - ii) Public - complained about property value decreasing due to their proximity to pot growers. Another lost water in well due to grower pumping into two 500K gallon tanks installed (for irrigation).

- e) Slide 25
 - i) No alcohol allowed to be provided on the property? This sounded unreasonable to most attending (in terms of resident having a beer for example).
- f) Slide 27
 - i) Dave Scheuring – any mitigation methods for outdoor grows for reducing odor? Not likely. How many of 67 currently can meet odor requirements?
 - ii) Different types of plants emit different odor.
 - iii) Draft EIR will be available in October, finalized in January.
 - iv) Clarification discussion of how much an acre of plants really is.
 - v) Have any violations been found? Yes. Shutdown? Yes, and enforced through DA.
 - vi) Are they making fire safety better or worse? Barry Burns – most have been good, none store their own water for fire use, but can use tank of irrigation water if needed. Inside fence is clean, outside fence is another story, but only so much you can do.
- g) Slide 28
 - i) Barry Burns – Cannabis is considered a commercial product. How is this OK on ag land? Fire departments are charging the growers the commercial rate, not the ag rate.
 - ii) Is there a target number for grow licenses? The EIR is looking at five options. The BOS will pick the number.
- h) Slide 30
 - i) G. Moris – manufacturing, distribution, etc. not compatible with A zones. They would be inconsistent with “preservation of agricultural land” per 8-2.1402 E of the ordinance. In the “Final Guiding Principles” document it stated the ordinance would “exclude retail, manufacturing, distribution, transportation, and testing licenses at this time”, so I was surprised to find it in the draft ordinance.
 - ii) Public suggested another meeting to go into detail on these other industries. Leslie suggested this be done during the 45-day EIR comment period in October.
 - iii) Adult (recreational) use?
 - (1) Barry Burns – since it has been legal, call volume has gone up – overdose, kids eating (candy in schools). Keep it out, brings in more crime.
 - (2) S. Reed – social justice – with it legal, you have to follow rules like alcohol. Take stigma away from it. We’ll create more jobs.
 - (3) Alcohol still has its problems too.
 - (4) Safety – story of a local walking dogs on own land, got shot at by illegal grower. Don’t want to see the city crime here.
 - iv) J. Hulsman – if none of the listed activities is illegal, why would we prohibit them? Adult recreational use is legal. The social effects will happen. The question is what is the impact to grow it here for that use? More odor, but otherwise how is it different?
- i) Slide 31
 - i) G. Moris - per the “Final Guiding Principles” document from the November community forum, what is the timeline for County Policies LU-2.3 and AG-1.3

to be amended to “prohibit subdivision of ag zoned land for cannabis purposes.” Will it be parallel path with the ordinance?

2) The meeting adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

GLM & JRH

06/09/18

06/15/18