

Table 2: Preliminary Evaluation of Sample Regulatory Options

	PROS	CONS	COST/REVENUE IMPLICATIONS
<p>Option 1 (Continued Prohibition)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Discourages cannabis use -Avoid complications with federal law -Avoids impacts to neighboring properties that may be generated by commercial cannabis uses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Highest potential for encouraging illicit operations -Difficult for residents to purchase a legal substance -Economic activity might happen elsewhere (in cities or other counties) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Not eligible for state grant funds -No change in local tax revenue -Ordinance preparation and enforcement costs would be lower, though extent of need for illegal grow enforcement need would be a factor -Likely lower cost for substance use treatment, etc.
<p>Option 2 (Limited Permitted Uses)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Generates economic activity and jobs by focusing on those uses for which the County may have competitive assets (e.g. industrial and agricultural land) and that probably have fewer impacts -RFP process provides the County with most control over how many uses get established and where they get established -Expanding personal grow to the outside option may ameliorate power consumption and structure risks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Somewhat facilitates cannabis use in County (which could lead to increased abuse and other societal concerns; however, without retail sales, the amount of facilitation is expected to be minor) -Some impacts on surrounding properties -Some increased security risk -Difficult for residents to purchase a legal substance -May conflict with potential changes in enforcement of federal law 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Eligible for state grant funds related to cannabis -Intermediate amount of tax receipts (amount would number/size of uses permitted) -Intermediate cost to prepare and enforcement new ordinance(s) -Intermediate cost for substance use treatment, etc.
<p>Option 3 (Expanded Permitted Uses)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Aggressively generates economic activity and jobs in various sectors (industrial, agricultural and retail) -Provides more and easier access to a legal substance for County residents and may help curb illegal uses --Local permitting of retail & edibles manufacture would provide improved health/safety oversight -Expanded personal grow to include outside option enables some residents to avoid the high power consumption and structural risks of growing inside and the expanded quantity may moderate the need for retail sales 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Facilitates greater cannabis use in County (which could lead to increased abuse and other societal concerns) -Requires extensive regulation/enforcement -More impacts on surrounding properties -More increased security risk -May conflict with potential changes in enforcement of federal law 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Eligible for state grant funds related to cannabis -Most tax receipts (amount would depend on number/size of uses permitted and the amount of tax approved by voters) -Tax receipts potential difficult to determine -Most cost to prepare and enforce new ordinance(s) and to prepare tax measure and collect new taxes -Likely higher cost for substance use treatment, etc.