

Read Measure A language to understand it

Have you noticed opponents of Measure A always tell you to read the county's analysis, but not the initiative? The initiative, they say, is a convoluted piece of legalese that no one could understand. The analysis, they say, is impartial. In fact, the Growers Alliance (the opponents) wrote an analysis, which the county then used to write their own.

The county's analysis is not impartial, and neither is Planning Commissioner Noah Levy, who has stridently taken sides to defend this special interest group, putting his face on their fliers, arguing their case in public forums, and now in a My Word.

Certainly, Levy read the hundreds of comments received from resource agencies and the public during the EIR process for Ordinance 2.0, most calling for greater restrictions on the size and number of cannabis grows. These comments were ignored — overruled for economic reasons. Money trumps environment once again.

Measure A deals with the concerns the county disregarded. Its development involved a true public process — with full community involvement via the EIR, interviews with agencies, growers and environmental groups. Contrast that with development of the county's biased analysis that consulted no one except the growers.

The purpose of Measure A is “to protect the county's residents and natural environment from harm caused by large-scale cannabis cultivation.” It explicitly says the Board of Supervisors is permitted to adopt modifications that further the purpose, intent, and goals of the initiative. It's incorrect and disingenuous of Noah Levy, who should know better, to say intent doesn't matter.

— *Diane Higgins, McKinleyville*