

Dear Board of Supervisors,

10.9.23

Susan Hoek, in her Board of Supervisors description says, "It is critical that we address all our issues with compassion and understanding. This can be the difference between the policy that simply checks the boxes and policy that addresses an issue in a meaningful way."

I am asking you, as a board of supervisors, to make sure you are not simply checking the boxes and are addressing the issues of the Mazu/Dunne cannabis project in a meaningful way. I have been in conversation with some of my neighbors and am worried. I do not feel you have heard or seen the residents of 6B Ranch in this decision-making process and ask you now to rethink this conditional approval.

We have been working hard to follow fire-wise advice on our properties with major clean-up projects individually and as a community. We all have wells and rely on ground water as drinking water and to run our homes. We also have perennial streams running through our neighborhood. We are proud of our neighborhood and are taking good care of it. You could currently use us as an example of how neighborhoods can work together, with the county, to increase fire safety and develop best practices.

If this farm develops, I am worried about water pollution, light pollution, air pollution, the traffic this farm will generate, and having people in our neighborhood that are not a part of our community but are short-term, hired residents. I am worried about overuse of our ground and irrigation water, the smell of bud before harvest, and the upkeep of the farm. I am worried that none of this will be supervised well as you do not have the human capacity to oversee these projects.

I moved here three years ago and my relator considered this one of the nicest neighborhoods in Grass Valley. We are now worried that all our home values will decrease in close proximity to this marijuana farm. This means your tax revenue of our homes will also decrease. If your goal is to generate revenue for the county, is this really the place to do it? Let's say our home values lost 10%. What fiscal loss would that be to the county?

While I am not opposed to marijuana farming, I am confused as to why you are permitting a farm in what has developed into a beautiful, proactive, supportive neighborhood instead of shepherding the 3,500 to 4,000 illegal farms into legal grows. I am worried, that when you told us in the first meeting you didn't have enough of a policing force to manage those farms, that you will not have the human power to oversee that this project follows county rules and regulations, especially when you are overlooking so many in this initial permitting process.

One of your "core services" is to support community health and safety. I do not believe you are taking our health and safety, and the health of the environment we live in, into account in this permitting process.

The cannabis ordinance intent itself says it is designed “to promote the health, safety and general welfare of residents and businesses in Nevada County.” I certainly do not feel like you are taking the health or general welfare of myself or my neighbors into account with this conditional approval.

If you were, then why would we have received official notice of conditional approval by snail mail with only 48 hours left of our 10 days to appeal? This does not feel like the open and honest communication you espouse in your values statement. And this certainly doesn't build mutual trust and confidence.

Your values statement says that you do not make commitments that you cannot keep. Please do not push through this farm without further consideration of alternatives that will better meet county fiscal needs and the health, safety and general welfare needs of your constituents in our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Tracy Lease



**From:** [Lynn Forbes](#)  
**To:** [BOS Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Public comment/10/10 BOS meeting  
**Date:** Monday, October 9, 2023 8:27:02 PM

Dist 4

**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.

To the Nevada County Board of Supervisors:

The Planning Department's approval for a cannabis operation at the 6B Ranch, 14120 Thoroughbred Loop, Grass Valley, is a blatant disregard of county, state and federal laws. It is also an egregious dismissal of stone cold facts. Time and time again neighborhood property owners have submitted documentation of the applicant's inaccurate site plan and failure to meet fire suppression, water, environmental and other requirements.

Why? Why does the county refuse to abide by our laws? Why is the increased risk of fire, health hazards, crime and property devaluation acceptable?

The application has been returned as incomplete many times over four long years, yet we had 10 days to file an appeal with an \$1,800 price tag. In addition, the owner owes tens of thousands of dollars in unpaid property taxes.

Something is very wrong with this picture. Do your jobs, do the right thing and reject this application once and for all.

Best regards  
Lynn Forbes and James Walters



**From:** [Lauren Drutz](#)  
**To:** [Clerk of Board](#)  
**Subject:** Support of the Appeal to prevent PLN20-0042 Conditional Approval from moving forward  
**Date:** Monday, October 9, 2023 9:02:20 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.

Dear Nevada County Board of Supervisors.

The Conditional Approval for PLN20-0042 is based on inaccurate and missing info submitted by the applicant, and hopeful outcomes predicted by the county.

These discrepancies conflict with the intent and language of County code relating to cannabis cultivation.

My concerns include:

One: The code requires “a legally established Residence” to be situated on the parcel where cannabis is to be grown. The so-called living structures associated to PLN20-0042 were built as horse barns in 1965 and 1967 by a previous owner and thus a basic criterion to permit cannabis cultivation, is missing. These horse barns were never permitted as residences and as such, have unknown electrical, plumbing and safety issues.

Two: The Conditional Approval warns “Please be aware that commercial farming uses high volumes of water and may result in dry wells.” This means that our wells and our water supplies are also at risk since local aquifers and wells are not isolated from each other.

Three: Un-permitted, old wooden structures at the proposed grow site where people are living and working, coupled with an inadequate water supply for fire protection are red flags for potential wildfire in a wildland urban interface.

Four: The only access road to the proposed grow area and un-permitted living structures is not owned in its entirety by the applicant. Legal questions and ownership issues have yet to be resolved.

Five: The applicant’s property is located adjacent to several neighbors’ parcels. The ordinance states that the “Cannabis Cultivations shall not subject residents of neighboring parcels who are of normal sensitivity to reasonably objectional odors.” I don’t know how this requirement can be attained with the cultivation of 1,080 pungent cannabis plants.

These concerns and other questions about the proposed grow have been brought to the attention of county staff during the permit application process. However, it appears that the county plans to approve this cannabis application even in the face of unfavorable facts. The application has been rejected as incomplete 8 times and has been in process for approximately 3 ½ years.

Pushing this permit along by ignoring discrepancies and hoping for overly optimistic outcomes, puts the health and safety of our neighborhood at risk.

The property rights of the applicant are just as important as the property and water rights and health and safety of our entire neighborhood. This conditional approval does not adequately address our concerns or stay true to the intent of the application process.

Sincerely,

Lauren Drutz

