

# Exhibit C

## Municipal/Town Advisory Council and Community Services District Comment Summary

MAC/TAC/CSD	Framework Reaction	Buffers (What distance should cannabis uses be buffered from sensitive and/or residential sites?)	Caps (Should we include caps on the number of permits? If so, how many? What uses should caps be applied to?)	Outdoor Personal Grow (Should it be allowed by right? Number of plants? Other requirements?)
<i>Alamo</i>	<p>The following safeguards be considered for inclusion in the County's cannabis regulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider limiting the sale of edible cannabis products to those where dosing is a max. of 10mg THC/dose and packaged as a single dose. Consumers would be allowed to purchase up to the limit allowed in state law.</li> <li>Prohibit sale of flavored leaf and bud.</li> <li>Consistent with recent legislation in CO, consider prohibiting the sale of edible products that mimic the shape and appearance of animals, humans, or fruit, including gummy bears.</li> <li>Prohibit the sale of flavored e-juices.</li> <li>Prohibit all self-service vending of all cannabis and products which contain cannabis.</li> </ul> <p>Recommend adherence to a County Land Use Process that is discretionary and remain that way for all cannabis applications within the unincorporated areas of the County.</p> <p>Recommend 'No Smoking' of cannabis in all public venues and to restrict the use of cannabis and smoking of cannabis in multi-unit housing. Currently, the County has a second hand smoke ordinance that bans the smoking of cannabis products in the unincorporated areas of the County in all of the same places as tobacco. This is to be strictly enforced.</p> <p>Recommended that all delivery of nonmedical cannabis and cannabis products in Alamo be prohibited.</p> <p>Request that the DRAFT Ordinance Regulating Cannabis in the Unincorporated Area of Contra Costa County be recirculated back before them prior to a decision being made by the Board of Supervisors if at all possible.</p>	600' residential/1000' sensitive sites	Restrict the number of permits issued related to the establishment of safe, orderly and accessible cannabis businesses	<p>Regulations on the establishment of indoor or outdoor personal cultivation be limited to three (3) plants whether indoor or outdoor with</p> <p>20' setback from all property line(s)</p> <p>No plants are visible from either public right-of-way or neighboring adjacent parcel</p> <p>Absolutely no front yard grows are to be established anywhere on the property.</p>
<i>Bay Point</i>	Make sure to include Schools and Parks, and Churches should be included	should use the same buffers as are used for the Tobacco Ordinance	Yes	Recommend 6 maximum
<i>Bethel Island</i>	Other issues brought up include sustainable water uses, use of funds (in particular in relation to location of potential commercial cannabis operations), and "small guy vs outsider/corporate interest"	500ft with 1,000ft notification area	Yes	Motion to allow personal grows PASSED.

# Exhibit C

## Municipal/Town Advisory Council and Community Services District Comment Summary

MAC/TAC/CSD	Framework Reaction	Buffers (What distance should cannabis uses be buffered from sensitive and/or residential sites?)	Caps (Should we include caps on the number of permits? If so, how many? What uses should caps be applied to?)	Outdoor Personal Grow (Should it be allowed by right? Number of plants? Other requirements?)
<i>Byron</i>	outdoor grows should be in an enclosed area and not visible by neighbors or the road	1,000 feet for sensitive sites and 500 feet for residential	include caps with a review after 1 year	Motion for 6 indoor or outdoor plants PASSED
<i>Contra Costa Centre</i>	Reasonable	Should be consistent with the County Tobacco Ordinance (1,000')	Place limited caps in the beginning and revisit after 3 years	Allow by right; 6 plants max; create policies to discourage nuisance to neighbors; grow as close to the building as possible and secure
<i>Crockett</i>	<p>Concerns about people coming from out of state to commit robberies on businesses that have cannabis and worried about the security of the community. Raised concerns about testing laboratories or warehouses and crime.</p> <p>Concerned about people driving high and more accidents happening and if the County has done a study on the effects it will have on other services like the hospital and sheriff.</p> <p>If the tax measure passes, what would the money be spent on-would like to see it be spent on public safety and hospital services.</p> <p>Environmental impacts-will these businesses still need to be reviewed for their environmental impacts before they begin to operate.</p>	Buffer zones are ridiculous because they don't make a difference. Kids can drive and still access drugs even with buffer zones.	(see "Framework Reaction")	(see "Framework Reaction")
<i>Diablo</i>	<p>No objection to Framework.</p> <p>Add a requirement that the local MAC be consulted before a Cannabis Land Use Permit is issued in that District.</p> <p>Agricultural zones in densely populated areas, like Diablo, should not be allowed to cultivate/manufacture/distribute cannabis commercially because of the narrow roads and pedestrian traffic situation.</p> <p>Manufacturing permits should be granted only where property already has a commercial manufacturing permit or there is ample space and low traffic to absorb the additional buildings/traffic.</p> <p>Consider eliminating delivery distribution for non-medical marijuana.</p>	Agree w/ County recommendation of 1,000' within sensitive site and 500' within residential	<p>Cap the number of cannabis permits issued and caps should apply to each commercial use. Start with small number of permits and after 1-3 years of data adjust the number as warranted. Look at other counties for the permit ratios of retail (small) to cultivation (largest) and manufacturing (medium). E.g., Alameda County should have good information on what is working and what is not. Permits should have reasonable expiration date.</p>	<p>Agree w/ County examples (for no other reason that we have no other data to compare it with).</p> <p>1) Not more than 3 plants at one time;</p> <p>2) Plants shall not be visible from public ROW or adjacent parcel;</p> <p>3) 5 foot setbacks from property line.</p>

Exhibit C

Municipal/Town Advisory Council and Community Services District Comment Summary

MAC/TAC/CSD	Framework Reaction	Buffers (What distance should cannabis uses be buffered from sensitive and/or residential sites?)	Caps (Should we include caps on the number of permits? If so, how many? What uses should caps be applied to?)	Outdoor Personal Grow (Should it be allowed by right? Number of plants? Other requirements?)
Discovery Bay	Well thought through.  Good to have one.  “Devil’s in the details”	Cultivation should be two miles from Discovery Bay	In the beginning keep caps tight, then release slowly as circumstances warrant	Should be prohibited in Discovery Bay
El Sobrante	Discussion and questions about zoning, possibility of allowing currently legal plants to grow outside, taxation of businesses, distribution of taxes, etc.	(see “Framework Reaction”)	(see “Framework Reaction”)	(see “Framework Reaction”)
Kensington	No major “red flags,” no strong objections  A lot of Framework wouldn’t apply to Kensington  Discussion around regulating medical delivery; how is it enforced across jurisdictional boundaries	(see “Framework Reaction”)	(see “Framework Reaction”)	Discussion around whether it would be appropriate to have combination of regulated indoor and outdoor personal grow; reached no conclusion
Knightsen	Concerns with enforcement, return to source taxation, theft and smell	Approve proposed Framework standards	Yes; cap be 0 “zero”	Motion to approve current state maximum of 6 plants outdoor PASSED
North Richmond	Framework open-ended; did not get indication that research of other communities with cannabis regulations was done. (MAC discussed a number of topics and raised the issue of social equity and return to source of taxes but no recommendations on other aspects agreed upon. Numerous individual survey responses received from participants.)	Yes	Yes	(see “Framework Reaction”)
Pacheco	Well thought through.	1,000’ buffers for sensitive sites and residential	Yes	Yes, with restrictions

Exhibit C

Municipal/Town Advisory Council and Community Services District Comment Summary

MAC/TAC/CSD	Framework Reaction	Buffers (What distance should cannabis uses be buffered from sensitive and/or residential sites?)	Caps (Should we include caps on the number of permits? If so, how many? What uses should caps be applied to?)	Outdoor Personal Grow (Should it be allowed by right? Number of plants? Other requirements?)
Rodeo	<p>They do not want to see any cannabis activities within Bayo Vista Housing Project.</p> <p>The Rodeo MAC wants to make sure that all day care facilities are included, even the day care facilities that are within residential homes.</p> <p>Do not want to see any cannabis activities near the YMCA in Rodeo.</p> <p>Concerns about being too restrictive for these businesses to thrive because it can bring in some revenue but at the same time, they are concerned about the access for children.</p> <p>Community concerns about potential thefts and burglaries because the Sheriff's Department is already spread too thin.</p>	(see "Framework Reaction")	(see "Framework Reaction")	(see "Framework Reaction")