

**Chesterfield Planning Board
Cannabis Subcommittee Draft Report**

2021 Cannabis Survey

In April of 2021, the Chesterfield Planning Board started the process to conduct a town wide survey of opinions regarding the various allowable cannabis uses. An ad hoc subcommittee of the Planning Board was formed (CJ Lammers, Sarah Hamilton, and Eileen McGowan) with the task of preparing, conducting, and reporting out the results of a survey. The survey layout and contents were approved by the Planning Board and Select Board for distribution.

The cannabis survey started in late October with a link open on the town website from October 26, 2021 through November 11, 2021 to an electronic survey. Also posted on the town's website were a letter from the Planning Board Chair, a Cannabis Fact Sheet, and a pdf of the survey.

Paper surveys were sent the last week in October in the regular mail, with self-addressed and stamped return envelopes included. Paper surveys were collected through November 16, 2021.

In addition, a notice was placed on the town sign, fliers were posted in prominent locations around town, and several messages were broadcast to town residents by the Town Administrator.

There were some challenges with the US Postal Service during this time period, resulting in some of the mailed surveys being delayed or not delivered at all. A few of the paper surveys were returned because of an incorrect address; these were turned over so the town mailing list can be updated.

The survey was scheduled to close on November 5th, however, because of the mailing delays the time periods for both electronic and paper survey collection were extended.

While there were some glitches with the mailing and the website there were a total of 275 responses. Attached is a copy of the survey with a tally of the responses inserted. It is our understanding that the Planning Board will use this information to begin drafting a cannabis bylaw. Please continue to check the town website for updates.

Thank you all for your participation,

CJ Lammers, Chesterfield Planning Board
Sarah Hamilton, Subcommittee Member
Eileen McGowan, Subcommittee Member

Chesterfield Town-wide Cannabis Survey Results

Total number of surveys returned: **275** includes **81 online surveys** and **194 paper surveys**

1. Have you read the fact sheet on cannabis? (If not, please review the enclosed information before continuing)

Yes I've read the fact sheet: **267** No, I have not read the fact sheet: **5**
No answer: **3**

2. Before reading the cannabis fact sheet were you aware of the difference between hemp and cannabis? (Please note that this survey uses the term cannabis to refer to marijuana, not hemp.)

Yes: **239** No: **29** I'm not sure: **4**
No answer: **3**

3. Which of the following would you want to see addressed in a Special Permit application for a cannabis facility? Please **circle the letters** of all that apply.

- a. Setbacks from the road and property lines for all facilities and growing: **212**
- b. Setbacks from schools or daycare facilities: **198**
- c. Screening such as landscaping or fencing for adjacent uses: **171**
- d. Light pollution controls: **198**
- e. Noise pollution controls: **186**
- f. Ground and surface water protection: **201**
- g. Building sizes, setbacks, and percent coverage of property: **168**
- h. Security requirements: **191**
- i. Odor controls: **190**
- j. Hours of operation: **158**
- k. Suitability of available infrastructure (electricity, roads, etc.): **174**
- l. Traffic volumes and flow: **91**

4. Do you support these types of cannabis facilities? Please place an X in the box that reflects your level of support. [Note: the columns “TOTAL Support” and “TOTAL Opposed” were added to help tabulate the results. The columns have been shifted slightly to allow for easier reading of the results.]

Type	Strongly Support	Support	TOTAL Support	Strongly Oppose	Oppose	TOTAL Opposed	Not Answered	No Opinion
Indoor Growing	77	71	148	72	26	98	5	24
Outdoor Growing	61	69	130	85	26	111	6	28
Retail Stores	44	48	92	104	41	145	3	35
Cannabis Product Manuf. or Distributor	49	63	112	84	26	110	5	48
Cannabis Research Facility	57	72	129	74	16	90	2	54
Independent Testing Lab/Standards Testing Lab	57	70	127	71	19	90	0	58
Social Consumption Establishment	33	39	72	107	54	161	0	42
Medical Treatment Facility	54	57	111	79	28	107	3	54

5. If an applicant were able to address all of the design elements and impacts related to an **indoor** growing operation (light, noise, and groundwater pollution, traffic, odor, etc.) what size of an **indoor** growing operation would you support? Choose only one.

Up to 20,000 sq ft (hockey rink): **73**

Up to 60,000 sq ft (football field): **50**

Up to 100,000 sq ft (2 football fields): **45**

TOTAL responses to size question for indoor growing: **168**

Do not support indoor growing: **93**

Not answered: **14**

6. If an applicant were able to address all of the design elements and impacts related to an **outdoor** growing operation (light, noise, and groundwater pollution, traffic, odor, etc.) what size of an **outdoor** growing operation would you support? Choose only one.

Up to 20,000 sq ft (hockey rink): **40**

Up to 60,000 sq ft (football field): **51**

Up to 100,000 sq ft (2 football fields): **63**

TOTAL responses to size question for outdoor growing: **154**

Do not support outdoor growing: **102**

Not answered: **19**

7. In some towns there are limits on the number of cannabis facilities. Do you think the **number** of cannabis facilities permitted should be limited?

Yes: **177** No: **46** I'm not sure: **31** Not answered: **21**

8. How important to you are the possible revenues to the town that could be generated by a cannabis facility?

Revenues to the town from cannabis-based businesses could take several forms:

> increased property tax on the cannabis businesses' property

> sales tax for retail facilities

> a contribution of up to 3% of gross revenue for the first five years of operation as negotiated in a Host Community Agreement.

The percentage of gross income negotiated in the Host Community Agreement can only be used by the town for impacts related to the cannabis operation such as roads and other public infrastructure needs. The other revenues can be used for any town purpose.

a great deal: **107** a lot: **24** a moderate amount: **42** a little: **18** none at all: **67**
not answered: **17**

9. Please provide any other comments or concerns you would like to add.

The numbered comments below are from the paper surveys, the comments that follow are copied from the online survey. While a few people gave their names on the paper survey, they are not included in the comments below because the survey is anonymous. One paper survey had the comment “see attachment”, and no attachment was received.

COMMENTS FROM PAPER SURVEYS

1. It is a business that would provide revenue to the town and help lower taxes.
2. I am a licensed hemp grower (Western MA Hemp). Growing cannabis indoors or outdoors is an industrial not agricultural operation. Because of this I oppose all cannabis operations.
3. I do not live in a small town to allow any business to disrupt our peace and quiet country.
4. We do not think our town needs to have these businesses!
5. I do not believe any tax revenue will or could make a positive impact on town finances. In fact, I think any hemp/cannabis operation would cost the town. Support only one small outdoor hemp grower.
6. Transparency to all residents is key. Cannabis operations can have a huge impact on this town and quality of life.
7. The security is what my biggest concern is. The bylaw should be flexible but strict since security is a potential issue.
8. No!!
9. We had a multi-month delay building our >850 sq. ft. home because it was too close to the road. Yet the town will allow industrial scale drug production operations? I cannot understand how this will preserve the rural setting of our beautiful town. Increased traffic, light pollution, and the general down grade of property value being near such a facility is not worth an increase in revenue. If Chesterfield is turning into the new Holyoke of western MA, I will be taking my family elsewhere. I cannot believe this town is willing to literally produce drugs to make money. Absolutely disgusting and disappointing.

10. Even though this creates tax income, do we want this for all the possible problems. We don't have an active police presence for the speeding issues.

11. This type of business should be welcomed.

12. I feel the town is lacking in business. I have seen the saw mill close. Farms shut down. I have never used marijuana, but I don't drink hard liquor either. I support this. I don't think the 'trucks' are going to be worse than the logging trucks or milk trucks. And it could bring in much needed revenue. Thank you for the survey.

13. We don't need that sh[*]t in our town.

14. I would like the town to have more revenue making ability but not through cannabis growing facilities or fields. Mitigation of odor and light has not been effective enough to use as a positive for easing one's mind about living near a facility.

15. We need to do everything we can to generate income for the town!

16. If people want cannabis – go to Easthampton or Northampton. It isn't helping their cities!

17. Could be a great benefit to the town.

18. I am aware of cannabis facilities in various other towns. The long-term revenue, more than not, does not make up for the impacts. I moved back to Western Mass for the quality of life and do not trust this use can be managed so as not to ruin what the town has and is.

19. Anything that can help the town is great!!!

20. We've already lost one opportunity due to a few noisy people. Let's not lose any more! Chesterfield needs the tax revenue!

21. 3% contribution first 5 years, after 5 years – what? Will this help reduce homeowner property taxes[?]

22. Would the additional income to the town benefit its residents? Would it lower our property taxes, county taxes? Would the town be able to vote what the additional revenue would be used for? Examples, taxes, road repairs, etc.? Where will the answers to my questions be listed[?]

23. The town needs local jobs! It will die a slow death without progress. We need young families with children. Local jobs will help that.
24. I do not believe this business would benefit a small town as Chesterfield.
25. Do not want any facility or growing operation in town. Do not want the town receiving revenue from this type of business. Cannabis is still illegal on a federal basis. We should not be relying on drugs for more town revenue. It's a good thing people are not jumping off bridges all around us because Chesterfield would be considering that.
26. While tax money is needed and would be welcome, serious thought must be taken when considering these options. Small-scale operations would be preferable. However, in September and early October there was a nasty smell coming from the small hemp operation on Willcutt Road. We really need to make sure any of these proposals will not degrade anybody's life in Chesterfield. Thank you to the planning Board for this survey and chance to express our opinions.
27. Thank you for doing this survey and doing it so well. I do not want any marijuana establishments in this town. I'd rather see Chesterfield focus on other types of revenue.
28. Opposed. [Possibly revenue is] Not important!
29. We need more business in town.
30. Keep it out of our small town!!!
31. Focus on environmental impacts associated with this process.
32. Would want to insure new industry would hire locally.
33. My reason is based regarding where I live – a small community.
34. My biggest concerns are light, groundwater, pollution and traffic. I love how peaceful our town is!
35. Do not want any type of facility. There are more than enough in surrounding communities to accommodate town residents!

36. I feel this could be a benefit for the community, but the safety of our roads and children need to remain a priority.

37. For Question 3, all aspects of a Special Permit should be addressed along with a stipulation that the owner and manager should live on-site. For the size, support Tier 1 only (5,000 square feet) for indoor and outdoor growing. THe income isn't important to me. Would prefer other businesses and that this only benefit 1 or 2 very small growers. The Host Agreement isn't income but temporary damage control. I believe grow facilities should be limited to two, very small Tier 1 facilities with all the restrictions listed so that they are an adjunct to provide income to two Chesterfield residents owning, managing, and living on the property only!

38. Income from cannabis is not outweighed income without costly drawbacks. Should not jump on the bandwagon without weighing such drawbacks.

39. Chesterfield is not the place for any cannabis facility, therefore a stringent bylaw is needed, any revenue would be offset by additional police, fire and PDPW expenses.

40. If/When another public meeting is held, it should be better moderated to avoid acrimony and nastiness.

41. Chesterfield residents are already equipped with indoor growing operations (flying under radar) without paying taxes or other penalty.

42. This is a chance to bring additional revenue to the town. It could help slow down the property tax increases that occur each year.

43. I moved to Chesterfield for its bucolic setting, night sky, and peace. I do not object to small retail stores for tax help and small 'agricultural' businesses are part of what makes Chesterfield, Chesterfield. Lights, noise, traffic on backroads, the need for more security, all bad.

44. Before COVID I went to a state conference on cannabis and found how difficult it was to grow. Plants outdoors can become 'hot' and go above THC levels very easily. Safe guards must be in place to check crops to be accountable for this because the crop must be destroyed and if it happens (can't be used). Make sure this is included. Guarding THC indoor areas also a problem. Armed guards might have to be used. Safeguards in place for the community is important regarding this.

45. [There should be] strict nuisance abatement and a] definite limit on [the number of] indoor growing but a lab or medical [treatment] would not be as big.

46. Revenue minus expense-to-town equals A value to the town's coffers. Any additional business may slow internet access at peak hours – staggered use would be wise. Well water could be reduced because of excessive drainage of available water in the aquifers. (Consider that climate change may also change existing availability)

47. It won't make any money in the first couple of years and declare bankruptcy before 5 years. The town needs to set up a security deposit and funding for hiring a special assessor and police up front. There will also need to be weekly odor monitoring.

48. I am against cannabis growing or consumption in Chesterfield.

49. Would we impose the same limitations on hemp production? I support cannabis production/sales/research and these could lead to much needed revenue for the town. I also believe cannabis should be regulated and this survey is too vague and general to inform what kind of regulations would be appropriate for the various kinds of operations.

50. I strongly support this but I have no idea about the particulars.

51. I don't think that income to the town should be a consideration at all when deciding on whether or not to allow growing in town! Be careful what you wish for!

52. Indoor growing should not be new development. Indoor growing should be in old buildings with needed infrastructure, water, electric, [and] traffic already established.

53. I am parent of teenagers in Chesterfield. I am not in favor of the legalization of marijuana. Voted no. Continue to be against with major concerns about use of this drug by both youth and older. I own property of relatively high value by Chesterfield standards. I don't believe property values would benefit from Chesterfield being a marijuana-growing town. I believe the future of this legalization business state-by-state to be very unclear as data on users, outcomes, etc. is still in infancy and, thus, very risky for a small town wanting to build and not shrink its tax base. I would prefer higher taxes personally to welcoming marijuana into my neighborhood. There are other ways to attract businesses and their revenues to Chesterfield. This business is not what "needs". 3% of gross revenue from 5 years max[imum]... then what?!? We are stuck with them and the host of issues long after this added money stops coming in. I do not and will not support in any way that recreational use of pot is harmless nor that legalization should remain the standard for this country. Now that we have broadband, Chesterfield will be much more attractive a location for families wanting to avoid urban

issues in favor of rural living. But it will not be attractive to wealthier city dwellers who might build expensive homes for significant property tax increases for the town if it [is] a pot-growing town. No way. A neighbor has expressed interest in a marijuana business down my street and I am worried sick that it may come to bear for some of the following reasons:

- Odor is a huge problem I have not heard satisfactory solutions for and it offends me greatly
- Traffic, lights, folks this business might attract as workers or other might not be workers I want hanging around my property
- Its effects on water are unknown
- I find it an unsavory business I'd rather not be faced with each time I leave or return to my home with kids
- I moved here for quiet and privacy and low traffic and do not welcome a change to my life here for a business I find dangerous
- I fear bait and switch aspects to pot licensing and permitting and have many concerns around enforcing violations and [obeyance]

Reiteration that state-by-state legislation of this drug is in infancy and long-term effects across categories is very unclear. Stakes are high for this small town to open a pandora's box which cannot be undone. Cannabis potency is changing and becoming powerful to the point of causing psychosis in users. More and more common. Does Chesterfield really want[ed] to be associated with cultivating some eventual toxic, deadly, or psychosis inducing plants on its land?! No!!! Thx.

54. The fact sheet does not include greenhouse grown cannabis, which is confusing. There are three methods of cultivation: indoor, outdoor, and greenhouse grown. I am using indoor to mean inside of a insulated, light enclosed structure, with a foundation and probably cement floor. I believe it is very risky to support indoor cannabis in Chesterfield, because there is a 50% risk of bankruptcy within a few years, and then we are left with the mess. Then we have concrete in the ground. Site restoration needs to be added to the Special Permit. Holyoke's old factory buildings are a much better site, and large companies are taking advantage of it!

I am using outdoor to mean in-ground greenhouse grown cannabis, as noted. I think it is not economical in Chesterfield's climate to grow cannabis outdoors without a greenhouse, because we have a short growing season, and weather variabilities will make an inconsistent crop that will not sell competitively. I doubt there will be applicants for uncovered outdoor growing.

Hemp can be raised in our climate outdoors, but your survey does not address Hemp.

You show little information on the Craft Marijuana Cooperative Model. I think that this model is appropriate for Chesterfield's rural community. Small greenhouse production can provide additional steady income to small farmers, in our Hilltown terrain and with the variability of climate upon us. Your only information is that the Craft marijuana cooperative is limited to one license. That license may be for a Tier 11, but as a co-op, it may include only a few farmers in Chesterfield with very low tier sq. ft..

I would like to see Chesterfield be a lead community in supporting this Craft Marijuana Cooperative Model.

55. Site restoration plans should be included in the bylaw. Nothing should be allowed. Don't need [income] since most will go to cannabis-related expenses. Northampton couldn't spend the money they got. I do not want this type of business in my pristine town.

56. There are many other options out there than mind-altering facilities that are a much better option such as a grocery store - way too many of these in the area. Sad that this is the only option for revenue that Chesterfield has brought forward to its citizens - we can do better. More people have use for a small grocery store than this and bring jobs and revenue.

57. Neighbors should not be subjected to this. The smell the traffic, and increase crime is all documented from other communities.

58. Does the town have the proper amount of staffed law enforcement on duty to properly maintain a secure environment downtown?

59. I am sensitive and allergic to marijuana. If any neighbors should have it or grow outside neighbors should be able to veto growth. Outdoor cultivation I am totally against because of my allergies and the smell it creates. I would like to see my property tax go down. \$8,000+ a year is ridiculous. Time to leave!

60. Inviting any type of cannabis growing will increase expenses to the town especially with respect to policing. We would need to expand the scope of our local police department.

61. Not near wetlands, rivers or streams.

62. Assuming all of the aspects in question 3 are addressed, I strongly support indoor growing and support outdoor growing, none of the other options listed.

63. Not in favor of any cannabis grow operation. Question 3 should have been after Question 4, if interested in a grow operation. Question 3 is misleading as no option for not in favor.

64. I just don't think a huge facility would fit in town. Strongly support cannabis business in Chesterfield, especially a small business like a co-op.

65. Do not support indoor growing in Chesterfield; support outdoor growing in greenhouses at 20,000 square feet for each applicant. Total cooperative square footage from all participants in towns could be more. I can imagine as many as 10, 2,000 square foot greenhouses on 10 farms in Chesterfield as a sustainable number. The Special Permit criteria should include a site restoration plan. Please read my attached sheet (no attachment was included).

66. Please don't open the door.

67. Zero factory approval.

68. Oppose cannabis factories.

69. If income from cannabis factories are approved individual property taxes should be lowered.

70. Primary concerns: compliance with dark sky initiative - 100% - no exceptions! Preserve the natural settings in all areas of town - no exceptions!

71. Revenues should go to child development and food security, senior housing, maintaining and improving child playground facilities.

72. Odor control for outside growing seems problematic. Consider how to require maintenance of indoor growers exhaust air odor control. Please control light pollution to the max! Consider applying International Dark Sky Association guidance. During permitting, town should supplement building com. Staff with consultants related to specialties not normally occurring in Chesterfield, ie. energy efficiency, odor pollution control, light pollution/dark skies, etc. paid from com. Impact fee. Consider requiring design and installation of waste piping to include convenient sampling to prove facility is not polluting ground water and sub-soil.

73. I care about the revenue generation a great deal or a lot depends on facility size and number of facilities per owner. I generally do not support cannabis facilities.

74. Laws are currently not...I repeat not...enforced; people vape/smoke in all public settings. We have a peaceful town, we don't need trouble here. As I mentioned in question 7, laws are not enforced, I smell skunk when going into the post office, going to Russell Park with kids. Also when shopping in Hamp!! Not OK!

75. I support the revenues generated a great deal if it is supported by the town. Not for any cannabis in Chesterfield.

76. Currently smoking/vaping in a public setting, laws are not enforced!! We do not need a facility like this up here. Most folks who live in Chesterfield like our pure, clean air and safe town.

77. I do not support a cannabis facility in our beautiful town. Go away.

78. We are a small town - any large operation requires big \$ - let's keep the town small.

79. I'm in favor if jobs are created locally and there are controls on traffic, etc.

80. We sure need some kind of revenue in this town!

81. The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection has had to take enforcement action against a number of cannabis growing facilities since the inception of this industry operating in the Commonwealth.

Documented issues associated with cannabis growing facilities include, (though not limited to) the following:

1. Light pollution which can impact the natural night sky for Miles
2. Nauseating odor which can create nuisance condition for Miles
3. Large mechanical ventilation and odor control machinery creating pure tone noise which can be heard for miles
4. Traffic

It has been my experience having worked for the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) for 36 years that some industry often considers paying fines for polluting or creating local nuisance conditions "a cost of doing business," most in particular, a business with large financial resources. Companies looking to do business in a locality often come in with wonderful promises to be good neighbors, when in actual practice, they do less than the

minimum promise, and once they get their foot in the door, their philosophy is “it’s easier to beg for forgiveness than to ask for permission”.

Boards of health in small town such as Chesterfield are part time and comprised of volunteers. It has been my experience that when push comes to shove when an industry (with large financial resources) is out of compliance in a small town, town departments do not have the financial resources nor the expertise to effectively intervene in a timely fashion and eventually turn to the MassDEP. Unless emergency conditions exist, MassDEP generally asks the town to go back and handle complaints on a local basis. It isn’t until a town has exhausted all options that the MassDEP considers intervening in what they consider “nuisance conditions” and then they only occasionally intervene.

The Bottom Line

I firmly believe that no facility has the right to enter our town if it will have a negative impact on the quality of life for a single individual. Many residents have lived their entire lives in Chesterfield because generations of that family have lived here because of the country quality of life.

Many town residents have often spent their life savings purchasing a home in Chesterfield, For the sole purpose of enjoying the dark night sky, the quiet solitude of the country air, the beautiful tree-lined streets and beautiful views that the town offers.

A for-Profit Industry SHOULD NOT be allowed to come into town and negatively impact the quality of life of a single individual.

Should the town decide to allow a cannabis growing facility to operate in Chesterfield, the proposed facility must agree to have zero negative impact upon the town and its residence.

The applicant should be required to provide the town with a large financial contingency account that the town can automatically access immediately for the use of addressing negative impacts created by the industry.

The applicant must agree to shut down any and all lighting should the facility impact the night sky in any fashion by admission of visible lumens and or color.

The applicant must agree to immediately shut down any and all HVAC equipment causing audible disturbance/disruption to a single individual.

The applicant must agree to not allow any odor from escaping the facility property. This includes though not limited to odors related to the growing, processing, packaging or other activities related to the on-site operation as well as odors related to or caused by transportation to or from the facility.

82. There should be no cannabis facilities. Revenue is not important.

83. Opposed to cannabis

84. Control odor and poor air quality and harm to the environment. Address rapid decline of infrastructure. Address more danger to children and drivers from more traffic.

My partner and I composed this response together so it is almost identical and says “we” instead of “I”. We strongly oppose all cannabis facilities of any kind. Although we feel research/standard testing facilities would be the “lesser of evils” (if there MUST be a facility here we would strongly prefer it to be one of these). The biggest issue we have is the size of the business, how many employees, manufacturing output, transport to/from, by the business itself and other businesses/customers etc. So when it comes to square feet we would never support anything as large as 20,000 ft.². We would also only support that all hiring prioritize Chesterfield residence, ideally exclusively. Unless it has less than 20 employees and doesn’t serve customers. The size of it and implications of that word without question worsen quality of life and could have detrimental effects on our community because if it’s activities - all of those listed under question three.

Regarding light pollution – despite whatever they claim about being able to mitigate - that the research and fact sheet show there is clearly a huge lack of research showing that this can be viably improved and doesn’t address light pollution from the facility itself even if it wasn’t even growing anything – like from the building, parking lot, security, added street lights etc.

Whatever money or tax incentives, etc. are NOT worth it!! It would ruin so many things that make erslev Chesterfield. As a newer resident, who has many friends looking to settle down and buy homes, I know it would make our town a much less attractive place to live and would turn people off.

85 (My partner and I composed this response together that is why it says “we” instead of “I”.)

We strongly oppose all cannabis facilities of any kind. Although the research/standard testing facilities would be the lesser of evils i.e. If there must be a cannabis facility here, we would strongly prefer it be one of those two. The biggest overall concern we have is the size of the business # of employees, manufacturing output, transportation to/from the business by the business itself, related businesses, customers, etc. so when it comes to the square-foot question we absolutely would never support anything as large as a hockey rink we would also support that all hiring prioritize Chesterfield residence, ideally exclusively.

Unless it has less than 30 employees and doesn’t serve customers, the size of it and the implications of that would without question worsen the quality of life and could have detrimental effects on our community because of its activities - every thing listed under question three and more. And with light pollution - despite whatever they claim they could do it mitigate that - as our research and the fax sheet show, there is clearly a huge absence of research showing that this

could be violate viably improved, and doesn't address light pollution from the facility itself if it wasn't even growing anything – like from the building park parking lot, security, etc.

Whatever money or tax incentives, etc. are not worth it. It would all get used up fixing all the problems it would bring. It would ruin so many things that make so many of us love Chesterfield. We have many other friends looking to buy homes now and in the next few years and all of them would have an issue with us and it would turn them off from considering moving to our town. It would make Chesterfield a much less attractive place to live for all the people we've talked to about it. As newer residents here, we ourselves may have completely ruled out Chesterfield when we were looking, if there was a cannabis cannabis facility here.

<end comments of from the paper surveys>

COMMENTS FROM THE ONLINE SURVEY

These comments are presented unaltered in the order that they appeared in the online survey.

Please note, neither the fact sheet nor the letter from the Planning Board Chair is available (or discoverable) at the Chesterfield website.

Site restoration or re use in the event of the cannabis business failing (current bubble is bound to burst, I figure 50% or more of new cannabis businesses will fail)

I do not support a cannabis facility in Chesterfield

It should only be side not outside only with the pollution because of the strong smell. They should be taxes more then taxpayers whom own there own homes. it's a business and the home shouldn't take up the slack. It's big business and these people make a lot of money!

Security deposit to cover town expenses for a special tax assessor and police needs.

I'm all for being a "No Commercial Cannabis Exclusion Zone" as a positive example toward solving this issue locally and beyond. "Grow 6 aok" WAS my vote! Get it!??

I defer to CCC regulations. My only concern is huge grow operations that don't fit the town.

Follow same laws as other businesses

These plants take a great deal of water. If coming from a well it has the potential to drain our aquifers especially as our climate changes.

I'd like to note that I would also like to see Chesterfield residents be polite and professional when speaking with folks who are proposing to engage with us in business rather than openly hostile and discourteous. We can decline an offer without being jerks about it. Choosing to do otherwise reflects poorly upon the quality of our community's character and ought rightly to be a source of shame for us.

No facilities should be located near schools or day care centers

I do not believe cannabis facilities should be permitted in Chesterfield. I am strong proponent of the legalization of cannabis, however cannabis businesses (cultivation, retail, etc) are not the type of industry I would welcome to my community. Our family moved to Chesterfield for its rural landscape and small town feel. Cannabis enterprises are well funded, highly speculative, centered around growth, which is the antithesis of what I believe Chesterfield stands for.

As with any commercial enterprise, operations should not interfere with quality of life for residents. Included should be impact on town resources, impact on environment, impact on neighbors, and impact on quality of life for residents of Chesterfield.

Light, odor, noise and water protection are essential to protect Chesterfield's environment and rural character.

No spirits at all!

Indoor Growing	I am more in favor of greenhouse production than warehouse-type facilities, as greenhouses are more in keeping with the agricultural nature of the community.
Indoor Growing	Not interested in this type of development
Retail Stores	100% not interested
Indoor Growing	I don't think the town is prepared for an influx of employees, cars, etc.
Retail Stores	we simply don't have the infrastructure. Small rural town. NOT worth the tax income
Cannabis Research Facility	MAYBE IF A SMALL FACILITY????
Social Consumption Establishment	absolutely NOT!! Again, we are a small rural town-- let's keep it that way!!!
Medical Treatment Facility	NO! Again it would destroy the character of the town!!!
Indoor Growing	As long as these organizations agree to do no harm to our water, our land, or our air, I don't see why any of them are a problem and that applies to all of these categories, indoor, outdoor, research, etc. It strikes me that people in town are clutching their pearls because this is pot and was, at one point, illegal. Alcohol was, at one point, illegal in America, but plenty of these folks crack into a Budweiser as is evidenced by the empty cans they are fond of leaving along the roads and in the woods of our town. Perhaps we should be less hypocritical.

Indoor Growing	I feel the possible detriments (Odors , light pollution, increased security risks, potential draw on the aquifer and pollution of ground water) are significant.
Outdoor Growing	There is no way to control odor and the security risks are much higher.
Retail Stores	Given the traffic issues in Northampton, I can't see this working in Chestetfield. Either the traffic impact would negatively affect quality of life or no one will want to come all the way here to buy anything that is more readily available elsewhere.
Cannabis Product Manufacturer or Distributor	I suppose it depends on where it would go; it has the potential to bring in a lot of traffic. I'm guessing most people wouldn't want to live near it.
Cannabis Research Facility	As long as it doesn't affect quality of life, then it is fine.
Indoor Growing	It would be extremely difficult to adequately address all of the impacts of 24 x 7 commercial cannabis greenhouses on the town, not just immediate neighbors, ranging from light pollution (even with shades) to transportation and security. If the town were already developed it might be possible.
Outdoor Growing	Not keen on this either; have been living next to an illegal operation and I imagine the aesthetics and operation of a legal facility would actually have worse impacts except perhaps for odor control.
Retail Stores	Likely not enough population density to sustain a retail store

Cannabis Product Manufacturer or Distributor	Impacts on town too large - noise, traffic
Cannabis Research Facility	Good use for a town of Chesterfield's size and scale, with far fewer impacts. Would strongly support with a category 5.
Independent Testing Lan/Standards Testing Lab	Good use for a town of Chesterfield's size and scale, with far fewer impacts. Would strongly support with a category 5.
Social Consumption Establishment	Not a first choice for our town center....
Medical Treatment Facility	Fully support medical uses and would give it a 5 if the category existed.
Outdoor Growing	The smell and the crime
Retail Stores	No way look at Northampton! This is a small town Community with families and small children in our town.
Cannabis Product Manufacturer or Distributor	Crime
Outdoor Growing	The outdoor growing operation that happened on Loomis Rd This past summer reeked as you drove up to and by towards the end of summer. You could even smell it coming off the cars that were working there driving by on their way out of town.

Cannabis Product Manufacturer or Distributor	I work in production for INSA in Easthampton. I have personally seen how well they are run and managed thanks to the CCC!
Cannabis Research Facility	The more we know the better!
Social Consumption Establishment	Consumption is much better indoors were only 21 and older can view any use of cannabis

I feel like anything over 10,000 square feet is monolithic and starts to feel like a Wal-Mart.

I have heard that the odor is beyond intense and I cannot imagine it would not impact the quality of life for Chesterfield residents

I apparently cannot select an answer AND add a comment. I would support up to 100,000 sq. ft. depending on the size of the property. Any property of at least 5 acres could support an outdoor growing area of that size. Any property under 5 acres should be limited to 50% coverage.

Parking? Traffic?? Where do employees eat?? Not workable

I would only support a stand this large if there was extensive intercropping to avoid a monocrop. Monocropping is destructive to soil structure and leads to erosion, pollution of local water supplies, and the inevitable turn toward fertilizers to try to prop up the dying soil. Nature cannot exist with one species dominating a huge swath of land. Biodiversity is the only thing that causes life to thrive on this planet. So sure, plant 100,000 square feet of pot, who cares, just make sure you plant other things in among it to encourage biodiversity, beneficial

pollinators, parasitic wasps, etc. that will help mitigate pest pressure, build soil, and maintain fertility and cleanliness everywhere.

I do not support any cannabis facilities in Chesterfield

Net zero.

Do not think they should be permitted at all

There should be limits to any and all of the individual types and among them. Many small towns that allow them limit them to very few, even just to one.

~ The special opportunity that might be available to the hilltowns is the fostering of farmer-based coops, where existing farms/farmers could form a cooperative, with each farm using some part of its land for an outdoor grow. This would be compatible with what we value and cherish here in the hilltowns while providing a unique economic opportunity for our local farmers. There could be incentives for this type of operation and they could potentially span across a few hilltowns or more. ~ While I think that economic benefits to the town are worth considering, it doesn't seem strategic or effective to be driven by these considerations. ~ Not mentioned here are stipulations specific to locally-driven preferences and/or locally defined economic etc. justice opportunities. For example, potential licensees could be required to have a hilltown resident on their leadership team; and/or required to offer internships to students from the hilltowns, etc.

Hemp/Cannabis production would be a great boon to the town for a number of reasons; tax revenue, jobs, etc. Maybe town residents can get a property tax reduction with the increased town tax revenue from such sources!

thank you for tackling this challenging topic. I am concerned with the quality of life for residents and the impact on the wildlife and outdoor recreation in our town.

feel that an industry that can add a tax base and job opportunities to our community, as well as increase tax revenue for our state is a win, win scenario. I am saddened that there was so much opposition to the grower that tried to start on Willcutt Rd.

Regarding question 4, it appears to me the majority of the criteria listed are already covered within the special permit regulations.

I do not support the town's establishment of cannabis-related bylaws. Instead, I think every interested establishment should justify their appropriateness within our community.

One indoor facility should allowed if it is sited properly and only if the up front costs to the town are covered. Most facilities declare losses during the initial phase so asking for a percentage from that will not cover the towns costs.

The town already double dips at the "transfer station" just to gain access to get rid of a bag of crap. Do we really need cash income on selling trash too??

I'm especially interested in the town pursuing business relationships with craft cooperatives!

I am not opposed to cannabis per se: it's the impact of extra people-- only way I can think of putting it-- on the town. If I wanted street lights and traffic lights and extra traffic and lots of people whom I don't know coming in and out, I would move to Northampton. Right now we are small rural, VERY low crime-- no traffic-- this is NOT the place for this!!!!!!

I don't consume cannabis but it is a legal business and should be treated like all businesses without singling out this industry. This town could use revenues from businesses being established in Chesterfield and taxes received would benefit our town. I was sad to see the one business decided not build in our town due to some opinions within our town.

Chesterfield is too small to engage with additional cannabis growers/sellers/researchers

Opposed to indoor and outdoor grow, research, other facilities. Not opposed to retail in appropriately zoned retail establishment

I think the town needs to encourage cannabis business, growing and manufacturing, to bring more jobs and revenue.

I have lived here for 20 plus years and pride myself in the country atmosphere. Even though cannabis has been legalized I'm ma it is still a mind alerting drug. The country setting of chesterfield is not the place for any time of cannabis facility. The ant of light and water requirements are astronomical. Wildlife is affected and just the overall feel of a safe country town will greatly be affected. This would be a huge loss to the town.

I am opposed to any Host Community Agreement or any cannabis company that does not include the following caveats: 1. Commitment to hire local people preferentially over any other applicants so as to help the local economy, 2. a commitment to allow unionizing and organizing of labor as unions are the only way to keep workers safe from corporate greed, 3. commitment to employ people with felony or misdemeanor convictions, especially those who were incarcerated for marijuana possession as it would be hypocritical to continue to punish them now that it's legal (it should never have been illegal, our country is insane to think it can outlaw a plant for goodness' sake), 4. a provision that any failure to live up to the terms of the Host Community Agreement gives the town the right to seize the assets of the company and declare it "The People's Cannabis Greenhouse of Chesterfield" and make it a worker-owned cooperative with profit sharing distributed among all town residents as well as any employees from outside of

Chesterfield who may have lent to the material construction and prosperity of the facility up to the point of the seizure. If corporations want to work here, fine, but if they try to take one step outside of the very narrowly defined legal obligations as laid out in the HCA, we own them, full stop, no qualifications, no questions asked. We are nuts to do anything less than that because it's inviting them to walk all over us like basically all corporations do.

With the MANY cannabis-related businesses popping up all over MA, I expect that some of these businesses will fail. I'm concerned that land or real estate may be developed for a cannabis business, then the business may fail and vacate the site, leaving some infrastructure that MAY not readily convert to use by other businesses. Also: Odor control seems harder to measure/monitor than light or sound pollution. I would want to hear more about how odor control (particularly for outdoor growing) is done. The \$\$ that would come to town has so many restrictions attached, and I would want to have more clarity about these specific restrictions and how difficult it would be for the town to receive the funds.

I do not support a cannabis facility in the town

Chesterfield is an agricultural town. Cannabis grow facilities are not agricultural; they are industrial. I think looking at this as just a way to make money for the town is short sighted and may ultimately affect the quality of life in town. Ask yourself, would you be happy living next door to an industrial facility?

The contributions for the first five years in relation to the host agreement are temporary. Sales and property tax revenues are certainly important to the town but the host agreement contributions are not allowed to be used for general revenues for the town, therefore question 9 sets up a erroneous expectation. Cannabis is a regulated commercial industry (even growers) and is not defined as agriculture in the state law. The town should not make the mistake of treating growers as allowed agricultural uses if it moves ahead with a bylaw to allow the uses.

Please have the new by-law ready for consideration and vote at the 2022 annual town meeting

I believe the statement "can only be used by the town for impacts related to the cannabis operation such as roads and other public infrastructure needs." is misleading. This statement potentially sounds as though the funds could be used for any roads and public infrastructure. My understanding is that the funds may only be used on items directly impacted by the cannabis business. This could be 'roads and public infrastructure', but only in areas directly affected by the business itself. I believe that Northampton recently decided to forgo the 3% contribution as it wasn't using the funds already paid in.

I think the Cannabis industry is a boom town that is likely to level off or go bust. I would hate to see a facility go in only to fold in a few years time. Sustainable? I am not sure our small town needs a lot of these outside entrepreneurs although the tax revenue would be nice. Maybe taking each permit on a case by case basis is better? Many questions! Thank you for doing this.

Cannabis growing operations should only be allowed on very small, individual, local grower scale. It is not worth the possible revenue if the scale is such that noise and other pollution, traffic and crime are created.

Creation of a well-thought-out master plan for all types of commercial enterprises is essential to ensure sustainable use of resources that has minimal negative impact on the town. Tax revenue is enticing, but it is important to take into consideration what one might be giving up to obtain it. I am glad the Planning Board is making this effort.

If we could be assured that an indoor grow facility would not emit light, noise, or odor, opposition would be less. But how can we be assured of such controls and that they would be effective? What substantial penalties or other enforcement mechanisms could be in place to assure compliance?

This has been too long in coming. The war on drugs is a joke. Our prisons should not be a business. Solve the real problems.

It would also allow more employment options for locals

Thank you for sending out this survey! I will make sure to keep an eye out for future emails and meetings. Personally I would love to be able to work with cannabis in my own hometown!

I have had experience with the town over reach ref licensing / permits and it is a total bureaucratic nightmare with a lot of controlling folks stepping on the rights of others. Bylaws should be limited to public safety period. End of story.

<end of comments from the online survey>