



OREGON LIQUOR CONTROL COMMISSION
Marijuana License Applications
As of 8:00 AM November 27, 2017

Marijuana License Application Statistics as of November 27, 2017

These numbers reflect the number of submitted recreational marijuana license applications as of 8:00 AM. Applications are organized by county of the proposed premises and include any applications within a municipality within that county.

| County | Lab | Processor | Producer | Retailer | Wholesaler | Research | Grand Total |
|--------------------|-----------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|----------|-------------|
| Baker | | 2 | 3 | 6 | 2 | | 13 |
| Benton | 1 | 6 | 35 | 11 | 1 | | 54 |
| Clackamas | 3 | 43 | 235 | 31 | 15 | | 327 |
| Clatsop | | 2 | 15 | 21 | 2 | | 40 |
| Columbia | | 3 | 34 | 8 | 1 | | 46 |
| Coos | | 5 | 30 | 22 | 3 | | 60 |
| Crook | | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 |
| Curry | | 2 | 18 | 14 | | | 34 |
| Deschutes | 2 | 23 | 59 | 30 | 15 | | 129 |
| Douglas | | 1 | 5 | 11 | 1 | | 18 |
| Gilliam | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Harney | | | 2 | 1 | | | 3 |
| Hood River | 1 | 5 | 30 | 6 | 1 | | 43 |
| Jackson | 3 | 47 | 329 | 49 | 25 | 1 | 454 |
| Jefferson | | | | 5 | | | 5 |
| Josephine | | 21 | 273 | 11 | 10 | | 315 |
| Klamath | | | 3 | 2 | | | 5 |
| Lake | | | 2 | 2 | | | 4 |
| Lane | 3 | 49 | 230 | 97 | 31 | | 410 |
| Lincoln | 1 | 6 | 18 | 27 | | | 52 |
| Linn | | 1 | 18 | 17 | 2 | | 38 |
| Marion | 1 | 19 | 41 | 59 | 12 | | 132 |
| Multnomah | 8 | 101 | 131 | 214 | 74 | | 528 |
| Polk | 1 | 3 | 62 | 11 | 1 | | 78 |
| Tillamook | | | 14 | 10 | | | 24 |
| Umatilla | | | 1 | 4 | | | 5 |
| Wasco | | 6 | 13 | 5 | 2 | | 26 |
| Washington | 7 | 21 | 121 | 38 | 15 | 1 | 203 |
| Yamhill | | 8 | 60 | 15 | 7 | | 90 |
| (blank) | | 2 | 3 | 2 | | | 7 |
| Grand Total | 31 | 377 | 1786 | 730 | 220 | 2 | 3146 |

Lane County - Recreational Marijuana Use Table

| | <u>ZONE</u> | <u>F-1</u> <u>(LC 16.210)</u> | <u>F-2</u> <u>(LC 16.211)</u> | <u>EFU</u> <u>(LC 16.212)</u> | <u>RC (3)</u> <u>(LC 16.291)</u> | <u>RI</u> <u>(LC 16.292)</u> | <u>GI (6)</u> <u>(LC 16.280)</u> | <u>LI (6)</u> <u>(LC 16.280)</u> | |
|----|---|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | <u>OLCC</u> <u>LICENSE/</u> <u>CERTIFICATE</u> <u>TYPE</u> | <u>USE</u> | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Producer (grower) License (1) | Marijuana Production | Allowed outright as a farm use. (1) | Allowed outright as a farm use. (1) | Allowed outright as a farm use. (1) | Tier 1, indoor only: SUP required, subject to 16.291(4), except as permitted outright by 16.291(2)(b). (1), (3) | SUP subject to size limitations in 16.292(3)(u), except as permitted outright by 16.292(2)(b). (1) | Permitted. (1), (6) | Permitted. (1), (6) |
| 2. | Processor License. (2) | Marijuana Processing. (2) | Prohibited. | SUP required for use and must be located on a property that has a dwelling. (2) | SUP required for use, only in conjunction with a farm use. Must be in conformance with State Law limitations for facilities for processing farm crops. (2), (4) | SUP required, subject to 16.291(4). (2), (3) | SUP subject to size limitations in 16.292(3)(u), except as permitted outright by 16.292(2)(b). (2) | Permitted. (2), (6) | Permitted. (2), (6) |
| 3. | Wholesaler license | Marijuana Wholesale Distribution | Allowed outright, in conjunction with a farm use, as defined in the definition of farm use. | Allowed outright, in conjunction with a farm use, as defined in the definition of farm use. | Allowed outright, in conjunction with a farm use, as defined in the definition of farm use. | Prohibited. | SUP subject to size limitations in 16.292(3)(u), except as permitted outright by 16.292(2)(b). | SUP required, subject to special provisions. (6) | SUP required. (6) |
| 4. | Retail license | Marijuana Retail Sales | Prohibited. | Prohibited. | Prohibited. | SUP required, subject to 16.291(4), except as permitted outright by 16.291(2)(b). (3) | Prohibited. | Permitted as a small scale personal and professional service, as a secondary use, limited in size to 2,500 sq. ft. (6) | Permitted as a small scale personal and professional service, as a secondary use, limited in size to 2,500 sq. ft. (6) |
| 5. | Laboratory license (5) | Marijuana Laboratory Operations | Prohibited. | Prohibited. | Prohibited. | SUP required, subject to 16.291(4), except as permitted outright by 16.291(2)(b). (3), (5) | SUP subject to size limitations in 16.292(3)(u), except as permitted outright by 16.292(2)(b). (5) | Prohibited. | Prohibited. |
| 6. | Research certificate | Marijuana Research | Allowed in conjunction with a farm use. | Allowed in conjunction with a farm use. | Allowed in conjunction with a farm use. | Prohibited. | SUP subject to size limitations in 16.292(3)(u), except as permitted outright by 16.292(2)(b). | Prohibited. | Prohibited. |

ALL USES SUBJECT TO APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF LANE CODE (LC) 16.420.

- (1) Marijuana Production is subject to setback provisions of LC 16.420(4)(a).
- (2) Marijuana Processing is only allowed on properties located within a Fire Protection District, in any zone. (LC 16.420(4)(e)).
- (3) RC (Rural Commercial) zone limits size of uses (8,000, 4,000, or 3,500 sq. ft.). See 16.291(4)(a).
- (4) See ORS 215.213(1)(u). Limited to 10,000 sq. ft. of floor area, and the farm that the facility is located on must provide at least one-quarter of the farm crop processed.
- (5) Marijuana laboratory uses must be conducted entirely indoors, in conformance with LC 16.420(4)(f).
- (6) Uses in the GI and LI zone are subject to the limitations and provisions of LC 16.280.



Steve Watkins <watkinsts217@gmail.com>

Olga Martin thanked you for your reply

1 message

Nextdoor Santa Clara / Spring Creek <reply@rs.email.nextdoor.com>

Fri, Nov 24, 2017 at 8:38 PM

To: watkinsts217@gmail.com

Olga Martin from Santa Clara thanked you for your reply:

"Good afternoon, Mr. Farr , I was another of the 25 participants that attended 11/21/17 meeting . Thank you for your transparency in making sure that all constituents are involved by sending e-mails and updates.

You mentioned "Urban Transition Zones", and that you are aware as a Lane County resident that the only urban area designated high rent is Eugene. I am perplexed as you stated as the meeting began the only matters for discussion was "Homeless Car Camping" now you seem to be saying something totally different and are referring to Oregon Land Use Commission. You state that this is a pilot program, is there a reason or justification for any of these programs? Does Eugene have any temporary or pilot programs as you have mentioned regarding itinerant issues? You state that the "pilot" program is based roughly on Eugene, how is that relevant to any other place such as the high rent Veneta. Is there any reason why it should not be adopted in cities such as the high rent urban area of Cushman, or Waltherville, as they are part of Lane County. I would appreciate your informed opinion and that of J Bosevich.

Without any previous justification of Eugene Itinerant issues I can only believe there are none. There are presently camp sites available throughout Lane County and Eugene"s urban growth boundary that accept automobiles. None of these areas are designated as a High Rent Urban Areas such as Eugene. The urban growth boundary is a jurisdictional issue involving the City of Eugene and there can be no comment regarding any investigation or audit as it may or may not exist. Church and religious organizations presently have 501 c (3) status and can engage individuals anyway they so desire under authority granted by the 1st Amendment. There is no reason for government to "monitor" any protected activity. Would respectfully request you and J. Bosevich provide your reasons for anyone to oversee any 501 c (3) with regards to separation of church and state.

Lane County urban growth zones have no justification or reason for any actions that are neither temporary or permanent. If the Commissioners desired or felt the need to change existing rules, Lane County and the Fair Housing Council of Oregon would be responsible for initiating in the courts a complaint with HUD on behalf of the community. It is the responsibility of staff to address unfair and discriminatory practices. Has the Urban growth boundary, although not a city, or high rent been submitted as a High Rent Urban Areas as Eugene, to justify rest stops/Homeless camping? remembering this is not

Eugene, Has there been any complaints submitted to the courts or HUD by any agency?

I believe your proposal is troubling, ill advised and problematic and does not abrogate rights that I have, or that anyone has in commencing a law suit against the Lender of the property or the Property Owner either jointly or severally to bring properties into compliance with Oregon Land Use and Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs). This proposal does not bar anyone from filing a request for investigation, audit and request for entry into a Compliance Agreement for a period of 5 years.

Correct me if I am mistaken but I know of no basis for itinerants to be lodged within any free Commune. If the Commissioners are unable to articulate a reason for this discriminatory practice these communes should be removed within 60 days. If not already in compliance, I request that the Commissioners submit any and all DOJ filings and requirements regulations to provide for the safety of constituents by reinstating drug intervention practices or drug task force county wide through DOJ.

Commissioner Farr addressed the matter of Saint Vincent DePaul a 501 c(3) receiving an as yet an undetermined amount. These services are not within the terms of the Notice of Determination which is an IRS matter. Mr. Farr in stating that he has a relative within the mental health field knows or should have known that: (1) Saint Vincent DePaul, cahoots or others cannot determine matters having to do with delivery of mental health systems without considering mental health needs. The case known as Coleman vs. Brown, was brought and affirmed by the Court in 2014 and remains ongoing, issues addressed are: (1) screening (2) accurate and complete record keeping (3) medication distribution (4) treatment programs (5) suicide prevention (6) depriving offenders of involuntary medication. These areas of service are not within the realm of a 501 c (3), such as Saint Vincent DePaul. Saint Vincent DePaul would benefit in reevaluating any proposals submitted and seek legal advice. Consideration of groups such as cahoots are unacceptable and present an undetermined risk to itinerants/offenders due to the unresolved issues regarding the group's services, or actions in the December 2011 Heroin overdose and the murder of Rick Allen Youngblood (EPD case 11-22151)."

[View or reply](#)

Private message

This message is intended for watkinsts217@gmail.com.

[Unsubscribe or adjust your email settings](#)

Nextdoor, 875 Stevenson Street, Suite 700, San Francisco, CA 94103