

From: [Mariann Humphrey](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Marijuana stores
Date: Wednesday, March 1, 2023 2:54:12 PM

03/02/2023
Public
Comment

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

I am very concerned about adding more marijuana stores. I thought we could only have four. Now someone wants to put in another store and change the location. Can't this city attract any more positive and lucrative businesses? What about an art store? Why do we need to go to Reno every time we would like to purchase items. On a medical viewpoint, I would suggest you look into Dr. Daniel Amen, who is a very well known psychiatrist who has done thousands of brain scans on people who used marijuana, along with other drugs and alcohol, do to the destruction to the brain. He has been doing research for 30 years, so has documented information about this. Yes, it does help with cancer and other ailments, but we already have stores to accommodate the people of our city. Six years is nothing, make sure the DA and the Sheriff have a big say on more of these shops. Stop looking at just the dollars. You will be destroying a community.

Thank you,
Mariann Humphrey
Carson City NV
Sent from my iPad

From: [Carson Demolition](#)
To: [Public Comment](#); [Lori Bagwell](#); [Stacey Giomi](#); [Maurice White](#); [Lisa Schuette](#); [Curtis Horton](#); [CCDA Information](#)
Cc: [David Gruenloh](#)
Subject: Landfill Rate Increase
Date: Wednesday, March 1, 2023 1:47:36 PM

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Mayor, Supervisors and DA office,

Unfortunately, I will not be able to attend tomorrow's meeting but do hope to have a representative there.

I read in today's article on Carson Now that the rate increases are going to be heard again tomorrow. During the last meeting, it was approved that the out-of-county fees would also apply to Waste Management with the DA approving that and stating that a line item for out-of-county fees for Waste Management would be added. The link in Carson Now does not show this, is this an error on their part, will these out-of-county fees be added to WM? https://legistarweb-production.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/attachment/pdf/1798748/Draft_Ord_re_Landfill_Rates_Second_Read_final.pdf

From the last meeting with Mayor Bagwell and Deputy District Attorney Adam Tully agreeing that a line item would be added showing Waste Management's out-of-county fees to equal that of everyone else. https://carsoncity.granicus.com/player/clip/2177?meta_id=84868

Board of Supervisors and Redevelopment Authority

Live and Recorded Public meetings of Board of Supervisors and Redevelopment Authority for Carson City, NV

carsoncity.granicus.com

I do hope that Waste Management will be charged the same out-of-county fees as everyone else as the franchise agreement is only for MSW generated in Carson City and it is indicated and written in this rate change ordinance.

Thank you,
Chris Pattison
Carson Demolition
C: (775) 882-4692
info@carsondemolition.com
<https://carsondemolition.com/>

P.S.

I would also like to echo what Mr. Olcese and I brought up on WM's in-county fees. It has always been known that the spirit of the franchise agreement was for MSW so that every resident would be insured with a flat and fair rate for their residential garbage collection. It is not the spirit of the franchise agreement that C&D along with other businesses be competed against unfairly by WM. These prices make it more costly for local contractors to use their own time and equipment or to use one of our services. Giving Waste Management an unfair advantage against dumpster rental, landscapers, contractors, and every other local business that uses our landfill.

Item 14A – Public Comment opposing expansion of marijuana dispensaries and retail stores dated March 2rd, Betsy Strasburg

Per CCMC 18.02.075:

A Zoning Map Amendment or Zoning Code Amendment may be initiated by a majority of the Commission or Board, or an owner of real property. The Director shall investigate each application to assure that the proposal is consistent with the requirements of this title. This applicant do not show ownership of any parcel in their application. The Planning Dept. and the DA's office have stated that have reviewed the application and verified ownership of parcel but will not show us how the applicant satisfied this requirement. **We, the taxpayers, have a right to know as do you that the first condition of an ordinance change application has been met. We need transparency. The Board need for the evidence presented by the applicant first.**

1. Board of Supervisors approved the increase **from 2 to 4 marijuana stores** reliant on the other existing codes. Supervisor Giomi made a motion to require the DA's office to look at the regulations. If this was expeditiously done by the DA, the motion would not have been withdrawn and we would have a comprehensive language already including location and distance limitations. The marijuana industry accepted these limitations when they accepted their current locations in the East and South Carson.
2. The 6 supplementary standards with respect to Marijuana stores are inadequate. **Example: 300 feet from a residential property is insufficient?**
3. Just because this Board can vote on a SUP later, it cannot be used as a justification to expand location limitations, without due consideration of the remaining regulations. This is the justification is used to satisfy condition 2 and 3.
4. **State Regulations are not enough local regulations – Douglas County has no marijuana stores. Local jurisdictions have an obligation to protect their constituents far beyond the State.**
5. **What is the basis to say that 6 years of experience is sufficient per the applicant?** The Sheriff has provided testimony that he had no problems with the two marijuana stores. He did not, and cannot, testify on the impact of marijuana in our community. There are no tests to detect marijuana. The Legislature has conducted a hearing on marijuana usage among pregnant women which is rising. There is trend towards high potency marijuana. A beer bottle size edible drink causes an intake of 90% THC. Children take marijuana by learning from their parents. Where is the protection? **With all these factors, 6 years is insufficient to determine adverse impact on public health, safety or welfare which is condition 3. Affirmative approval by the planning staff is wrong. Carson City does not need to be leading edge of experimentation of the negative effects of marijuana. Please look at learnaboutsam.org and talk to the SET division of the Carson City sheriff.**
6. The entire Carson Street corridor from Winnie to Medical Parkway is requested for the expansion zone to avoid a cluster of cannabis stores. How can there be a cluster when marijuana stores are 1 to 2 miles apart. The supervisors said that they **should not protect profitability of**

existing marijuana stores when they voted to increase from 2 to 4 marijuana stores. Why do you want to protect the profitability of the stores by expanding locations now? **Be consistent in the reasoning. The City should not bypass location and distance limitations to protect profitability of the stores.**

- 7. I request the Board to reject this application until the DA's office can provide additional regulations to protect the community as Supervisor Giomi was trying to do and only if the applicant is an owner of a parcel and can request an ordinance change.**