

From: [Georgann Alioto](#)
To: [BOS Public Comment](#)
Subject: Fwd: Regarding: [REDACTED]
Date: Monday, December 4, 2023 12:05:04 PM

Dist 2

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

From: Georgann Alioto [REDACTED]
Date: December 4, 2023
Subject: Regarding: 22309 Meyer Ravine

Regarding: 22309 Meyer Ravine, Grass Valley, Ca

From: Georgann Alioto, Anthony Reiss, Andrew Reiss
[REDACTED]

This is in reference to:
22309 Meyer Ravine, proposed commercial cannabis grow opposition and Project PFX22-0039: Petition for Exceptions to Road Standards on a private, one lane one means of egress road.

Our entire neighborhood uses Meyer Ravine as an access road to get to our homes. We are all opposing this grow. It is already a very compromised one lane Private Road that dead ends. The road is not in good shape. The narrowest portion has ditches on one side and a 2 foot strip of dirt on the other side.

Although in an ag area, this is primarily residential. On any given day you will see people walking with their young children, dogs and horses.

It is a narrow road in most places: a turnout seems to be a private driveway so one or the other car can pass and have a road block.

This is all private and to know that this grow will bring even more traffic than we already have to make an allowance for is unreasonable.

How do we get ordinance to allow for an Exclusionary Zone? Please hear our reasons opposing this 22309 Meyer Ravine grow.

Thanking you in advance.

Sincerely,

Georgann Alioto

Anthony Reiss

Andrew Reiss

From: [ruthanne fray](#)
To: [BOS Public Comment](#)
Cc: [Bob Kiss](#); [Jeanne Franklin](#)
Subject: 22309 Meyer Ravine proposed cannabis grow
Date: Monday, December 4, 2023 1:08:19 PM

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

December 4, 2023

Nevada County Board of Supervisors
c/o Clerk of the Board
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 200
Nevada City, CA 95959

RE: PLN20-0042; ADP20-2012, PFX22-0039

I am writing as a resident of Nevada County in support of Court and Megan Worden's appeal and objection to the permit at 14120 Thoroughbred Loop, Grass Valley. My community is facing a similar situation with two more commercial Cannabis permits, including PFX22-0039 at 22309 Meyer Ravine Road.

I have two points that I'd like you to consider:

The first is the potential liabilities you place upon existing residents, who, like the Wordens, are opposed to the pending grows adjacent to our homes. I believe that you have a fiduciary responsibility to protect existing residential communities from the potential harm that large commercial Cannabis Cultivation bring. I don't think that you are doing that.

Cannabis is not like other crops. It is a drug, often helpful, but also potentially harmful. We know, for example, that children metabolize Cannabis differently than adults and shouldn't be exposed to its particulates; and that commercial grows often attract criminal elements, yet many of the grows that you are championing are in the backyards of children. Additionally, the crime rate on Meyer Ravine Rd has already had an increase relative to "trimming season" for the illegal grows in our area. At least 3 neighbors have had thefts of personal property.

There are no public safety patrols on our private road.

Our other concerns are similar to the Worden's:

1. A pending commercial Cannabis permit involving a private road, on which easements have been misrepresented by the applicant.
2. The environmental impact on waterways and residential wells, permeating odor, power surges, grow lamps and fire risk – in our case heightened due to one egress for hundreds of residents.
3. Increases in fire insurance premiums, which my agent says are based on areas.
4. A business Owner will not occupy the required residence.
5. Commercial drug transported on a private shared road.
6. Cost of an appeal or an attorney.

There are already many commercial Cannabis cultivations in the County to serve medical needs, and we all understand the problems with illegal grows. But in addressing these

problems, you are burdening many residents, who have elected you, My second point involves notification and Code Compliance. Just the other day I received this email from a neighbor about a recently permitted (without community notification) Cannabis grow on Blue Heron Road:

“To follow up on my phone call about Blue Heron burning of removed trees for their project: Air Quality Condition #8 (Job Set) states:

“”No burning of waste material or vegetation shall take place on-site”

On Sunday 11/19 there was extensive burning of trees that were removed from the clear-cut woodland area that has been graded under Building Department supervision. The slash includes at least 8’-10’ piles of logs and debris which has been placed in a 100 foot set back area at our northern property line, and is being removed by heavy equipment and placed on the graded pad and burned.

According to CF, Blue Heron is planning to continue the burning of this vegetation and has scheduled another, larger burn in the near future.”

The height of the blaze and flare-ups in the video sent were frightening and dangerous. My neighbors frantically called the Fire Department, who told them that the County had granted a burn permit. They homeowners called the County, but each department dodged responsibility. The promises of Code Compliance has been an empty promise so far. I am upset that you sat in another resident's home and promised us at least Code Compliance. And you won't even do that.

Our neighbors have watched these issues unfold over the last few months, we come away with the impression that, as a Board, you are indiscriminately pro Commercial Cannabis cultivation. We are uneasy about the allure of the 10 million dollar grant you are seeking. Like the others who will sit in front of you on December 5th, we are very disappointed that you refuse to consider “Exclusionary Zones”, and that you do not have an easier method besides costly appeals to decline these grows, which are inappropriate and potentially dangerous in residential areas. Now you face potential lawsuits. For the good of the residents you serve, please deny this permit and reconsider your Cannabis policy.

Sincerely,

Ruthanne Free

Resident, Nevada County