



Although a wonderful resource and thorough document, the draft Environmental Impact Report may be too limited in at least one key way.

When examining the effects of policy on the complex interactions of living systems and geography that constitute our environment we need to pay special consideration to human beings who are a part of it.

By not examining the effects of excluding many of the smallest and most venerable of cannabis cultivators we have not taken in to consideration the full human impact of our policy.

The EIR fails to look at licensing small gardens on parcels less than 2.5 acres in most rural areas, and any gardens in residential zoning

Many of the smallest cultivators did not register and are not represented in the EIR estimates

"It is estimated that the 567 registrants who currently cultivate 36 acres of canopy employ 1,500 FTE cultivation employees, which includes onsite trimmers and processing/manufacturing workers."-3.12-4

The current amount of people making their living in the local cannabis industry is probably much greater. The number generating supplemental income adds many more.

"This EIR, therefore, assumes a future growth of 6,516 FTE employees at cannabis cultivation sites, with another 600 manufacturing workers located outside of cultivation sites, for a total industry growth of 7,116 FTE jobs."-3.12-4

These are new jobs. Replacing the previously unregulated livelihoods and supplemental income.

"Assuming a 40-hour work week, over 52 weeks, \$20 per hour is equivalent to \$42,640 gross income per year. If the cannabis cultivator/worker were the only wage earner in a local family"3.12-11

This is not enough to raise a family.

"that would qualify the household as "very low income" under the criteria established by the California Department of Housing and Community Development"3.12-11

or find housing.

Are we trading small businesses and community members for jobs that don't pay not enough for workers to put down roots?

And what about the patients who's providers will not be considered for licensing?

The county has considered a low/no income cannabis access program to lessen the human impact of these changes in policy.

Percentage of taxes revenues provided for one or more identified organizations specially suited to supply the underserved members of the patient community

Provide tax rewards program for local businesses that donate product to the underserved patient community.

How would these programs mitigate the loss of patient access to cannabis?