CORRESPONDENCE

PERSONAL CULTIVATION & OUTDOOR CULTIVATION PART A - IN FAVOR

Hartman, Clare

From:

Guhin, David

Sent:

Tuesday, August 08, 2017 7:48 AM

To:

Hartman, Clare

Subject:

FW: PLEASE allow outdoor growing of medical cannabis

From: Beth Crowley [mailto:bcrowley2@earthlink.net]

Sent: Monday, August 07, 2017 6:10 PM **To:** Guhin, David <dguhin@srcity.org>

Subject: PLEASE allow outdoor growing of medical cannabis

PLEASE allow outdoor growing of medical cannabis for individual patients and for individuals growing for other individual patients.

- 1) It's so expensive at the dispensary!
- 2) Some patients need to juice the undried leaves or the entire plant, and you can't even buy it that way from the dispensary.

I don't care what you do about recreational users.

Thank you, Elizabeth Crowley

Sent from my iPhone

August 3, 2017

AUG 1 5 2017

Dear City of Santa Rosa,

Planning & Economic Development Department

The Sonoma Chapter of American's for Safe Access would like to thank you for listening to the needs of medical cannabis patients and considering the state laws related personal cannabis cultivation. Since 2002, a 100 square foot garden policy has been in place countywide; keeping the 15 year status quo set by our former District Attorney, Mike Muller, makes sense.

Allowing caregivers to help terminally ill patients cultivate, also makes sense. Many patients depending on cannabis for quality of life do not have the option to grow at home due to living circumstances or lack of physical energy. If the county is going to restrict compassion and discounted medicine at dispensaries in the future, then we need to allow non-commercial growers to access this medicine affordably. Allowing Adult users of cannabis to cultivate their own personal medicine will likely reduce the safety impacts that neighbors fear with theft. If any adult can cultivate their own product, other people's medicine is less appealing.

In addition, we support Delivery Services operating so that homebound patients can have the access they need. There are a number of delivery options in Sonoma County, however, in light of regulatory requirements, next year we want to ensure this access continues to be available for patients.

Allowing for onsite consumption is an option that would greatly benefit patients, as some patients' living situations do not allow them to smoke at home (i.e. anyone living in a multi-unit housing). Access to purchase medicine is available through dispensaries, however, access to use a person's medicine is often very limited when state law allows for this activity to take place on private property.

Allowing a dispensary to sell smoking and vaping accessories is a part of the product education that is provided by a dispensary. We wouldn't want to send a senior citizen to a smoke shop to inquire about tobacco smoking when they are seeking medicinal guidance. It seems highly appropriate that medical use devices would be available at the location where patients are purchasing their medicine.

Over the years, we have seen dozens of successful cannabis events in Sonoma County. The Emerald Cup has grown to 25,000 attendees. During this weekend in December, almost every hotel is booked; restaurants, and other local businesses are benefiting from the revenue of hosting such events.

One point we would like the city council to reconsider is the restriction on allowing patients under the age of 18. There are a number of minors who have tumors, epilepsy or other rare untreatable conditions that would benefit from cannabis. If a doctor approves a child's use, a parent or guardian supports this alternative medical plan, city agencies should not restrict minors from accessing medicine.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Sonoma Chapter of American's for Safe Access

Stover Leans
Ross John
Andrew
Aranon
Month

From:

Froschl, Angela

Sent:

Monday, May 01, 2017 4:58 PM

To: Cc: Guhin, David

Subject:

Bliss, Sandi

Attachments:

FW: Outdoor growing ban City Santa Rosa 6plant indoor energy impact.pdf

Hello!

Here's another...

Thank you,

Angela Froschl | Senior Administrative Assistant

City Managers Office | 100 Santa Rosa Ave, Suite 10 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-3014 | Fax (707) 543-3030 | afroschl@srcity.org



From: Ken Norton [mailto:kenenorton@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, May 01, 2017 4:56 PM

To: _CityCouncilListPublic <citycouncil@srcity.org>

Subject: Outdoor growing ban

Re. Agenda item on proposed Outdoor Growing of Cannabis ban

Dear Council Member:

The ban on outdoor growing of cannabis will greatly harm Medical Patients, whose doctors have recommended the use of the plant per Proposition 215, the 1996 Compassionate Use Act, that gives resident patients and their caregiver in California the right to cultivate and use cannabis for medical purposes. Since 1996 patients and caregivers have formed networks to make this plant and its medicine accessible. Now since Prop. 64 legalizing cannabis for recreational use has passed, patients are being forgotten in the fear that recreational plants will overwhelm the city.

Since 1937 American citizens have been brainwashed to believe it is the *Evil Weed*, and now its perceived *Evil Smell* is the result of 80 years of repetition of a lie created for political convenience. For a patient with a chronic disease or pain it is *Well Smell*, for we patients associate it with welcome relief and healing. Smell is taught to be disgusting or not and should not be a criteria. Strains can be grown that are not so pungent. Many of the terpenes in cannabis that contribute to the smell of the flower are in other plants as well, like lavender.

PubMed on the internet has over 21,000 peer-reviewed scientific articles on its list of published research papers by top universities on cannabinoid alone. THC and CBD are a couple of the over 80 cannabinoids that have been identified in cannabis. It is the most studied plant ever. And it is the safest as it will not stop heart or lung function as do most all of the pharmaceuticals and alcohol. Children with epilepsy and autism are being treated successfully with cannabis, and they have moved to our state because of the Compassionate Use Act. Adults, Baby Boomers and older seniors are helped by treating PTSD, dementia, Alzheimers and a multitude of autoimmune diseases including cancer. Those with chronic pain can decrease or eliminate their opiate pain medication use with cannabis ingestion and the use of salves. Growing one's own medicine adds another level of trust to the healing process for the patient.

The outdoor ban will add energy and indoor growing equipment costs. I did a quick research on the internet to get some data on what energy costs a 6-plant grow operations indoor will incur. The chart is attached and shows significant burden to the city 's energy use. The ban on outdoor growing of cannabis will also harm the region's climate by the tremendous energy use of indoor grow operations. Patients face the added uncertainty of possible energy price hikes.

The 6-plant limit per residence will not be enough for many patients to treat themselves over the year for chronic diseases, especially with more than one patient in the residence, forcing them to go to the dispensaries to buy at four or more times the cost for cannabis that can be polluted with pesticides. Patients grow for themselves to be assured of the purity of the cannabis entering their already challenged immune system of the body. Cost and Safety of patients is being sacrificed for the fear from 1937 politically initiated hysteria.

If a ban for recreational Prop. 64 growing outdoors is passed, be sure to include Prop. 215 Patient Exemption to allow for outdoor growing in sufficient amount to treat the patients in a residence over the year.

Sincerely,

Kenneth E. Norton, M.S.

Patient

Santa Rosa

From:

Froschl, Angela

Sent:

Tuesday, May 02, 2017 8:02 AM

To: Cc: Guhin, David Bliss, Sandi

Subject:

FW: 14.2

Good Morning,

FYI...

Thank you,

Angela Froschl | Senior Administrative Assistant City Managers Office | 100 Santa Rosa Ave, Suite 10 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-3014 | Fax (707) 543-3030 | afroschl@srcity.org

----Original Message-----

From: Tom Shader [mailto:tomshader@aol.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2017 12:22 AM

To: CityCouncilListPublic <citycouncil@srcity.org>

Subject: 14.2

Hi Council Members,

I am a resident of the Victoria Drive "island" soon to be incorporated into the city. I write to you because the decisions you make now will affect me once I live within city limits. I will try and be at the City Council Meeting tomorrow, but I'm not sure I can be there in time.

I am a medical marijuana user.

Please don't make it impossible to grow cheap and environmentally friendly marijuana on my property. I have grown in years past, (usually 4 to 6 plants) and to the best of my knowledge, I have not offended any of my neighbors (most of whom I know...). I'm not a "high tech" farmer. I buy the clones, stuck them in the ground, and water them, ...the end. My little plants give me enough harvest to get through the year.

Indoor growing systems are expensive and very energy consuming. If you do make it illegal for "little guys" like me to grow outdoors, it only benefits large growers and the "black market". The price, to those of us down here on the consumer level, will remain high. This would be awful for those of us with health issues that marijuana has been shown to help. Please don't cut off our access to affordable medicine. Equally awful... by keeping the price high, pot and the money it generates will remain very attractive to crime. Let me say that in another way... Allowing folks who want marijuana to easily grow their own will cause the price will fall, making it less attractive to people trying to make easy money through crime. Legalization will not make cannabis less attractive to crime if the price remains high.

This is a chance for regular citizens to utilize this herb for both medicine and (starting next year) recreation without having to support outside suppliers.

Thank you for your time,

Tom Shader (707) 542-1467

From:

Froschl, Angela

Sent:

Tuesday, May 02, 2017 8:02 AM

To: Cc: Guhin, David Bliss, Sandi

Subject:

FW: Outdoor marijuana ban - please understand the implications

Good Morning,

FYI....

Thank you,

Angela Froschl | Senior Administrative Assistant

City Managers Office | 100 Santa Rosa Ave, Suite 10 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-3014 | Fax (707) 543-3030 | afroschl@srcity.org



From: Joel Grogan [mailto:joel.grogan@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, May 01, 2017 8:47 PM

To: _CityCouncilListPublic <citycouncil@srcity.org>

Subject: Outdoor marijuana ban - please understand the implications

To my Respected Santa Rosa City Council Members:

As a horticultural professional and citizen of Santa Rosa, I am dismayed to read that the City is moving forward to ban outdoor cultivation of cannabis.

The proposed ban has good intentions but its result will intensify the very problems that the ban seeks to address. Though there are some potential impacts that outdoor growing will have on our communities, forcing growers to grow indoors and/or in greenhouses has more negative consequences than letting folks grow the "natural" way.

Two oft-repeated arguments against outdoor cannabis cultivation are odors and crime. Neither of these issues will be even remotely solved by moving the plants indoors.

Odor:

- Indoor cultivation, aside from using much more energy than outdoor, also encourages growers to have plants
 continuously in flower. Outdoors, plants initiate flower formation in the late summer or early fall. If the odor of cannabis
 flowers is what ails you, indoor growing will actually make this problem worse, with indoor growers producing cannabis
 odor year-round instead of primarily during harvest season.
- The text of the state law lacks any specific requirements for the odor control of personal-use indoor cultivation, nor can I imagine any way to effectively enforce them.
- Indoor cultivation often relies on techniques that are more likely to leave dangerous chemical residues in the finished products – resulting in a potential public health issue, harkening back to the effects of tainted liquor produced during prohibition

Crime:

- Keeping cannabis plants enclosed in greenhouses and indoor grow rooms merely encourages more violent crime –
 both by making the plants harder to steal (requires a home invasion instead of jumping a fence) and by encouraging
 people to grow more than the limit of six plants.
- With the higher initial investment required for indoor growing, as well as the increased privacy, what is to stop someone
 from growing more than the limit?

I have heard of neighbors complaining of odor, and some even claiming to be allergic to cannabis. This may be true; however, many plants in our landscapes are allergens to some individuals. We have not banned the planting of sycamore, oak, or pine trees. And who has not occasionally wished for a ban on the use of manure that produces that "Sonoma Aroma"? Still, to ban farmers from using animal waste on their fields would infringe on their rights while also causing our agrarian community to suffer in other ways.

Though I understand and am sympathetic to the arguments against legal outdoor cannabis cultivation I'm afraid there is no way to legalize cannabis while making it invisible. Voters have elected to end the prohibition on marijuana, and that means change. In the long run, I think it will be change for the better.

Thank you,

Joel Grogan

Joel R. Grogan

Pipevine

CA Contractor's Lic. #997374 ISA Certified Arborist #PN-7677A QWEL Certified #110

tel. (707)486-1916 joel.grogan@gmail.com

From:

Froschl, Angela

Sent:

Tuesday, May 02, 2017 2:26 PM

To:

Guhin, David Bliss, Sandi

Cc: Subject:

FW: 5/2/17 City Council meeting agenda item 14.2

Good Afternoon.

FYI...

Thank you,

Angela Froschl | Senior Administrative Assistant

City Managers Office | 100 Santa Rosa Ave, Suite 10 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-3014 | Fax (707) 543-3030 | afroschl@srcity.org



From: jessamyn harris [mailto:j@jessamynharris.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2017 2:02 PM

To: _CityCouncilListPublic <citycouncil@srcity.org>
Subject: 5/2/17 City Council meeting agenda item 14.2

Hello, council members,

I'm writing about today's agenda item 14.2, the proposal to ban outdoor cannabis growing in Santa Rosa. I'm hoping to make it to the council meeting today, but as I have a 7 year old child, and a photography business, I'm not sure I will be able to make it. I'm hoping you'll be able to see this email before the subject comes up on the agenda!

As a Santa Rosa home owner, business owner, and mother - as well was a (non-cannabis) gardening novice hobbyist - I think it's ridiculous and offensive for the city to attempt to ban outdoor cannabis cultivation. For one, it is it too late in the growing season to actually prevent it - everyone who is planning to grow cannabis has already purchased their plants and supplies, so the claim that an immediate ban will be helpful to people who had plans to grow by preventing them expense or trouble, is patently false.

Additionally, cannabis is MUCH less toxic and harmful to our community than conventional pain and anxiety drugs, which, as you know, continue to ravage this country with addiction. Cannabis is a medicinal herb and should be treated with respect. The smell is on par with more fertile tomatoes.

Please speak up against a proposed ban. I'm embarrassed, ashamed and frustrated with the city of Santa Rosa for even floating this proposition, and I hope that the council will do the right thing.

Thank you,

Jessamyn Harris

homeowner, 607 Ashbury Ave.

Jessamyn Harris, photographer 707-235-8953 <u>j@jessamynharris.com</u>

From:

Moogie Moo <theantimoog@gmail.com>

Sent:

Saturday, April 29, 2017 12:53 PM

To:

CMOffice

Subject:

Attn I am a constituent and citizen of Santa Rosa

Dear Santa Rosa,

I hear you are trying to ban outdoor cannabis growing for medical and for commercial. This is a big mistake. For people like me on disability, we cannot afford to buy medicine from a "club" if you ban this you will be responsible for putting many people in a position where they cannot grow the medicine they need for Epilepsy, cancer, hiv wasting syndrom, pain, dengerative muscle disorder and to take less pharmaceutical drugs, I believe law enforcement can still effectively target criminals regardless of this law. It will not make "catching people easier" law enforcement should be focused on people moving into our town from all over the world to grow. Which I assume the Santa Rosa police have the ability to do. The networks that distribute Marijuanna in our county ilegally are well known by police, all this ban will do is criminalize people like me who grow outdoors 3- 6 plants for personal use, I cannot afford to pay for a high pressure sodium light. It is a plant that helps me and does more good for me then anything my doctor could perscribe. Also forcing it indoors will increase the illegal growing problem we have here. Indoor cannabis smells much much more then outdoor so the smell thing doesn't make sense. Policing illegal Marijuanna growing should be easy, bust people who are actually breaking the law growing over 30 plants, and who are known criminals srpd knows many of them. I think you are hurting patients and I will actively opose the ban no matter the cost. For 15 years I have been growing with no problems from my neighbors, or the city. I am respectful and blend it with the rest of my garden. Why are you giving the cannabis clubs so much power? I think law enforcement should be focused on making CRIMINALS life's harder, this will not do that. Most criminals I know who grow do not have medical grow license and have 100s of plants and don't have medical certification because they do not want to draw attention to themselves. I feel this is not fair and doesn't really make sense when you look at what actually is happening. Some more cons of this idea is that by moving all grows indoors, more power will be used, more fires will happen, people will have less access to SAFE homegrown medicine, you will push people who grow for themselves to illegal markets, indoor Marijuanna is much more expensive to create and creates a lot of pollution. Growing outdoors in small amounts smells access lot less then smoking it, people will grow outdoors regardless of the law, illegal cannabis markets will prosper until the price of cannabis goes down and it's not worth it to sell I legally anymore, like alcohol. There are not laws against growing fruit you can create alcohol and other medicines with. I am a gardener it is My life. I feel you are very out of touch with what our community wants and deserves when it comes to this issue. If you support this know that you will pay a price at the polls. We are organized. There is a big difference between growing for personal and growing commercial, the police should be able to tell the difference, people like me growing outdoors for personal use do not harm the environment and do not harm our community. Please rethink this. It's a plant, not a weapon of mass destruction. -from,

Tyler Moore a native and citizen of Santa Rosa

From:

Douglas McKenzie <douglasi@sonic.net>

Sent:

Sunday, April 30, 2017 7:19 AM

To:

_CityCouncilListPublic; Coursey, Chris; Rogers, Chris; Olivares, Ernesto; Tibbetts, Jack; Combs, Julie;

Sawyer, John; Schwedhelm, Tom

Subject:

Cannabis growing

Here we go again. The assumptions of the ban are erroneous.

The "odor" of cannabis? Really? Yeah, if you have an illegal grow of

100 plants, yes some. Are we now going to outlaw BBQs or toxic gasses from lawnmowers, weed eaters, etc? Some people LIKE the smell of cannabis.

Increase crime? All of the examples in the article of home invasions are again for illegal grows and oil manufacture. Here's the easy thing to do:

ENFORCE THE LAWS ON THE BOOKS.

Do not make law abiding citizens criminals.

We have a lack of law enforment staff to enforce the laws as they are.

Don't make our law enforcement officers burdened by a senseless and uniformed law!

Regards,

Doug McKenzie

From:

L limitless@sonic.net>

Sent:

Monday, May 01, 2017 12:48 PM

To:

_CityCouncilListPublic; Combs, Julie; Coursey, Chris; Olivares, Ernesto; Rogers, Chris; Sawyer, John;

Schwedhelm, Tom; Tibbetts, Jack

Subject:

The city council needs to soften their residential cannabis growing approach, here's why

The task you have, in working on the city council might broadly be described as, "We here to look after and care for the citizens in and of Santa Rosa."

That means the least of us, too. I need to comment and make three points in this discussion.

- a) over regulation
- b) you are helping the already wealthy (and often folk that worked the "Black" side of cannabis) get rich
- c) you seem to have no regard for the person/patient that makes \$12 an hour or less and is the backbone of this city's work force

Prop 64 would appear to be written by venture capitalists and big business. Moving the relationship of patient/caregiver out of use in favor of a system that will resemble alcohol manufacture and consumption.

I work in the wine industry and am an award winning maker. The steps you are taking related to patient residential grows, ignore two things, you're not thinking about.

When the alcohol prohibition ended, regulating it was ceded to each state and county not done at the federal level.

The result was what the wine industry thinks of as "a lot of silly over regulation". From California, we can ship directly to just 26 other states, known as "reciprocal states". This leads to wildly different and difficult to manage local laws.

The county in Tennessee where Jack Daniels is distilled, you can't buy alcohol. In the other Tennessee counties, you can't buy alcohol in any form at a grocery store and you can't buy it at a State store on Sunday because by law, you can't sell alcohol on Sunday there.

I can legally vint wine in my garage directly across from Proctor Terrace Elementary School. Somehow, we have stuctured growing cannabis within a few hundred feet of a school as illegal.

You are all adults, with either first hand or good second hand experience with cannabis. Think, with a "this century" brain.

"Would you rather be out at night with someone that has smoked an excessive amount of cannabis or someone that is sloppy drunk?"

Good, now we understand something else. On the scale of inebriants, alcohol because you loose your balance and coordination and judgement, has the higher potential for harm. The way you are structuring the city regulation relative to cannabis, doesn't reflect this.

Santa Rosa could easily over-regulate (and seems to) marijuana grows, limiting it now to people that are VC capital backed and with millions of dollars. The few indoor warehouse complexes that are being approved here in Santa Rosa.

are going to help the people that are already rich from black market sales over the past decade to move comfortably and legally into a 1 percenter status.

I know some of the personalities that have come for permit applications on pricey warehouse projects. I can't name one that didn't get their start growing illegally or brokering illegally. Every time I look into who is really operating these LLC's there is someone I know from the Black market involved. And of course it has to be this way, because they know the industry at all levels, just like the folk that distilled illegal whiskey in the 1920's. The people that knew how to distil (illegally) became the liquor manufacturers.

So, you are regulating this too harshly and you are going to be the functionaires that allow Black Market money to be laundered into a legitimate business.

You need to re-calibrate your douchebag meter.

Last, in the 90's when Prop 215 passed, we approved it because we saw terminal cancer patients get back their appetite once they began using cannabis. Nutrition is fundamental to a recovery from Chemo therapy.

But you know what else? Cannabis helps me to sleep at night. It helps many I know manage anxiety and a host other real medical problems. The price for an ounce of cannabis, in Santa Rosa varies between \$350 and \$480 (strain, quality are the variables).

Someone making \$12 an hour has a weekly gross income, (not net after with holdings and taxes income), of \$480.

When Colorado went recreational 2 years ago, the prices at dispensaries went up about 30% because the demand stripped supply. People like my 72 year old mother, decided to drink less sauvignon blanc and try "Train Wreck" instead.

That means the cost at a dispensary will go from %480 to \$625.

My 22 year old daughter goes to the JC and she has a medically noted and real anxiety problems. A number of her friends do too. Her medical recommendation allows her to treat the condition in a way that is effective and at present affordable, because she can grow her own "medicine".

Take that away from her and even though she gets \$12+ at In n Out, she will not be able to allocate a week and half of her pay to solve this problem.

If you take the "medical" out of this and say it was all a clever euphemism or work around for pot heads to get high, you ignore and depreciate the needs of Chemo patients and people like my daughter. If you don't allow her to grow what she needs, and her frinds what they need, then you are going to have large profits go to people that are already insanely wealthy from their past life.

The argument made in favor of what I think of as over regulation, has to do with lack of police agency resources. Or that is the claim. At present, it's basically legal if you are a patient. The police don't get over involved. If you make it illegal for patients to look after them selves, you will write a law that police have to enforce, *which* they don't have to do now. Your over regulation, will draw down police resources where there is no draw down now.

You will obligate enforcement of something they don't enforce now and frankly enforcement of this will draw down resources for more important things... like it taking 2 years to find the knife murderer (Jessie Zetino) of Michela Woolridge, who was slain on November 1st 2012.

My parents found a way to take care of my health needs. The world was different. We had a middle class then. Obligating dispensary only purchase of cannabis at \$500 an ounce will put an undue burden on almost everyone as the purchasing power of current wages isn't near what it was in the 1970's.

That extra burden will be a tax on all patients and those sizable profits will flow to people that are already quite well off and hand it to the 1 percenters.

Fundamentally, police agencies protect assets and incomes of the wealthy and that is exactly what making residential grows illegal will do. Once the law is codified, it won't be given further study or be re-thought.

This is that moment in time where and when you can do something *appropriate* and not over react.

My parents, were able to see to my health, but it was in better times. Why can't we be those parents for my daughter and your children?

From:

Terry <terrykisan@yahoo.com>

Sent:

Monday, May 01, 2017 9:26 AM

To: Subject:

Outdoor Cannibis cultivation

CityCouncilListPublic

Dear City Council Members,

I understand you are considering an ban on outdoor cultivation of cannabis in Santa Rosa. The primary reason I voted for Proposition 64 was because it would allow non-commercial outdoor growing of a few plants by individuals in their own backyards. The ability to 'grow your own' helps to de-commercialize and demonetize this plant, keeping it affordable and safe for those who choose to use it. Indoor cultivation has a huge carbon footprint and is entirely unsustainable. What is wrong with a little garden with a few tomatoes, some basil and a cannabis plant?

As you consider regulations under this new law, please do not prohibit the ability for private citizens to safely grow a plant or two outdoors in the veggie garden for their own personal use. Natural and organic as nature intended.

Sincerely,

Theresa Allan 227 W 8th St Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Hartman, Clare

-			
	rn	m	۰
	··	ш.	

Froschl, Angela

Sent:

Wednesday, May 03, 2017 7:59 AM

To: Cc:

Guhin, David Bliss, Sandi

Subject:

FW: Outdoor Cannabis Growing Prohibition: opposed

Good Morning,

FYI...

Thank you,

. Angela Froschl | Senior Administrative Assistant City Managers Office | 100 Santa Rosa Ave, Suite 10 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-3014 | Fax (707) 543-3030 | afroschl@srcity.org

----Original Message-----

From: Catherine Kubu [mailto:kubucat@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2017 8:58 PM

To: Arielle Kubu-Jones <arielle.c.kubujones@gmail.com>

Cc: Coursey, Chris <ccoursey@srcity.org>; Tibbetts, Jack <hjtibbetts@srcity.org>; Combs, Julie <jcombs@srcity.org>; Olivares, Ernesto <EOlivares@srcity.org>; Rogers, Chris <CRogers@srcity.org>; Sawyer, John <jsawyer@srcity.org>; Schwedhelm, Tom <tschwedhelm@srcity.org>; _CityCouncilListPublic <citycouncil@srcity.org>

Subject: Re: Outdoor Cannabis Growing Prohibition: opposed

I guess I'm too late then

Catherine

Please excuse any errors. Sent from my iPad.

- > On May 2, 2017, at 09:11, Arielle Kubu-Jones <arielle.c.kubujones@gmail.com> wrote:
- > Hello Council,
- > I wanted to write to say that the proposal to completely eliminate personal cultivation of cannabis outdoors is short
- > Personal medical (under prop 215 and the new state-level laws) and personal (under prop 64) cultivation should be allowed outdoors without needing an accessory structure. Please consider following what Petaluma and Healdsburg have adopted and allowing patients to grow a limited number of plants in their personal gardens. In addition, in my view those without the medical recommendation (who are covered by prop 64) should be able to grow a limited amount
- > Requiring people to grow indoors or in a greenhouse is cost-prohibitive for many and much less energy efficient than simply growing outdoors using the sun. Concerns about crime and odor may apply to large scale grows for the market (selling to dispensaries etc) but are definitely overblown when applied to individuals growing for personal use. Consider

adopting common sense regulations for personal outdoor gardens, such as setbacks or height restrictions on plants, in lieu of a complete prohibition.

- > Please do not punish patients and hobbyists. Preserve limited personal and medical outdoor cultivation.
- > Arielle Kubu-Jones
- > Little John Lane, Santa Rosa

Hartman, Clare

From:

Froschl, Angela

Sent:

Wednesday, May 03, 2017 8:00 AM

To: Cc:

Guhin, David Bliss, Sandi

Subject:

FW: Opposed to medical Marijuana ban in Santa Rosa

Good Morning,

FYI...

Thank you.

Angela Froschl | Senior Administrative Assistant

City Managers Office | 100 Santa Rosa Ave, Suite 10 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-3014 | Fax (707) 543-3030 | afroschl@srcity.org



From: Rolf Wessman [mailto:Rolf@wessman.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2017 4:53 PM

To: _CityCouncilListPublic <citycouncil@srcity.org>

Cc: Guhin, David <dguhin@srcity.org>; Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>; Olivares, Ernesto <EOlivares@srcity.org>;

Rogers, Chris <CRogers@srcity.org>; Sawyer, John <jsawyer@srcity.org>

Subject: Opposed to medical Marijuana ban in Santa Rosa

Opposed to medical Marijuana ban in Santa Rosa

Having been diagnosed with ALS 7 years ago, I am now completely paralyzed and depend on a ventilator 24/7. The ban on outdoor growing of Marihuana would limit my access to a very helpful

San Luis Obispo's offensive odor ordinance seems like a sensible compromise. See the following link:

http://www.sanluisobispo.com/news/local/article39516969.html

Sincerely,

a@wessman.com 707.538.0230

From:

Froschl, Angela

Sent:

Tuesday, May 02, 2017 9:22 AM

To:

Guhin, David Bliss, Sandi

Cc: Subject:

FW: Outdoor Cannabis Growing Prohibition: opposed

Good Morning,

FYI...

Thank you,

Angela Froschl | Senior Administrative Assistant

City Managers Office | 100 Santa Rosa Ave, Suite 10 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-3014 | Fax (707) 543-3030 | afroschl@srcity.org



From: Arielle Kubu-Jones [mailto:arielle.c.kubujones@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2017 9:11 AM

To: Coursey, Chris <ccoursey@srcity.org>; Tibbetts, Jack <hjtibbetts@srcity.org>; Combs, Julie <jcombs@srcity.org>; Olivares, Ernesto <EOlivares@srcity.org>; Rogers, Chris <CRogers@srcity.org>; Sawyer, John <jsawyer@srcity.org>;

Schwedhelm, Tom <tschwedhelm@srcity.org>
Cc: CityCouncilListPublic <citycouncil@srcity.org>

Subject: Outdoor Cannabis Growing Prohibition: opposed

Hello Council,

I wanted to write to say that the proposal to completely eliminate personal cultivation of cannabis outdoors is short sighted and unfair.

Personal medical (under prop 215 and the new state-level laws) and personal (under prop 64) cultivation should be allowed outdoors without needing an accessory structure. Please consider following what Petaluma and Healdsburg have adopted and allowing patients to grow a limited number of plants in their personal gardens. In addition, in my view those without the medical recommendation (who are covered by prop 64) should be able to grow a limited amount outdoors as well.

Requiring people to grow indoors or in a greenhouse is cost-prohibitive for many and much less energy efficient than simply growing outdoors using the sun. Concerns about crime and odor may apply to large scale grows for the market (selling to dispensaries etc) but are definitely overblown when applied to individuals growing for personal use. Consider adopting common sense regulations for personal outdoor gardens, such as setbacks or height restrictions on plants, in lieu of a complete prohibition.

Please do not punish patients and hobbyists. Preserve limited personal and medical outdoor cultivation.

Arielle Kubu-Jones Little John Lane, Santa Rosa

From:

Froschl, Angela

Sent:

Wednesday, May 03, 2017 7:59 AM

To: Cc:

Guhin, David Bliss, Sandi

Subject:

FW: Outdoor Cannabis Growing Prohibition: opposed

Good Morning,

FYI...

Thank you,

Angela Froschl | Senior Administrative Assistant City Managers Office | 100 Santa Rosa Ave, Suite 10 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-3014 | Fax (707) 543-3030 | afroschl@srcity.org

----Original Message----

From: Catherine Kubu [mailto:kubucat@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2017 8:58 PM

To: Arielle Kubu-Jones <arielle.c.kubujones@gmail.com>

Cc: Coursey, Chris <ccoursey@srcity.org>; Tibbetts, Jack <hjtibbetts@srcity.org>; Combs, Julie <jcombs@srcity.org>; Olivares, Ernesto <EOlivares@srcity.org>; Rogers, Chris <CRogers@srcity.org>; Sawyer, John <jsawyer@srcity.org>; Schwedhelm, Tom <tschwedhelm@srcity.org>; _CityCouncilListPublic <citycouncil@srcity.org>

Subject: Re: Outdoor Cannabis Growing Prohibition: opposed

I guess I'm too late then

Catherine

Please excuse any errors. Sent from my iPad.

- > On May 2, 2017, at 09:11, Arielle Kubu-Jones <arielle.c.kubujones@gmail.com> wrote:
- > Hello Council,

> I wanted to write to say that the proposal to completely eliminate personal cultivation of cannabis outdoors is short

> Personal medical (under prop 215 and the new state-level laws) and personal (under prop 64) cultivation should be allowed outdoors without needing an accessory structure. Please consider following what Petaluma and Healdsburg have adopted and allowing patients to grow a limited number of plants in their personal gardens. In addition, in my view those without the medical recommendation (who are covered by prop 64) should be able to grow a limited amount

>

> Requiring people to grow indoors or in a greenhouse is cost-prohibitive for many and much less energy efficient than simply growing outdoors using the sun. Concerns about crime and odor may apply to large scale grows for the market (selling to dispensaries etc) but are definitely overblown when applied to individuals growing for personal use. Consider adopting common sense regulations for personal outdoor gardens, such as setbacks or height restrictions on plants, in lieu of a complete prohibition.

1

- > Please do not punish patients and hobbyists. Preserve limited personal and medical outdoor cultivation.
- >
- > Arielle Kubu-Jones
- > Little John Lane, Santa Rosa

Hartman, Clare

From:

Froschl, Angela

Sent:

Thursday, May 04, 2017 11:31 AM

To:

@010000 - City Council Guhin, David; Bliss, Sandi

Cc: Subject:

FW: Attn I am a constituent and citizen of Santa Rosa

Information Only - Do Not Reply All

Good Morning Mayor and Council Members,

Please see response from citizen below with further thoughts regarding marijuana growing.

Thank you.

Angela Froschl | Senior Administrative Assistant

City Managers Office | 100 Santa Rosa Ave, Suite 10 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-3014 | Fax (707) 543-3030 | afroschl@srcity.org



From: Moogie Moo [mailto:theantimoog@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, May 03, 2017 4:56 PM To: Froschl, Angela <afroschl@srcity.org>

Subject: RE: Attn I am a constituent and citizen of Santa Rosa

Also I just wanted to say banning outdoor growing all around. this wont do anything but mobilise the people against you next time there is a vote. Maybe you should consider an exception for people who have been doing this since 1996 with a medical licence, I don't want legalization. I would like to know who is funding the move to do this? And would like to know why you are attacking my rights as a disabed person under proposition 215 a law written by the people for the people, to gurantee my right to SAFE medicine I can grow. Why are you attacking our rights do you not think this will effect your job? Just more of my thoughts. Im disabled or i would come down to city hall. I want you to know that if the ban goes through i will personally work with people I know including Cherie Marie alvarez, to get you out of office. Thanks for your time and thanks for not voting yes on this ban. Tyler Moore a native of santa rosa and a grower of herbs.

On May 1, 2017 4:30 PM, "Froschl, Angela" <a froschl@srcity.org> wrote:

Good Afternoon,

Thank you for taking the time to express your thoughts with the City Council. We appreciate input from our community. Your e-mail has been received by all City Council Members and forwarded to the appropriate department as well.

Sincerely,

Angela Froschl | Senior Administrative Assistant

City Managers Office | 100 Santa Rosa Ave, Suite 10 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Tel. (707) 543-3014 | Fax (707) 543-3030 | afroschl@srcity.org



From: Moogie Moo [mailto:theantimoog@gmail.com]

Sent: Saturday, April 29, 2017 12:53 PM To: CMOffice < CMOffice@srcity.org >

Subject: Attn I am a constituent and citizen of Santa Rosa

Dear Santa Rosa,

I hear you are trying to ban outdoor cannabis growing for medical and for commercial. This is a big mistake. For people like me on disability, we cannot afford to buy medicine from a "club" if you ban this you will be responsible for putting many people in a position where they cannot grow the medicine they need for Epilepsy, cancer, hiv wasting syndrom, pain, dengerative muscle disorder and to take less pharmaceutical drugs, I believe law enforcement can still effectively target criminals regardless of this law. It will not make "catching people easier" law enforcement should be focused on people moving into our town from all over the world to grow. Which I assume the Santa Rosa police have the ability to do. The networks that distribute Marijuanna in our county ilegally are well known by police, all this ban will do is criminalize people like me who grow outdoors 3- 6 plants for personal use, I cannot afford to pay for a high pressure sodium light. It is a plant that helps me and does more good for me then anything my doctor could perscribe. Also forcing it indoors will increase the illegal growing problem we have here. Indoor cannabis smells much much more then outdoor so the smell thing doesn't make sense. Policing illegal Marijuanna growing should be easy, bust people who are actually breaking the law growing over 30 plants, and who are known criminals srpd knows many of them. I think you are hurting patients and I will actively opose the ban no matter the cost. For 15 years I have been growing with no problems from my neighbors, or the city. I am respectful and blend it with the rest of my garden. Why are you giving the cannabis clubs so much power? I think law enforcement should be focused on making CRIMINALS life's harder, this will not do that. Most criminals I know who grow do not have medical grow license and have 100s of plants and don't have medical certification because they do not want to draw attention to themselves. I feel this is not fair and doesn't really make sense when you look at what actually is happening. Some more cons of this idea is that by moving all grows indoors, more power will be used, more fires will happen, people will have less access to SAFE homegrown medicine, you will push people who grow

for themselves to illegal markets, indoor Marijuanna is much more expensive to create and creates a lot of pollution. Growing outdoors in small amounts smells access lot less then smoking it, people will grow outdoors regardless of the law, illegal cannabis markets will prosper until the price of cannabis goes down and it's not worth it to sell I legally anymore, like alcohol. There are not laws against growing fruit you can create alcohol and other medicines with. I am a gardener it is My life. I feel you are very out of touch with what our community wants and deserves when it comes to this issue. If you support this know that you will pay a price at the polls. We are organized. There is a big difference between growing for personal and growing commercial, the police should be able to tell the difference, people like me growing outdoors for personal use do not harm the environment and do not harm our community. Please rethink this. It's a plant, not a weapon of mass destruction.

-from,

Tyler Moore a native and citizen of Santa Rosa

From:

Froschl, Angela

Sent:

Monday, May 22, 2017 9:54 AM

To: Cc: Guhin, David

Subject:

Bliss, Sandi FW: Do *NOT* ban outdoor cannabis!

Good Morning,

FYI...

Thank you,

Angela Froschl | Senior Administrative Assistant City Managers Office | 100 Santa Rosa Ave, Suite 10 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-3014 | Fax (707) 543-3030 | afroschl@srcity.org

----Original Message-----

From: jjames@sonic.net [mailto:jjames@sonic.net]

Sent: Sunday, May 21, 2017 4:43 PM

To: _CityCouncilListPublic <citycouncil@srcity.org>

Subject: Do *NOT* ban outdoor cannabis!

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the Santa Rosa City Council

From: Johanna James

1138 Lance Drive, Santa Rosa, 95401

707-528-0586

Date: 21 May, 2017

Re: Santa Rosa City Council Regular Meeting May 23, 2017, Agenda Item

14.3

REPORT - URGENCY ORDINANCE TO IMPOSE TEMPORARY MORATORIUM ON THE OUTDOOR CULTIVATION OF CANNABIS FOR EITHER PERSONAL OR COMMERCIAL PURPOSES (Continued from the May 2, 2017, Regular Meeting)

I am strongly opposed to any complete ban, whether temporary or permanent, on outdoor cannabis cultivation in the City of Santa Rosa!

This is a matter of serious principle to me, rather than having a basis in any immediate practical considerations for myself. I do not grow cannabis, I do not use cannabis, and I am fortunate that at this time I have no medical need for it -- though there are many in Santa Rosa who do. I am deeply committed however, to the premise that one should be able to grow what one chooses -- within *reasonable* legal limits -- in one's own yard in Santa Rosa! I think any complete ban on outdoor cultivation would be setting *un*reasonable -- i.e., lacking in sufficient reason -- legal restrictions on the use of our yards.

Among the main arguments raised against outdoor cannabis cultivation are "adverse impacts on surrounding neighbors, including noxious odors and security risks" (Staff Report, from David Guhin, Director of Planning and Economic Development, p. 1).

In an urban area, by definition, we live, work, and play in close proximity; we are exposed to all manner of neighboring odors, whether they be residential, commercial, or even rural as we approach the outer edges of the city. Many of these, even though fully legal, are bothersome, annoying, or even provably unhealthy at least for some of us, but we accept and tolerate them as best we can. Just a few of the examples from my own experience: I am subject to smoke from neighbors'

fireplaces in winter and cookouts in summer as well as cooking smoke from events at the fairgrounds; often unpleasant smells from restaurants and fast food places; strong fragrances carried some distance from a nearby laundromat; manure smells from surrounding farm areas; smells from a neighborhood winery; clouds of exhaust fumes & dust from leaf blowers, string trimmers, and lawn mowers; lavender, so lovely and popular in landscaping, gives me a vicious headache as does the privet growing all over the area, but I don't expect them to be banned.

I fail to understand what additional "security risks" are presented by the outdoor presence of a plant which is now legal by State standards in California, beyond any of the risks we already face for theft of anything from our property. As a legal substance, its monetary value is now a fraction of what it was, and thus far less attractive to steal. A bicycle left out might be worth more, but we do not ban those! Obviously there are concerns regarding minors obtaining cannabis; unfortunately, however, there are already myriad ways in which they already do and have been doing for many years, along with alcohol and tobacco.

You've already heard from many others about the needs of medical cannabis patients as well as the unacceptable demands and costs of indoor cultivation -- I needn't repeat those here.

I would certainly endorse what I would consider reasonable limits on outdoor cannabis cultivation within the City -- e.g., for personal use only, maximum number of plants, minimum setback, rear yard only away from public sidewalks and streets, perhaps even maximum plant height -- but *not* a complete ban.

From:

Froschl, Angela

Sent:

Wednesday, May 24, 2017 7:41 AM

To: Cc: Guhin, David Bliss, Sandi

Subject:

FW: Marijuana subject

Good Morning,

FYI...

Thank you,

Angela Froschl | Senior Administrative Assistant City Managers Office | 100 Santa Rosa Ave, Suite 10 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-3014 | Fax (707) 543-3030 | afroschl@srcity.org

----Original Message----

From: Diane Ballard [mailto:dianeballard1618@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2017 8:29 PM

To: CityCouncilListPublic <citycouncil@srcity.org>

Subject: Marijuana subject

Good evening City Council

I am urging you to just set a limit to how many households can grow for Medical purposes outside. 6 to 8 Many patients have no money to purchase at a facility, but plants grow in the ground.

I worry about indoor grows in neighborhoods as old homes have older electricity and will cause fires.

The people who cause people to be upset are the big 25 or more plants too much for one house.

Medical patients are at your mercy!

I wanted to be present tonight at this meeting, but I was there when it was originally put on calendar.

Thank you, D

Santa Rosa

From:

Trippel, Andrew

Sent:

Wednesday, April 19, 2017 7:51 AM

To:

Jbekas

Cc:

Guhin, David

Subject:

RE: Proposed Ban on Outdoor Cannabis Cultivation

Good morning,

Thanks so much for your comments regarding the proposed ban on outdoor cannabis cultivation. I'm sharing your email with our division director David Guhin who organized Monday's City Council discussion and will be able to distribute your comments to Council members and others.

Best Regards,

Andrew

Andrew Trippel | City Planner

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Ave Rm 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-3223 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | atrippel@srcity.org



From: Jbekas [mailto:johnbekas@yahoo.com]

Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 6:51 PM
To: Trippel, Andrew <a trippel@srcity.org>

Subject: Proposed Ban on Outdoor Cannabis Cultivation

Andrew Trippel

I live in Santa Rosa. My wife and I bought our first house here 3 years ago, and our son just turned 13 months old. I'm not sure I wold have been alive to see that if it weren't for medical cannabis. I suffer from both a seizure condition and chronic pain for a broken hip as a result of a near fatal car accident I suffered on the way home from work one day. In New Jersey, my doctors were giving me a cocktail of Clonezapam, Roxicodone, muscle relaxers, Dilantin, Keppra, Lamictal.

I live within city limits, and I just want to grow my six plants in my yard. I moved here from New Jersey with the prospect of reducing/eliminating my need for pharmaceutical drugs and their awful side effects. One of the drugs I was taking causes something called "Dental Dysplasia" and your teeth grow over your gums. The side effects to my organs and neurological system are too many to count.

Since I have lived here, I have enjoyed the freedom of growing my own medical cannabis. If outdoor cultivation for medical use is banned, I feel like I have travelled from across the country for nothing, I am only on two medications now and I have been seizure free after I started my cannabis use.

Forcing people like myself to purchase their medication from clubs, which is essentially what this is doing, is on par with Mylan and other pharmaceutical companies hiking up the price of their drugs 400%+ If I consume one brownie in two days, that's 25\$ In a month this adds up to \$375 a month. If I buy cannabis flowers at the club, it can cost upwards of 500\$ a month, not to mention the price of pills and tinctures. Sick people cannot afford this. Big Cannabis is forcing people with chronic debilitating diseases to have to buy their medication at a club where they cant afford it, when they can grow it on their own. This is horrible, and I feel as thought it goes against the compassion and understanding that Santa Rosa and Sonoma County are known for.

From:

brightlightbeing@comcast.net Tuesday, April 18, 2017 8:57 PM

Sent: To:

Guhin, David

Subject:

100 square feet OUTDOORS w/o cultivation permit -YES!

Τηε ρεστ οφ τηε ωορλδ ισ μορε σανε, πραχτιχαλ, ωισε ιν τηειρ ρελατιονσηιπ το χανναβισ. Ηιγη τιμε φορ τηε Y Σ , ινχλυδινγ Σ αντα Pοσα, το ρελαξ ανδ Λ ΕΓΑΛΙΖΕ. Ιτ ωουλδ β ε γοινγ β αχκωαρδσ το δισαλλοω ουτδοορ γροωι ν γ.

Therefs a Monoxyatyre of vineyards all over this area – stop picking on a FAR more healthy and u seful plant!

The City of Santa Rosa prides itself in being green, sustainable, and environmentally conscious...

Voters of the State of California, and the County of Sonoma, agree that medical patients can cultivate for their personal use, up to 100 square feet, and that adult users over 21 can cultivate up to 6 sun-grown - the most natural, affordable plants; both outdoors and in greenhouses without a cannabis cultivation permit in accordance with State medical cannabis laws.

Than you, Judith lam

From:

Froschl, Angela

Sent:

Tuesday, March 28, 2017 4:57 PM

To:

Guhin, David

Cc:

Bliss, Sandi; Hartman, Clare

Subject:

FW: out door Marijuana growing in Santa Rosa

Good Afternoon,

FYI...

Thank you,

Angela Froschl | Senior Administrative Assistant City Managers Office | 100 Santa Rosa Ave, Suite 10 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-3014 | Fax (707) 543-3030 | afroschl@srcity.org

----Original Message-----

From: William J. Bagnani [mailto:wjbagn@yahoo.com]

Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 4:55 PM

To: _CityCouncilListPublic <citycouncil@srcity.org> Subject: out door Marijuana growing in Santa Rosa

I am not in favor of a ban of all outdoor growing Marijuana. I live in Santa Rosa and grow for my wife who has been paraplegic for over 30 yrs and has chronic pain. Opiates carry more problems and Marijuana is very expensive unless grown on your own. Inside growing is costly in electrical bills and much more difficult. I grow responsible and find this one of the only solutions to her quality of life. Please don't make it an all out ban. Thank You

William H Low RN Santa Rosa Ca

From:

Sandra Bandy <sandrabandy6@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, March 28, 2017 11:23 AM

To:

CityCouncilListPublic

Subject:

NoBan

The voters of the state of California agreed that medical patients can cultivate for their personal use up to 100 ft.² and that adult cannabis users can cultivate up to six plants. The city needs to be in harmony with this law. Please do not ban medicinal marijuana cultivators from growing their own medicine. Thank you, Sandra L Bandy 777 Aston Ave 78, Santa Rosa, Ca. 95404. Phone 791-4354

Sent from my iPhone

From:

emnem0110@gmail.com

Sent:

Tuesday, March 28, 2017 11:27 PM

To:

_CityCouncilListPublic

Subject:

Outdoor cultivation

As a citizen of Santa Rosa, I hope my opinion along with others persuade the city council to see the benefits of growing marijuana outdoor.

Not only to the patients smoking the sun-grown product, but the environment as well.

Growing marijuana outdoor is in its most natural state. Thriving off simply the sun, water, and soil.

Hemp is a very leafy plant and thus contributes a high level of oxygen to the atmosphere during its growth.

Not only environmental reasons, but energy efficiency should be kept in mind. I hope this persuades the approval of outdoor cultivation within city limits.

Thank you, Emily

From:

T Fredricks <fredricks5757@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, March 28, 2017 11:04 AM

To: Subject: _CityCouncilListPublic
Banning outdoor cultivation

I am writing in regards to the meeting tonight re the banning of medical cannibis being grown outside within city limits.

I take care of a disabled sister and she uses medicinal cannabis. She uses it not to get high, but to help with other issues.

She lives on social security, therefor, her medicine comes from the 3 plants i grow a year plus what I purchase for her.

It would greatly affect her access to her medicine if this ban takes place.

I understand that there have been issues with cultivation, but please, do not punish those of us that are respectful about our surroundings and grow a small amount.

Please find a middle ground that does not make it unaffordable and unaccessable to those who do not have alot of money.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Teresa Fredricks

From:

Froschl, Angela

Sent:

Tuesday, March 28, 2017 7:43 AM

To:

Guhin, David

Cc:

Bliss, Sandi; Hartman, Clare

Subject:

FW: Medical marijuana outdoor ban

Good Morning,

FYI...

Thank you,

Angela Froschl | Senior Administrative Assistant

City Managers Office | 100 Santa Rosa Ave, Suite 10 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-3014 | Fax (707) 543-3030 | afroschl@srcity.org



From: Luda Fiske [mailto:ludafisk@sonic.net] Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 6:50 AM

To: CityCouncilListPublic < citycouncil@srcity.org>

Subject: Medical marijuana outdoor ban

Good day to all of you,

For those who use medical marijuana and grow just a few plants the purchase of a green house and the space to build it can be impossible. Being forced to buy it commercially can be cost prohibitive. Leave the medical marijuana people out of any of your plans to control the new laws concerning legalization. Not only is it jumping the gun but harmful to many users and voters.

I never miss an election and this is important to people I know and care about.

gregory gilbertson



Virus-free. www.avast.com

From:

Alonzo Hayden <therealaix@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, March 28, 2017 11:10 AM

To:

CityCouncilListPublic

Subject:

Medical cannabis outside farming

Hello my name is Al I've suffered from post-traumatic stress due to events that I suffered at the Sonoma County Fairgrounds. And I haven't been able to work for 11 years. The only way I cope or deal with the stresses of day-to-day it's by smoking cannabis. But the price was too high and it was illegal so I got a license. I have a small place where I can grow all I do is add water and now I have my medicine .by taking this away you will force me to have to spend my social security on cannabis. I have been growing my own cannabis for the last 7 years no one has bothered me I have never been robbed my neighbors don't complain. The overwhelming fear is not being able to be part of society. The cost to grow cannabis indoors is ridiculous when it can be completely avoided but having a safe space outside next to your home locked away and the money I save by not having to give it two a vendor who will most likely be geared to serve recreational users the major infusion of recreational users will bring the price two levels the average person on Social Security can not afford but, when I grow my own I have enough to last with no cost to anyone. I made purchase my clones or my seeds but the light comes from the sun and the water comes from the ground compost from a compost heap fertilizes and I can have my medicine without the ability to grow my own cannabis I would most likely have to buy it from someone selling it off the streets because the price would still be cheaper than going to a club. so by stopping people from growing their own cannabis those people who are not afraid to grow will grow and sell to those who do not want to go to a club because they don't trust the quality from a club which will be geared for the recreational user please vote no and allow us with medical to continue to grow the way we have some people cannot afford a greenhouse some people can't afford\$15,000 PG&E bill the people who are behind this law most likely work for the industry PG&E the large company standing behind in the shadows squeezing the citizen out what's next I can't grow corn to feed my grandson I can't grow tomatoes because Safeway is might lose money when will it stop it won't stop until it affects you don't know because it affects me and mark my words so many young people are going to try to grow marijuana indoors so many houses will be burned down next year because of people plugging millions of plugs into the wall all this old equipment is not going to be good bless you and bless your families and please vote no allow people to have some dignity to be able to feed their own families to be able to medicate themselves and enclosing there is no such thing as extra what we grow is what lasts Until We Grow Again in other words when it runs out it runs out until the sun permits.

From:

Annalisa Hopper <annahopr@hotmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, March 28, 2017 12:44 PM

To: Subject: _CityCouncilListPublic Outdoor cultivation ban

To whom this may concern:

My name is Annalisa Hopper, I've been a cannabis farmer and patient for 12 years. I used to work for Peace In Medicine and a number of local collectives, but have grown personally for myself and a number of other patients, as their caregiver. The recent changes in legalization and prop 64, have caused severe detriment to the small time farmers in the area. Not only have you voted to significantly reduce the area and amount of plants farmers can cultivate, but also passed legislation taxing square footage of each garden. You have also stereotyped farmers as not being hard workers, while most of everyday of their lives, from sun up to sun down, are devoted to making sure ill people have access to medicine they desperately need. Roughly 45% of this county depends on this industry, and you've literally undercut and stolen their incomes, by empowering corporate industrial cultivation, and means to provide for their families. Families that have been doing this for over 50 years, are devastated, and you've slashed revenue that these people and the people they hire, put into the local economy every day. Patients depend on small local gardens to provide them with safe, pesticide -free medicine, that costs a lot less to provide, and doesn't cause as much harm to the environment as indoor grow operations do. By empowering people to turn to indoor operations, you could be indirectly responsible if more fires due to electrical issues occur because of this legislation. You've looked the other way when wineries pollute the local environment with pesticides and water hoarding, by taxing our industry the most. With this legislation, you will cause a big percentage of your population to leave the county, which will significantly curve any revenue coming into the county. I'm pleading for you all to reconsider passing this legislation, because people rely on their small outdoor gardens to be able to afford living in the country. These cultivators aren't all criminals, I find the most of them, are middle to lower class, retired, baby-boomers, and young professionals, that are in debt, because of school, who depend on this second source of income or depend on the medicine for their own needs. People won't be able to afford buying medicine from dispensaries with the new taxes imposed, which could spiral out and effect everything, in the grand scheme of things. I'm hoping that this matter will not be taken lightly and will have more discourse that any other legislation passed as of late.

Sincerely, Annalisa Hopper 702-376-2285 516 Earle St. Santa Rosa, Ca 95404

Sent from my iPhone

From:

William Rogers < LGBRogers@msn.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, March 28, 2017 9:08 AM

To:

_CityCouncilListPublic

Subject:

Outdoor Plant Vote Today

Marijuana was legalized statewide on November 8, 2016. It was a small victory in an otherwise dismal election, but we Californians rejoiced. Finally, weed would be legal to smoke or possess in one's own home, if one is a human over the age of 21.

Regarding your vote today to prohibit growing plants in our backyards:

I am a quiet, law-abiding, 56 year resident of Santa Rosa. I own my home, pay taxes, and vote in every election.

If I plant two plants in the backyard of my single family home, for my personal consumption, what harm am I doing? My neighbors smoke weed. My yard is not visible from the street. Are you saying that I am creating a nuisance?

The chemicals? I would use the fertilizer that I put on my vegetables.

The smell? Well, some people smoke cigars on their porches, and some people use gas powered lawn mowers and leaf blowers. Some people even drive diesel automobiles...and all these things are legal in our fair city. In fact, I think the same rules that apply to smoking, e.g. restrictions for apartments and multi-use buildings, would apply nicely to the "smell issue" as well.

Remember, some people (like me) are medically sensitive to the aromas of jasmine and magnolia blossoms which permeate the city at certain times of the year. These plants are not illegal, are they?

The fundamental beauty of cannabis is that each person could, potentially, grow enough for their personal consumption.

The State of California has declared, through a vote of its citizens, that marijuana shall be legal for all residents over the age of 21.

Instead of an outright ban, how about imposing a limit on the number of plants one household may grow within the city limits of Santa Rosa?

Sincerely, Lianne Rogers

From:

Froschl, Angela

Sent:

Tuesday, March 28, 2017 4:57 PM

To:

Guhin, David

Cc:

Bliss, Sandi; Hartman, Clare

Subject:

FW: out door Marijuana growing in Santa Rosa

Good Afternoon,

FYI...

Thank you,

Angela Froschl | Senior Administrative Assistant City Managers Office | 100 Santa Rosa Ave, Suite 10 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-3014 | Fax (707) 543-3030 | afroschl@srcity.org

----Original Message----

From: William J. Bagnani [mailto:wjbagn@yahoo.com]

Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 4:55 PM

To: _CityCouncilListPublic <citycouncil@srcity.org> Subject: out door Marijuana growing in Santa Rosa

I am not in favor of a ban of all outdoor growing Marijuana. I live in Santa Rosa and grow for my wife who has been paraplegic for over 30 yrs and has chronic pain. Opiates carry more problems and Marijuana is very expensive unless grown on your own. Inside growing is costly in electrical bills and much more difficult. I grow responsible and find this one of the only solutions to her quality of life. Please don't make it an all out ban. Thank You

William H Low RN Santa Rosa Ca

From:

trish manzano <trisha.manzano8@icloud.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, March 28, 2017 10:09 AM

To:

CityCouncilListPublic

Subject:

Outdoor growing in Santa Rosa

Dear city council my name is trish and I live in Santa Rosa . I read in the press democrat that you are voting on a moratorium on outdoor cannabis growing . I urge you you to vote against this moratorium and any ban of outdoor growing . I grow outside cannabis to produce cannabis for my disability . I can not afford a green house and do not have the space money for lights and a indoor growing room . I am worried that next year you will ban the growing of my vegetable garden and try to tax or force my garden into a green house as well . I believe the smell of cannabis is a wonderful smell that should be enjoyed by everyone . I do not believe a green house Will stop people from stealing cannabis .Thank you for your time Trish .

Sent from my iPhone

From:

Richard McCune <mccune_rich@yahoo.com>

Sent: To: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 12:01 PM

10:

_CityCouncilListPublic

Subject:

Outdoor Cannabis growing ban

Many people actually use cannabis as medicine. Preventing them from growing their medicine is not right. Growing cannabis was approved by the voters of the state. Don't force them to buy their cannabis from someone else. I like the solution Cloverdale came up with. Three plants per household. That should be enough for most people.

From:

Thomas Barbara Novak <tvnovak@hotmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, March 28, 2017 6:07 AM

To:

CityCouncilListPublic

Subject:

Outdoor cultivation prohibition folly

I believe your proposal to ban outdoor cultivation of medical marijuana for personal use is morally, economically, environmentally and sociologically wrong. The intent of legalization is to be able to allow people to use marijuana. It is a weed that grows well here and the resources required to grow indoors is a waste. It seems your justification for prohibition revolves around your greed for a tax revenue and will send people to more expensive and black market options. Please look at the whole picture before you rush into a bad decision expanding prohibition instead of embracing what the citizens voted for. Thank you, Barbara Novak

From:

Gary <showestg@comcast.net>

Sent:

Tuesday, March 28, 2017 10:29 AM

To:

_CityCouncilListPublic

Subject:

Don't ban outdoor cannabis completely

Dear Council Member,

I urge you not to ban completely outdoor growing of cannabis. Some folks with medical conditions cannot afford the high cost of medicine and grow a very small quantity for personal use that causes no concerns for neighbors. Do not abuse these few folks that cause no concerns to the public. Sincerely,

Gary Schouest

Santa Rosa, CA

From:

Froschl, Angela

Sent:

Tuesday, March 28, 2017 5:14 PM

To:

Guhin, David

Cc:

Bliss, Sandi: Hartman, Clare

Subject:

FW: Please Vote No on Outdoor Personal Cultivation Ban

Attachments:

PRA response 12-20-12.pdf

Good Afternoon,

FYI...

Thank you,

Angela Froschl | Senior Administrative Assistant

City Managers Office | 100 Santa Rosa Ave, Suite 10 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-3014 | Fax (707) 543-3030 | afroschl@srcity.org



From: Sarah Shrader [mailto:sarah@safeaccessnow.org]

Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 5:03 PM

To: _CityCouncilListPublic <citycouncil@srcity.org>

Subject: Please Vote No on Outdoor Personal Cultivation Ban

March 28, 2017

Dear Santa Rosa City Council,

As chair of the Sonoma ASA Chapter, I am speaking out tonight against the Urgency Ordinance that would ban outdoor cultivation within Santa Rosa City Limits. As an advocacy organization that supports medical cannabis patients, I do not see a benefit for patients by passing this ordinance.

Not the intent of California Law

Three California Bills were passed by state legislature in 2015, known as MMRSA. These bills create a state licensing structure that purposely exempts medical cannabis patients who cultivate up to 100 square feet for their personal use. Personal use gardens are intended to be non commercial, the patient or their caregiver can cultivate their medical need without going through a permit process. In addition, the voters of the State of California (and in Sonoma County) approved Proposition 64 in November of 2016, allowing adult users over 21 to cultivate up to 6 plants.

Urgency Ordinance

There has been no emergency that's taken place to require this type of urgent action. Medical cannabis patients have cultivated their medicine with the counties permission since Proposition 215 passed in 1996.

Sun Grown Medicine

Sun-grown medicine, is the most natural, affordable, medical quality cannabis for patients to produce for themselves. Requiring indoor production creates an artificial environment, plants naturally are drawn to the soil, lighting, and environmental conditions of this region.

Affordable Medicine

It is not affordable for low-income patients to purchase equipment for indoor cultivation, pay high electric bills, or to build a structure that may require City Permits. We need to keep affordable options available for medical cannabis patients.

Education & Compliance

As an educator in Sonoma County, it has been a simple policy over the last fifteen years to share with patients, that they are allowed their own personal cultivation of up to 100 square feet. For patients who inquire about compliance in the future, it will be much more complicated to look up each individual by their zip code to find out which jurisdictional rules apply to them.

Mooreland Raids

A series of raids that took place on September 26th of 2012, included eleven different enforcement agencies in the Moorland area of Santa Rosa. This action resulted in multiple people's deportation and conviction, many of whom had less than 30 plants, and had never smoked medicine. Creating laws that make personal use illegal will only support this type of multi agency activity. This is not where we want to see enforcement resources spent. Please see attached Public Record Request, which confirms that 8 medical cannabis gardens were eradicated.

Sonoma District Attorney Policies

District Attorney Mike Mullins set the county guidelines in 2002, to be 100 square feet for medical patients after two unsuccessful prosecutions of medical cannabis gardens. All of the District Attorneys elected since Mike Mullins have remained committed to the 100 square foot policy.

City of Santa Rosa

The City of Santa Rosa prides itself in being green, sustainable, environmentally conscious, and progressive on cannabis polices. Forcing cannabis cultivation indoors, it does not meet these goals, and increases our county's Carbon footprint.

San Francisco State Legalization Task Force Recommendations

The San Francisco Task force has recently made recommendations to not issue permits to one acre outdoor facilities (MMRSA permit 3, outdoors). The reasoning was that San Francisco is such a

dense city, one acre parcels are not available. The second recommendation was not to issue type 5 permits in the future, because large cultivations would likely take out smaller cultivations as their competition. The decision was made unanimously to support all other cultivation types.

Recommendation: Allow for personal cultivation of 100 square feet, both outdoors and in greenhouses without a cannabis cultivation permit in accordance with State medical cannabis laws.

I appreciate your consideration to these matters, and encourage you to vote in favor of patient access,

Sarah Shrader

sarah@safeaccessnow.org

707 540 4025

From:

Froschl, Angela

Sent:

Tuesday, March 28, 2017 2:58 PM

To:

Guhin, David

Cc:

Bliss, Sandi; Hartman, Clare

Subject:

FW: Please DON'T ban sun-grown medicine.

Good Afternoon,

FYI...

Thank you,

Angela Froschl | Senior Administrative Assistant

City Managers Office | 100 Santa Rosa Ave, Suite 10 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Tel. (707) 543-3014 | Fax (707) 543-3030 | afroschl@srcity.org



From: Anna Storti [mailto:astorti123@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 2:51 PM

To: _CityCouncilListPublic <citycouncil@srcity.org> Subject: Please DON'T ban sun-grown medicine.

Sun grown medicine is the most natural affordable, medical quality medicine for patients to produce for themselves. Sun grown medicine should NOT be banned within city limits. **Recommendation: Allow for personal cultivation of 100 square feet, both outdoors and in greenhouses without a cannabis cultivation permit in accordance with State and medical cannabis laws. - Anna (California resident)

From:

William Rogers < LGBRogers@msn.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, March 28, 2017 4:09 PM

To: Subject: _CityCouncilListPublic
Outdoor grow vote

Council Members,

Of all the asinine things you have come up with over the years this ban on outdoor growing of marijuana is one of the most idiotic proposals. First you are fixing a problem that doesn't exist. Remember November the people of California voted to LEGALIZE marijuana for recreational use in California. To make growing small amounts of marijuana for personal or medical use within Santa Rosa California illegal you are creating a problem that was just remedied state wide. The More people that have two or three plants the less the problems associated with it become. You also increase the carbon footprint of Santa Rosa by requiring people to grow indoors. So much for being earth friendly.

I fully support a limit on the number of plants (say 4 to 6) and outlaw commercial grows in residential areas. If you insist on being reactionary twits I will stand against you now and at the next election cycle. To call this an Urgent matter is ridiculous.

If you support this I just have to ask myself " What the hell kind of Idiots are we electing?" Sorry for being course but the council has a track record of Stupid. Please don't be stupid again today.

William Rogers

814 Humboldt St. Santa Rosa,ca

From:

DAWN WALKER <dsvtx2@comcast.net>

Sent:

Tuesday, March 28, 2017 3:50 PM

To:

CityCouncilListPublic

Subject:

Cannabis Urgency Ordinance

Dear City Council Members

I write to ask that you not follow the City Attorney's recommendation to prohibit the outdoor cultivation of cannabis.

My recommendation as a life long environmentalist is to

Regulate the commercial cultivation of cannabis the same as other agricultural crops.

Follow the voter's mandate of passing proposition 64 allowing for limited cultivation outdoors or indoors. Because:

Outdoor growing uses far less valuable resources, such as light and water. There is a reason it is not hard to catch illegal indoor marijuana farms - high electricity use is a dominant clue. Growing outdoors will also allow rain to provide at least some of the water required to grow outdoors, compared to 100% municipal water for indoor growing.

Also of concern is that a mandate for indoor growing only, discriminates against people of lower economic status. Indoor growing equipment is not inexpensive.

Thank you for your consideration, Dawn A. Walker 95404

Sustainable Design is Intelligent

From:

Steven Patch <steven.a.patch@gmail.com>

Sent: To: Wednesday, March 29, 2017 9:43 PM

To: Subject: _CityCouncilListPublic
Cannabis outdoor growing

Hello,

As a resident of Santa Rosa, I urge you to drop the idea of banning the growth of cannabis plants outdoors for personal use. This will hurt many of your constituents that need their medical cannabis treatments who can not otherwise afford to purchase it. What makes you think it is okay to govern what people grow in the backyard of their own home? This country is losing its freedoms one by one because of people in power who think they know what is best for everyone else. I see that one of the reasons to ban outdoor growth is the smell. Would you also think it is ok to ban outdoor grilling because a vegetarian next door doesn't like the smell of grilled meat? Absurd right? Same concept. I hope you find it in your hearts to allow the people of Santa Rosa to have one less freedom taken away.

Thanks, Steven