

## El Dorado Planning Commission

P.C. 12/14/23  
Item #5  
2 Pages

Michael Ranalli <Mike@ranallivineyard.com>

Wed 12/13/2023 6:36 PM

To: Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>; Brandon Reinhardt <Brandon.Reinhardt@edcgov.us>; Kris X. Payne <KPayne@edcgov.us>; Daniel Harkin <Daniel.Harkin@edcgov.us>; Lexi Boeger <Lexi.Boeger@edcgov.us>; Andy Nevis <Andy.Nevis@edcgov.us>

 1 attachments (130 KB)

EDCPC\_Agenda Item 5 (File # 23-2192).pdf;

Madam clerk, please include this memo for Agenda Item 5 File# 23-2192

December 13, 2023

**Attention: EDC Planning Commissioners**  
**RE: Agenda Item 5 (File # 23-2192)**

Planning Commissioners,

Please consider my comments for Agenda Item #5, as I am unable to attend in person.

Respectfully, the legislative record for Agenda Item 23-2192 is a convoluted mess and does not make easy your ability to do what the Board of Supervisors directed of you on September 12, 2023.

- There are no legislative links to any of the prior commission meetings and no reasonable ability for commissioners or the public to relate this item to prior commission actions. How will you put the topics for discussion into any context?
- The staff reports and the seven attachments are poorly aligned to the direction given to fix significant problems in the ordinance. The ordinance code under review (J - Staff Memo Attachment C Update 12-12-23) was not originally posted with the agenda item.

Your commission has contributed to a significant amount of work to address the numerous problems with this ordinance. I have observed the recommendations of this planning commission not move forward to the Board of Supervisors in its entirety. Rather, your work product seems to have been synthesized in a manner that made it painfully difficult for your Board of Supervisors to perform their policy role effectively.

The Board opened the ordinance for your commission to consider changes and make recommendations. Your commission has the latitude and opportunity now for your good work to be appropriately considered in its entirety by the Board of Supervisors. The Board and the Commission have acknowledged that the Commercial Cannabis ordinance needs fixed. The process for this ordinance revision needs to be treated in the same manner as any other legislative processes.

Farmers, ranchers, foresters and their families know well the cost and consequence of ineffective governmental programs and administrative processes. I ask that the Planning Commission be able to do the job your Board of Supervisors directed.

Michael Ranalli  
President, El Dorado County Farm Bureau

*Protect, promote, and enhance the economic opportunities and long-term viability  
for El Dorado County farmers, ranchers, and foresters.*

P.C. 12/14/23  
Item 5  
3 Pages

Planning commission 12-14-2023 public comments for item 23-2192

Lee Tannenbaum <lee.tannenbaum@gmail.com>

Wed 12/13/2023 8:56 PM

To: Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

Cc: Kris Payne <krispayne999@gmail.com>; Andy Nevis <andynevis@gmail.com>; lexi boeger <lexiboeger@gmail.com>; Brandon Reinhardt <Brandon.Reinhardt@edcgov.us>; Daniel Harkin <Daniel.Harkin@edcgov.us>; kevinwmccarty@pm.me <kevinwmccarty@pm.me>; Michael Pinette <michaelpca@gmail.com>; Ali Jones <jones.ali.138@gmail.com>; phil barrier <pbar1@hotmail.com>; David Harde <davidharde123@gmail.com>; rsandie101@yahoo.com <rsandie101@yahoo.com>; adolfzierke70@gmail.com <adolzfierke70@gmail.com>; ericjacobsen1@gmail.com <ericjacobsen1@gmail.com>; dwaynetincup@gmail.com <dwaynetincup@gmail.com>; robin.s.klein@gmail.com <robin.s.klein@gmail.com>

📎 1 attachments (33 KB)

Summary list - CEQA\_non-CEQA - Google Docs.pdf;

Please insure this email is included for public comment for the Planning Commission 12/14/23 item number 23-2192.

Commissioners, the attachment is the same summary list previously sent, ordered by CEQA, non-CEQA, and items that could be argued either way (and both could be correct). Hoping this will be easier for us all to discuss.

In case this does not get posted, I will have hard copies for our hearing tomorrow. Thanks so much.

lee

Lee Tannenbaum  
CEO Cybele Holdings, Inc.  
President El Dorado County Growers Alliance  
650.515.2484



## Summary list formatted by CEQA vs non-CEQA

### CEQA

- Agriculture not commercial - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Potential DTC and on site consumption - PC voted no, county is not ready at this time.
- County wide EIR, AG, etc.
- Specialty cottage license - Open for discussion. The question here is how do we allow mom and pop farmers to get through the process in a timely and cost effective manner.
- CEQA individual or county EIR. Goes to Ag Discussion - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- County cannot control crop size as there are other issues with Eid etc - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Grow sizes. Emulate state regs - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change

Non-CEQA for today's discussion that we ask to be included in today's discussion.

### Board approved and ROI

- Annual fees to start when conditions are completed or allow for operations to begin while conditions are completed - Planning has agreed to this. Needs to be retroactive.
- Remove the need to resubmit the entire package each year - Planning has agreed to this. Also needs to be clear that online submission is OK.
- Multi year licenses - Planning department approved
- Background check, change ownership definition to conform to state definition. Remove the need for spouses, and all other non-decision makers to have background checks. - Confirmed by EDSO/BoS to be OK to be tied to state definition
- Background checks to be objective. Follow state guidelines. - Confirmed by EDSO.
- Square foot tax needs to be changed to gross sales. Tax collector agrees - BoS has approved this. - Tax Collector purview

### Alliance requested for today and non-CEQA

- Speed, or lack thereof to complete process - BoS direction
- Change definition of Indoor cultivation to allow for propagation (the ability to grow for seeds or clones for business use) - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Manufacture and process/processing have same definitions - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Mixed light definition needs to be changed - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Premises and parcel need to be distinct, not the same - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Site plan to show propagation areas - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Remove seeds from cannabis definitions. Feds/State consider seeds to be hemp. - Needs to be removed
- 2 hours to be available for inspection is unreasonable. Vacations, travel, etc. designated local contact - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Transfer of ownership needs to be fixed - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change

- Fines. Need to be enforced by code enforcement and not sheriff - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Revocation for flagrant violations, not small ones. Growing pains for all. - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Neighbor continual notification is not needed and no other business is required to do this. Needs discussion
- Odor testing by qualified folks - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Allow indoor, manufacturing (non-volatile) and distribution for outdoor cultivation. Public safety issue. Think vineyard. - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Lighting. Under 25 for mixed light. Over 25 for indoor. As long as neighbors are not disturbed (and ordinance covers violations), could remove this altogether. - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Allow porta potties - Planning approved - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change

Open for interpretation on CEQA impacting - there are arguments that could go either way on these according to counsel.

- Remove setback waiver language re November, 2018 date - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Setbacks are significantly more than any other county - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change



2460 Headington Road  
Placerville, CA 95667-5216  
Phone: 530.622.7773  
Fax: 530.622.7839  
Email: info@edcfb.com

December 13, 2023

**Attention:** EDC Planning Commissioners  
**RE:** Agenda Item 5 (File # 23-2192)

Planning Commissioners,

Please consider my comments for Agenda Item #5, as I am unable to attend in person.

Respectfully, the legislative record for Agenda Item 23-2192 is a convoluted mess and does not make easy your ability to do what the Board of Supervisors directed of you on September 12, 2023.

- There are no legislative links to any of the prior commission meetings and no reasonable ability for commissioners or the public to relate this item to prior commission actions. How will you put the topics for discussion into any context?
- The staff reports and the seven attachments are poorly aligned to the direction given to fix significant problems in the ordinance. The ordinance code under review (J - Staff Memo Attachment C Update 12-12-23) was not originally posted with the agenda item.

Your commission has contributed to a significant amount of work to address the numerous problems with this ordinance. I have observed the recommendations of this planning commission not move forward to the Board of Supervisors in its entirety. Rather, your work product seems to have been synthesized in a manner that made it painfully difficult for your Board of Supervisors to perform their policy role effectively.

The Board opened the ordinance for your commission to consider changes and make recommendations. Your commission has the latitude and opportunity now for your good work to be appropriately considered in its entirety by the Board of Supervisors. The Board and the Commission have acknowledged that the Commercial Cannabis ordinance needs fixed. The process for this ordinance revision needs to be treated in the same manner as any other legislative processes.

Farmers, ranchers, foresters and their families know well the cost and consequence of ineffective governmental programs and administrative processes. I ask that the Planning Commission be able to do the job your Board of Supervisors directed.

Michael Ranalli  
President, El Dorado County Farm Bureau

*Protect, promote, and enhance the economic opportunities and long-term viability  
for El Dorado County farmers, ranchers, and foresters.*

Summary list formatted by CEQA vs non-CEQA

#### CEQA

- Agriculture not commercial - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Potential DTC and on site consumption - PC voted no, county is not ready at this time.
- County wide EIR, AG, etc.
- Specialty cottage license - Open for discussion. The question here is how do we allow mom and pop farmers to get through the process in a timely and cost effective manner.
- CEQA individual or county EIR. Goes to Ag Discussion - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- County cannot control crop size as there are other issues with Eid etc - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Grow sizes. Emulate state regs - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change

Non-CEQA for today's discussion that we ask to be included in today's discussion.

#### Board approved and ROI

- Annual fees to start when conditions are completed or allow for operations to begin while conditions are completed - Planning has agreed to this. Needs to be retroactive.
- Remove the need to resubmit the entire package each year - Planning has agreed to this. Also needs to be clear that online submission is OK.
- Multi year licenses - Planning department approved
- Background check, change ownership definition to conform to state definition. Remove the need for spouses, and all other non-decision makers to have background checks. - Confirmed by EDSO/BoS to be OK to be tied to state definition
- Background checks to be objective. Follow state guidelines. - Confirmed by EDSO.
- Square foot tax needs to be changed to gross sales. Tax collector agrees - BoS has approved this. - Tax Collector purview

#### Alliance requested for today and non-CEQA

- Speed, or lack thereof to complete process - BoS direction
- Change definition of Indoor cultivation to allow for propagation (the ability to grow for seeds or clones for business use) - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Manufacture and process/processing have same definitions - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Mixed light definition needs to be changed - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Premises and parcel need to be distinct, not the same - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Site plan to show propagation areas - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Remove seeds from cannabis definitions. Feds/State consider seeds to be hemp. - Needs to be removed
- 2 hours to be available for inspection is unreasonable. Vacations, travel, etc. designated local contact - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Transfer of ownership needs to be fixed - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change

- Fines. Need to be enforced by code enforcement and not sheriff - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Revocation for flagrant violations, not small ones. Growing pains for all. - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Neighbor continual notification is not needed and no other business is required to do this. Needs discussion
- Odor testing by qualified folks - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Allow indoor, manufacturing (non-volatile) and distribution for outdoor cultivation. Public safety issue. Think vineyard. - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Lighting. Under 25 for mixed light. Over 25 for indoor. As long as neighbors are not disturbed (and ordinance covers violations), could remove this altogether. - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Allow porta potties - Planning approved - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change

Open for interpretation on CEQA impacting - there are arguments that could go either way on these according to counsel.

- Remove setback waiver language re November, 2018 date - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change
- Setbacks are significantly more than any other county - Open for discussion and voted in favor of change



Archon Farms, Inc.  
701 12<sup>th</sup> St, Ste 202  
Sacramento, CA 95814

December 13, 2023

El Dorado County  
Planning Commission  
330 Fair Lane, Building A  
Placerville, CA 95667

ATTN: El Dorado County, Planning Commissioners:

This message is regarding Agenda Item #23-2192 related to the draft Resolution of Intent (ROI) proposing revisions to the County's cannabis ordinance, as directed by the Board of Supervisors on October 17<sup>th</sup>.

We appreciate the work of staff and the Commission throughout this process in helping make these improvements to the cannabis ordinance. During the October 17<sup>th</sup> Board meeting, staff introduced the argument that additional ordinance revisions would not be appropriate because they would warrant additional CEQA analysis and potentially the drafting of an environmental impact report (EIR).

We believe there are other proposed revisions which are appropriate to include in the draft ROI to be sent back to the Board of Supervisors, falling squarely within the "common sense" CEQA exemption under CCR section 15061(b)(3) as well as section 15305 for minor alterations in land use limitations. In addition to the six items listed, we urge the Commission to incorporate the following four revisions into the ROI:

**1. Mixed-Light Cultivation**

**a. Ordinance Revision:**

- i. Revise definition of "mixed-light cultivation" in Ordinance Section 130.41.200.(2) – Definitions, in alignment with DCC regulations, so that it reads:
  1. *Mixed-light cultivation means the cultivation of mature cannabis in a greenhouse, hoop-house, glass house, conservatory, hothouse, or other similar structure using a combination of natural light ~~or light deprivation~~ and artificial lighting at a rate of less than or equal to ~~six~~ twenty-five watts per square foot or less.*
- ii. Revise language of Ordinance Section 130.41.200.(5)(J) – Cultivation Standards, to align with the revised definition above.

**b. CEQA Applicability:**

- i. Section 130.41.200(5)(J) of the ordinance already contains the following text, requiring measures to mitigate potential impact to surrounding land uses:
  1. *All lights used for mixed-light cultivation shall be fully contained within structures or otherwise shielded to fully contain any light or glare involved in the cultivation process.*
- ii. Given this existing protection, it is reasonable to conclude there is no possibility that additional wattage per light fixture will have an effect on the environment, and thus meets the "certainty" standard and CEQA exempt per CCR 15061.

## 2. Premises Definition

### a. Ordinance Revision:

- i. Incorporate the State definition of “premises” per DCC regulations / CCR Title 4 Division 19 §15000.(ccc):
  1. *“Premises” means the designated structure(s) and land specified in the application that is owned, leased, or otherwise held under the control of the applicant or licensee where the commercial cannabis activity will be or is conducted. The premises shall be a contiguous area and shall only be occupied by one licensee.*
- ii. Revise language of Ordinance Section 130.41.200.(5)(B) – Cultivation Standards, so the sentence reads:
  1. *Distance shall be measured from the nearest point ~~of the property line~~ of the premises that contains the commercial cultivation to the nearest point of the property line of the enumerated use using a direct straight-line measurement.*

### b. CEQA Applicability

- i. Amending the definition of “premises” as a singular measure leaves in place all other land use restrictions / environmental concerns, including the following:
  1. 800-foot setback from property lines per 130.41.200(5)(C).
  2. 1,500-foot setback from any school, school bus stop, place of worship, park, playground childcare center, youth-oriented facility, pre-school, public library, licensed drug or alcohol recovery facility, or licensed sober living facility per 130.41.200(5)(B).
  3. Odor nuisance thresholds and mitigation standards per 130.41.200(5)(D).
  4. Water supply sufficiency and conservation per 130.41.200(5)(E)-(F).
  5. Visual screening and exclusionary fencing per 130.41.200(5)(G)-(H).
  6. Renewable energy supply and lighting controls per 130.41.200(5)(I)-(J).
  7. Waste and sewer disposal restrictions per 130.41.200(5)(L)-(M).
- ii. Given the existing protections which will remain in effect, it is reasonable to conclude the amendment will not cause any significant effect on the environment, and thus meets the “certainty” standard and CEQA exempt per CCR 15061.
- iii. To the extent that the objections of specific neighbors in certain areas qualifies as ‘environmental impact’, the proposed amendment still qualifies for a section 15305 CEQA exemption under “minor alterations in land use limitations which do not result in any changes in land use or density”.

## 3. Indoor Propagation

### a. Ordinance Revision:

- i. Incorporate the State definition of “outdoor cultivation” per DCC regulations / CCR Title 4 Division 19 §15000.(xx):
  1. *“Outdoor cultivation” means the cultivation of mature cannabis without the use of artificial lighting in the canopy area at any point in time.*
- ii. If necessary, add language to ordinance specifying that outdoor and mixed-light cultivators may conduct propagation of immature plants in an indoor structure,

according to existing County building and fire code, as well as any applicable land use entitlement conditions.

b. CEQA Applicability:

- i. Outdoor and mixed light cultivation facilities are already granted the right to utilize indoor structures for office / administration, processing, harvest storage, and other ancillary purposes – this amendment would not affect any land use.
- ii. This revision merely proposes to clarify that these cultivators are not restricted from utilizing the indoor space for immature plant propagation – no flowering / mature plants – due to the poorly-worded ordinance definition in 130.41.100(2).
- iii. Given all cultivation standards will otherwise remain in effect, it is reasonable to conclude there is no possibility of environmental impact from this amendment, and it thus meets the “certainty” standard and CEQA exempt per CCR 15061.

4. Non-volatile Manufacturing & Distribution in Rural Areas

a. Ordinance Revision:

i. [OPTION A – FULL MICROBUSINESS, NO SOLVENTS]:

1. Revise text of 130.41.300(6)(A) to include Planned Agricultural (PA), Limited Agricultural (LA), and Rural Lands (RL) as permitted zones for **distribution use**.

*a. Distribution Transport-Only is already exempt from zoning restrictions in 6(A), full distribution use entails same buildings, vehicles, and operations – just the ability to coordinate with testing laboratory for product sample testing prior to retail.*

2. Revise text of 130.41.300(9)(A)(2) to include Planned Agricultural (PA), Limited Agricultural (LA), and Rural Lands (RL) as permitted zones for Type 6 **manufacturing use**, restricted to non-volatile and non-flammable extractions.

*a. DCC Type 6 licenses are already restricted from engaging in non-volatile solvent extraction (butane / hexane) but allow other solvent extraction such as ethanol and carbon dioxide (CO2).*

*b. Proposed “Option A” ordinance revision would further restrict permitted manufacturing, prohibiting flammable solvent (ethanol) extraction, only allowing extraction using water / ice or mechanical processes, such as pressure and heat.*

ii. [OPTION B – RURAL LANDS (RL) INFUSION MICROBUSINESS]:

1. Revise text of 130.41.300(9)(A)(3) to include Rural Lands (RL) as a permitted zone for Type N (infusion) and P (packaging) manufacturing use, in addition to Planned Agricultural (PA), Limited Agricultural (LA), and Agricultural Grazing (AG) in the current ordinance text.

*a. Option B would be a watered-down version of Option A and would still allow cultivators in the RL zone to hold a microbusiness license, limited to distribution transport-only, and manufacturing infusion or packaging – zero extraction of any kind permitted.*

b. CEQA Applicability:

i. [OPTION A – FULL MICROBUSINESS, NO SOLVENTS]:

1. Ordinance section 130.41.300(6)(A) already allows certain distribution uses (Type 13 transport-only) within LA, PA, AG, and RL zones, this amendment would merely include a second distribution type (Type 11 distributor) to the existing category of permitted land uses.
2. Ordinance section 130.41.300(9)(A)(3) already allows certain manufacturing uses (infusion and packaging) within LA, PA, and AG zones, this amendment would merely include a third manufacturing type (Type 6, no solvent extraction) to the existing category of permitted land uses.

ii. [OPTION B – RURAL LANDS (RL) INFUSION MICROBUSINESS]:

- i. Ordinance section 130.41.300(9)(A)(3) already allows certain manufacturing uses (infusion and packaging) within LA, PA, and AG zones, this amendment would merely include a fourth zone (Rural Lands / RL) to the list of permitted zones for this license type, involving zero extraction.


Given the nature of the above items along with those contained in the ROI as written, critically important to the development of the legal cannabis industry in El Dorado County yet negligible in terms of potential negative effects to their surrounding communities, we strongly urge the Commission to seize the day and use this opportunity to benefit the law-abiding agricultural cannabis entrepreneurs by incorporating the four items listed above, and certifying the expanded Resolution of Intent for Board consideration.

Finally, regarding the remaining proposed revisions to the cannabis ordinance, which we admit are likely subject to more formal CEQA review and analysis, we implore the Commission to revisit the topic of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for cannabis cultivation in El Dorado County and communicate its importance to the Board of Supervisors. After conferring with legal counsel on this matter, we understand that an EIR will likely be required for the other key proposed ordinance revisions (reduction in 800' setback distance, elimination of "grandfather date" clause), and thus we as a county might as well use it as an opportunity to streamline the CEQA review process and modernize our cannabis permitting system.

We believe that the Board understood the concept of an EIR as a standalone ordinance revision at the October 17<sup>th</sup> meeting, not something that would otherwise still be required to achieve the remaining revisions they approved for consideration. Consequently, we believe it is appropriate for the Commission to include a recommendation for the Board to authorize an EIR for commercial cannabis in the final ROI and propose that it streamline the CEQA review process as an added benefit to the industry.

Help us improve El Dorado agriculture with common-sense actions today. Let's work together to make our county's cannabis as world-renowned as our wine. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards,



Kevin W. McCarty

CEO / President, Archon Farms Inc.

Member, El Dorado County Growers Alliance

kevinwmccarty@pm.me