
**PLUMAS COUNTY
CANNABIS WORKING GROUP**
Minutes of the Meeting of October 20, 2016

WORKING GROUP MEMBERS:

Kim Scott, District 1
Mat Fogarty, District 2
Michael James, District 3
Cindy Robinson, District 4
Debbie Thompson, District 5
Supervisor Kevin Goss
Supervisor Jeff Engel

Support Staff:

Craig Settlemire, County Counsel
Sheriff Greg Hagwood
Tim Gibson, Agricultural Commissioner
Randy Wilson, Planning Director

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The Plumas County Cannabis Working Group convenes in a meeting on October 20, 2016, at 1:00 p.m. in the Board of Supervisors room, Courthouse, Quincy, CA.

There being no chair, Planning Director Wilson calls the meeting to order.

Members present:

Kim Scott
Mat Fogarty
Michael James
Cindy Robinson
Debbie Thompson
Supervisor Kevin Goss
Supervisor Jeff Engel

Support staff present:

Craig Settlemire, County Counsel
Tim Gibson, Agricultural Commissioner
Randy Wilson, Planning Director
Rebecca Herrin, Senior Planner
Nancy DaForno, Clerk of the Board

ADDITIONS TO OR DELETIONS FROM THE AGENDA

There are no additions to or deletions from the agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

Harry Rogers, second generation rancher and representative of the Plumas County Growers Coalition introduces himself. He has attended several meetings on medical marijuana. As the state license requires a local permit be obtained first, he encourages that the permit process be put in place as soon as possible so that responsible growers can get in line for permits.

Rogers feels that the risk of delay if an Environmental Impact Report is prepared would hurt growers. He encourages the members of the group to read ordinances and CEQA determinations from other counties and provides information about CEQA determinations other jurisdictions have used.

There is no further public comment.

1.A. Introductions

1.B. Select Chair and Vice Chair of the Cannabis Working Group

M/S/C: to select Kevin Goss as Chair

M/S/C: to select Jeff Engel as Vice Chair

1.C. Adoption of Regulations Governing Public Comment Opportunity

County Counsel Craig Settlemire advises the group that, as the working group is advisory to the Board of Supervisors, it is subject to the requirements of the Brown Act. Public input is required and the group may adopt reasonable regulations regarding public comment. The Board of Supervisors Resolution 87-4084, adopting regulations governing the public comment opportunity during regular meetings of the Board of Supervisors, is included in materials distributed to the group. Settlemire explains that the group may modify the Board's rules. Settlemire hopes to provide a Brown Act summary at a future meeting for the working group members.

M/S/C: to adopt the public comment opportunity rules.

1.D. Overview by Randy Wilson, Planning Director

Wilson discusses materials distributed to the group: Plumas County Cannabis Ordinance Development brainstorm ideas, July 2016; Notice of Preparation from the California Department of Food and Agriculture for the Medical Cannabis Cultivation Program; Bureau of Medical Cannabis Regulation Regulations Process. Wilson is working with the County Information Technology department to develop a page on the Plumas County website for distribution of information to the group and the general public. He encourages the group members to provide information that they would like to see posted. Rebecca Herrin is gathering contact information for the public notice list.

Wilson stresses the need for education and workshops on current laws that impact cultivation. He discusses various issues and impacts of potential permitting processes. There is a handout provided that addresses zoning issues ("Main Street or Industrial Park? Where does Cannabis Industry fit?"). Plumas County will need to address how cannabis will be permitted under the General Plan and zoning codes. Types of activities and where permitted must be determined, while addressing local conditions and preferences. There are unique challenges, potentially impacting community character. There will be issues with revenue and taxes. There will potentially be limitations resulting from required separation from schools, for one example. The County may choose to limit the number or location of dispensaries. Wilson stresses a community approach to developing a cannabis program/ordinance.

Wilson discusses a graphical handout from the California Department of Agriculture that summarizes survey results of local county interest in various types of cannabis activities/permits. 44 people responded to the survey from Plumas County.

Wilson stresses that the County can't just rely on the state legislation in developing a local ordinance, but also must follow the state rulemaking process to try to keep the ordinance in line with permit rules. The Adult Use of Marijuana Act (Proposition 64), if approved, will require rulemaking by the state agencies as well. The County needs the local permit to be in line with the state permit so as not to inhibit the process.

Interim ordinances have been used by other jurisdictions, but Wilson provides a caution on interim ordinances. Ultimately the ordinance must match up with the state rules.

Wilson discusses fees for processing permits and the necessity to obtain funding for compliance and enforcement. The local Agricultural Commissioner could contract to issue the state permits, but he does not have necessary staffing. Discussion of state vs. local advantages and disadvantages.

Mat Fogarty explains that licenses must be obtained by January 1, 2018 for vested rights or "grandfathering" to be in place. Otherwise, operations become illegal until such time as state licenses are obtained. The ordinance and permit requirements must be in place well before that date.

Wilson adds that Plumas County has an advantage in starting from scratch in developing a cannabis ordinance in that other counties' mistakes can be avoided.

1.E. Discussion regarding goals and objectives of the Working Group

Most members are in agreement that the ordinance should be developed in a timely manner as soon as possible and should be simple rather than more complex. However, the ordinance does need to be adequate and in line with needs of the growers. Supervisor Goss stresses that there is a deadline and there is a need to meet monthly with possibility of holding special meetings in other parts of the County and also evening meetings. Discussion regarding meeting schedule and possibility of streaming the meetings online.

Randy Wilson suggests that the topic of the next meeting involve looking at the GIS mapping system to get an overview of zoning and discussion of compatibility issues, such as wetland and flood plains that require setbacks. As the next regular meeting will be after the election, more will be known about Proposition 64.

1.F. Set regular meeting date, time, and location

M/S/C: to set the regular meeting date time and location of the third Thursday of the month at 1:00 pm in the Board of Supervisors room in the Courthouse.

One member states that Mondays are the best days for her. Goss states that agenda items should be emailed to him and email addresses should be sent to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Nancy DaForno.

ADJOURNMENT the meeting of the Cannabis Working Group is adjourned until the next meeting which is scheduled for Monday, November 7, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in the Board of Supervisors room.