



South Land Park
Neighborhood Association

WWW.SLPNA.ORG

PO Box 22903 SACRAMENTO, CA 95822

June 7, 2017

Michael Hanebutt, City of Sacramento

Re: Z17-081 6400 Freeport Blvd CUP

Dear Mr. Hannebutt:

This letter is a follow-up to the SLPNA letter emailed to you on June 5, 2017. There were several specific concerns expressed by the community and/or 10 of the 13 SLPNA board members, including:

1. Concern that operators are out of town and therefore would not be responsive to the community after they would be approved to do business.
2. The perceived "rush" to approve these projects before city and state regulations are developed (impact studies commence next year; state regulatory framework still under development; no process is in place to disburse funding to communities from the 1% impact fee).
3. Questions of how four full time staff could operate the facility 24 hours/7 days a week.
4. Many operational questions were deflected to the main operator (Omar Crespo) who was never present at any meeting.
5. How will city monitor the operations? Surprise inspections? Auditing their books? How will the City handle neighbor complaints should they arise?
6. Unclear if the property owner or the two operators associated with the application, have ever been involved in the cannabis industry, and their level of expertise in recognizing the security and community risks associated with cultivating a federally classified narcotic product near a preschool and residences.
7. Proximity to residential area.
8. Strong opposition from neighboring preschool which has been in operation for decades.
9. Reports of increasing crime, traffic, and trash in the area since the other marijuana-based business moved in.

10. Concern re: over-concentration of marijuana businesses in the area.
11. Unclear how 1% fee would be reinvested in Neighborhood.
12. Proximity to future trail.
13. Concerns about drawing invasion-style crimes to this area
14. Inconsistent information as to whether plants would be processed at facility or simply grown.
15. Although the application clearly states it is for medicinal cannabis, concern that it would eventually service recreational uses (currently outside the scope of their application), which some community members oppose.
16. Concerns of odor control (impact to preschool and customers/staff of nearby businesses).
17. Opposition by architectural preservationists (the plans call for walling-off the windows, giving the structure a fortress like appearance; preservationists want an historical analysis of the building).
18. If the area becomes known as a "marijuana corridor", concerns about impact to nearby property values.
19. Cultivation ordinance was supposed to approve these businesses for industrial warehouse areas, not in a mixed use commercial zone with substantial public foot traffic (neighbors include gyms, dance studio, preschool, insurance office, etc.)

Other myriad concerns have been raised, including some residents' general opposition to licensing of high energy and water consuming businesses, promotion of intoxicating substances, etc.

There was a general uneasiness about approval of the project until these issues can be fully vetted and addressed. A supermajority of the board did not feel comfortable supporting the application, and only 19% of our members expressed support, while 54% were opposed.

The SLPNA Board approached this issue with an open mind and will continue to do so, with the community interest as our first priority.

Sincerely,

Brian Ebbert

President, SLPNA

cc: SLPNA Board officers

Jess Huang, District 5 staff