

Table 1: OPTIONS FOR SETTING LIMITS ON THE GRANTING OF DISCRETIONARY LAND USE PERMITS FOR COMMERCIAL CANNABIS

(DRAFT)

Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development
Board of Supervisors
October 24, 2017

I. OPTIONS FOR NUMBER OF PERMITS TO BE ISSUED		PROS	CONS	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
A.	No Limit (LUP for cannabis use may be approved on any qualifying parcel)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Promotes Cannabis Businesses -Maximum Revenue Potential -Open to All Businesses Large and Small 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Risk of Proliferation of Cannabis Uses/Influence -Community Impact/Nuisance/Crime Issues -More Extensive and Less Predictable Enforcement Demands 	Consider for Manufacturing, Distribution, Testing
B.	Hard Cap (permanent limit on # of each type of cannabis use)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Limits Cannabis Influence -Restricts Proliferation of Cannabis Uses -County Maintains Control -Limits Impacts on Communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Possibly Cumbersome Selection Process -Restricts Cannabis Related Businesses and Access -Limits Revenue Potential 	Consider for commercial cultivation and retail sales
C.	Gradual Annual Increase (aka “Ramp-up”) (increase # of permits over time <u>with or w/out</u> hard limit)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -County Maintains Control of # of Cannabis Uses -Restricts Proliferation of Cannabis Uses -Allows Enforcement Capability to Keep Pace with New Uses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Slows Approval of Commercial Cannabis - Restricts Cannabis Related Businesses Less revenue over the near term 	Consider for all commercial uses
II. OPTIONS FOR APPLICANT SELECTION PROCESS		PROS	CONS	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
A.	1ST Come, 1ST Served (cannabis applications processed like other Land Use Permits on a 1 st come 1 st served basis; cut-off is based on time application is deemed complete)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Uses Established Process (in part) -Simple. Minimizes # of Decisions to be Made -Deemed Complete Cut-off Favors Capable Applicants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Applicants May Race Each Other -Less County Discretion, Though Still Able to Deny - No Ability to Prioritize Applications 	2 nd choice
B.	RFP with Scoring (“Request for Proposal” process with scoring system where County requests that qualified applicants submit proposal by specified date to be selected by County through a criteria-based review)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Additional Layer of Discretion for County -Encourages Professionalism and “Good” Business Practices -May be able to pursue policy priorities through scoring system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -More Staff Work to Develop and Implement -Establishes New Process and Learning Curve -May be Perceived as not Objective -Developing Scoring System May Be Controversial Process 	Consider for any use category that will have a hard-cap or an interim cap
C.	Lottery (Project proponents selected to apply by a lottery process)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Transparent Selection Process -Simple Selection Process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Less County Discretion Though Still Able to Deny -Less Desirable Proposals May Be Invited to Apply and Receive Approvals 	3 rd choice