

Cannabis Comments  
c/o Matt Johnston,  
Santa Cruz County Planning Department,  
701 Ocean St., 4th Floor,  
Santa Cruz, CA, 95060



Marijuana cultivation should be strictly regulated exclusively on agricultural land. It is not appropriate for forest and watershed areas

Non-Surreptitious growing of marijuana poses a number of threats to life in the mountains. Fire can spread more easily in the mountains. In the mountains is harder to patrol whether rules regulations and restrictions are being followed. Grow locations should only be sited on agricultural land where they can be easily monitored and not subject mountain wildlife and residential uses to environmental problems and nuisances of noise, fire risk, increased mountain road activity that would likely accompany grow locations in the mountains.

1. There should be strict regulations regarding electric and fire hazards.
2. There should be no toxic chemicals in mountains. Timber areas have been free from such uses. The value found in residential properties in the mountains is partly due to freedom from such usage. There is a large variety of wildlife in the forest that should be protected from toxics (as well as fires).
3. There should not be generators or other noise generating activities. There should be no grow sites without full on-grid electric. Generators are a disturbance to existing and future residential usage. Sound carries exceptionally far in mountains, where people located their residences in significant part because of the minimum of nuisance noise. The only occasional chain sawing which occurs in the mountains should not be augmented with chronic constant generator noise. Property values for residential use would lower if subjected to ongoing chronic noise. Solar should not be allowed as it easily could become just an excuse for overuse of backup generators. Further, allowing grow sites to have generators would just make it harder to effectively shut down any sites that fall out of compliance with regulations.
4. Grow sites should only be in agricultural areas. Not on special use zoned parcels.
5. Because of the potential for criminal activity at an extremely high valued crop location, as well as fire and environmental considerations, grow sites should not be within 1000' of residential even if residential is in agricultural zone.
6. Any potential grow site should require a public hearing with notice to all properties within 5000'.
7. All grow sites should be subject to regular random inspections.

It seems unlikely that strictly regulating will result in any significant long term difference in price to a degree to make it prohibitive for those who need it.

It would be better to strictly regulate marijuana cultivation at the beginning. Use revenue produced from legal grow operations to enforce regulations against illegal grow operations. It is quite possible that the difference in profit between a legal grow operation and an illegal one will no longer be sufficient to finance the degree of hiding that illegal grows have gone to. There is no need to reward those who have grown illegally by providing them with relaxed restrictions.

Thank you for your careful consideration.