

Attachment B

This page intentionally left blank

From: [Spencer, Craig x5233](mailto:Spencer.Craig.x5233)
To: [Nickerson, Jacquelyn x5240](mailto:Nickerson.Jacquelyn.x5240)
Subject: FW: Medical marijuana ordinance - Monterey County
Date: Thursday, September 1, 2016 2:17:09 PM

From: Daniel Sosa [<mailto:danielmichaelsosa@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 3:28 PM
To: Spencer, Craig x5233
Subject: Re: Medical marijuana ordinance - Monterey County

Associate Planner Craig Spencer,

My name is Daniel Sosa. I own 3 contiguous parcels of land in the Lockwood area of Monterey County. They are zoned PG-40. I have been cultivating outdoors on two of them since 2013. I have done so legally and responsibly.

I left you a voicemail earlier today. You may recall me speaking at Planning Commission meetings in June and July and the Board of Supervisors meetings on July 12.

First of all, I would like to say I appreciate Planning staff's work on this effort. It is no small task to take on.

At the Supervisors meeting on July 12, the Board asked Planning staff to come back at the end of August with a narrowly crafted ordinance to include outdoor cultivation, with the intention of creating a pathway for existing good actors.

Here are a few examples of narrowly crafted provisions that would allow for Use Permit applications for responsible outdoor cultivation on PG-40 while also limiting the number of applications. I have shared similar ideas with Supervisor Salinas, Supervisor Armenta, and Supervisor Parker in the weeks leading up to the last meeting.

Only allow Use Permit applications for outdoor/mixed-light/nursery cultivation on PG-40 properties that have PG & E service (or on a contiguous property of the same owner that has PG & E service). This would significantly limit Use Permit applications and also limit the risk of fires caused by generators.

Only allow Use Permit applications for outdoor/mixed-light/nursery cultivation on PG-40 properties where a home exists on the property or on a contiguous property of the same owner (or a building permit application is on file and project completion happens within 2 years). This would significantly limit Use Permit applications, encourage responsible development, and increase property values (and revenue for the County).

Only allow Use Permit applications for outdoor/mixed-light/nursery cultivation on PG-40 properties where the water source produces upwards of 15 GPM. This would significantly limit Use Permit applications and also protect areas where there is a low water table.

Only allow Use Permit applications for outdoor/mixed-light/nursery cultivation on PG-40 properties for those who can demonstrate that they have been cultivating in compliance since prior to January 1, 2016 (or on a contiguous parcel of the same owner). This would limit Use Permit applications and also create a pathway to compliance for existing responsible actors.

Only allow Use Permit applications for outdoor/mixed-light/nursery cultivation on PG-40 properties for those who can demonstrate that the property has been inspected and cleared of any Code violations, especially and specifically related to grading, within the last three years.. This would force Code violation and grading issues to be dealt with even before beginning the Use Permit application process for cultivation.

I believe a combination of all or some of these provisions would address most of the concerns surrounding outdoor cultivation, while also creating a pathway for responsible actors.

One major benefit of the Use Permit process is that the County will be able to monitor locations which fail the Use Permit process (to maintain their compliance). Furthermore, denied applicants will be more likely to voluntarily cease operations if they expect the County to enforce.

I am curious to know the direction you are taking with the drafting of the Ordinance. What stage of drafting are currently in? Do you anticipate that a draft will be on the agenda for Supervisors to review at the August 23 meeting? If possible, I would love to open up a dialogue with you on this issue.

Thank you for your time and consideration on this matter.

-Daniel Sosa

cell [323 348 9439](tel:3233489439)

On Fri, Jun 24, 2016 at 10:35 AM, Daniel Sosa <danielmichaelsosa@gmail.com> wrote:
Craig Spencer,

First of all, thank you for your work on developing a medical marijuana ordinance for Monterey County. I am sure it is challenging to attempt to balance the interests of everyone.

As you know, I attended and spoke at the Planning Commission meeting on Wednesday. I own three contiguous parcels of land zoned PG-40 in the Lockwood area. I was pleased that the Commission instructed staff to come back next week with a less restrictive draft of the ordinance. I was also glad that the Commission indicated that they would like to allow for the possibility for farmers to build new greenhouses, allow outdoor cultivation applications, and allow cultivation applications on all agricultural uses, including PG lands. I also agree with their suggestion that we should use our existing use permit process to determine whether the permits should actually be issued.

I agree with the Planning Commission that agriculturally zoned land should be allowed to apply for cultivation permits. Specifically, I would like to see Type 3 Outdoor License, Type 3B Mixed-light License and Type 4 Nursery License be allowed on PG-40 zoned land.

I understand that there have been concerns in the past with cultivation on farmland and grazing lands. While I cannot speak for other operations, I can confidently say that my operation is secure, uses a legal water source, and we have never cut down one tree. Two years ago a Code Compliance Officer inspected my property and told me that nothing I was doing required a permit. This was documented in e-mail. Two years ago I even met Sheriffs at my property at their request, answered their questions, gave them copies of my legal paperwork, shook their hands, and never heard from them again.

I believe that it is the Planning Commission's intent to recommend to include PG-40 zoned property for medical marijuana cultivation. However, in the case it is not opened up completely, I believe that it should at least be opened up with certain provisions to allow people who can demonstrate that they have been operating responsibly in the past an opportunity to apply for cultivation licenses (specifically Type 3 Outdoor License, Type 3B Mixed-light License, and Type 4 Nursery License).

I had the opportunity to meet with Supervisor Salinas yesterday morning and express to him the views I am expressing to you now. I feel that he gave thoughtful consideration to my concerns, and I hope that he will be an ally in allowing those with agriculturally zoned land, particularly PG-40 land, the opportunity to apply for cultivation permits in Monterey County.

Once again, thank you for all of your efforts and for your consideration of these issues.

Sincerely, Daniel Sosa

From: [Spencer, Craig x5233](mailto:Spencer.Craig.x5233)
To: [Nickerson, Jacquelyn x5240](mailto:Nickerson.Jacquelyn.x5240)
Subject: FW: Anti-Legalization efforts for Pot and FDA process requirements
Date: Thursday, September 1, 2016 2:08:45 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: Steve Craig [<mailto:stevecraig.turtlecreek@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2016 6:26 PM
To: jeff@learnaboutsam.org
Cc: Charles Rowley; Erin McKenna; Erin Rowley Cooley; Doug Cooley; Janine Cooley; Parker, Jane; Markey, Kristi A. x7576; Spencer, Craig x5233; Holm, Carl P. x5103; Glen Jonas; Charles Ewing; Paula Getzelman; Linda Plumb
Subject: Anti-Legalization efforts for Pot and FDA process requirements

Jeff:

We live in one of the remaining truly rural parts of central pari-coastal California, and the marijuana grow mania here is out of hand. The seven growers in our canyons are for the most part are now out of water, huge fires are burning the coast range, and these growers are importing water by the truckload nearly daily to keep up with overplanting beyond their well capacities, in a land use zone that is not even legal under the County's new and not yet fully implemented or effective "Commercial Medical Legalization" ordinance.

Glad to hear of your organization, did see the news today on keeping all marijuana species on Schedule I status, and also good to hear that research will go forward but this research must meet FDA standards, and pass drug trials. China is putting nearly all not yet extinct Tibetan herbal medicines through similar testing and research and there is a large complex of writing on how this process is working. A good read on the problems of this transformation, effects on the environment etc., is a book called Healing Elements by Sienna Craig, Medical Anthropology Professor at Dartmouth, UC Press, published a few years ago. The book presages some of the iconography of transition from a situationally supplied herb to approved medical forms, fully tested, with standardized dosing, a very difficult task actually to work out with any one herb, let alone a suite of them as the Chinese are working on. Their approach is more ambitious and more rigorous. And the book also describes the holes and misses and failures in the process in China and the effects of various dubious herbal treatments on sick people.

Hopefully we will catch up with the Chinese effort to really study their native plant folio for potential use as medicine, either apart from or with the Buddhist format of treatment and health analysis that accompanies the use of Chinese medicine in many parts of China, Tibet, Nepal, India and Mongolia and many parts of Europe and North America still, today. We have hundreds of equally valuable, or potentially valuable herbs to research, but this country with the dominance by Big Pharma does not have a systematic program like the Government of China has, despite some good efforts to start such a program in the 70s and 80s when ethnobotany was taken more seriously by drug manufacturers. Not everything about China is a model, as the illegal flooding of the market for a heroin high by using small dose Fentanyl caps is killing American youth all over the country by the scores.

We have the marijuana factor from the 70s and 80s leading a literary and political movement to end the war in Vietnam, to expand the realms of music and literature, to change the way poetry was prepared and read, and all these non-medical social factors are the authentic root of "medicalized marijuana". NORMAL and others are using the medical approach to structure a new form of addiction which will be highly profitable, a milder one perhaps than alcohol, but all the same, one purposed with the same intents, same players in the end. The people who pushed various psychoactives for political purposes experimented widely and broadly but in a very narrow range of interest, (getting high, tuning in, turning on, and dropping out, in that order), and so this seems a very odd precursor to medical uses. However, here we are.

I met and liked Allen Ginsberg, Peter Mathiessen, and Chris Isherwood, and I think each, while experimenting with the herb, came to very very different literary conclusions about its utility, either medically or socially or politically. As for Allen and his coterie, the SF movement, etc., while I respect their message, and appreciate the movement it generated to stop the Vietnam War, it has left us with a serious problem where lucidity and clarity are in many ways, just not valued by the young. The rush to obtain income to government coffers in the leap to medical status is a shame, as this herb has not been adequately studied ethnobotanically or medically, even if a voting public says it has been, and I predict, wide availability will result in a less aware, less intelligent, less stable, and less inventive portion of our young population, increased political paranoia about people who do not share our entire world view, and a dissipation of character that is unnecessary, if this herb had gone through a regular medical process rather than an initiative.

As a painkiller, it is of much less value than opiates, as a social mediator, about the same as alcohol, as an appetite stimulator, good, as a sleep aid, some varieties are effective, but it is such a ramshackle structure of medical uses that only the initiative process could be used to bring about its premature legalization. The governments obstreperous position on research is largely responsible for this dilemma. Science would likely find a few uses, just as LSD and mescaline, San Pedro Cactus, and Peyote Cactus have been found to be beneficial in the treatment of some mental disorders. They also are excellent used rarely to reset one's course in life, or to appreciate some part of a canyon in nature or to develop a full panoply of etiology to support a religious order, as the Native American Church has.

A good article on a new antibiotic derived from very elemental protoplasm part, magnified and reformulated, in a recent New Yorker article on the search for new antibiotics emphasizes the importance of completing the science before moving to distribution. Medicine in the end is about the starting point: the planets' plants, and their synthetics, once plant values are known, quantified and understood. The smallest parts, the most primitive parts, may be the most fulsome as a source of new medical treatments. The recent film Code Black fills in the young doctor's perspectives on what is happening to medicine and is worth seeing to better educate oneself on this subject.

Like most herbs, such as *C. sativa*, *indicans*, *r. sp.* and all the GMO varieties, such plants are most effective and least dangerous as herbs with structures not modified by GMO cloning; the more GMO messing, the more drug-like the herb becomes (GMO modified chemistry of native plants or synthetic immitants of various compounds can be emphasized to increase market share). See the recent English study on GMO based chronic use resulting psychosis/psychotic effects and situational paranoia.

I think the effects of marijuana as it is now grown, with manipulation by GMO design, is a dangerous move leading to very strong psychoactive dosages and a street sale bias to the rambling psychoactive part of the herb. So many people assume that this herb will be fully legalized; while limited medical use may have some value, it should go through the FDA process, with some margin for compassionate use exclusions for cancer and HIV and Hep patients and poppy addicts (in its many natural herbal, drug and synthetic drug forms).

It is a shame to watch our local governments enable Big Pharma and Big Tobacco and Narco-Culturenos move into large "legal" operations. A more cautious approach would be to allow small individual grows only, statewide, as these seem to have become a right of property as the initiative on Compassionate Use was written under Jerry Brown, but it seems wise to avoid enabling large moves into the commercial arena in the hope that marijuana will free us of the debt of the American local government. The Initiative for full legalization is not good medicine; medical use is enough, and lets wait and see what medical uses it will serve.

Horse out of the stable
Now feet, teeth and surging run,
A new animal.

Tu Fu

And it is worse still to see up close and personal the water gradients and basins dropping (each stem requires about 3,000 gallons to maturity), the social change, the enclosure and prohibitions on movement through open space, the "guard it don't share it" mentality of owning rural property, and other effects that are not really even being considered in the rush to become a local government with a marijuana industry here in Monterey County.

Does your organization have an effort underway to oppose the full legalization effort on the November ballot in California? If so, what is the website? We would like to donate and assist if we can.

Thanks for the posting,

Steve Craig
Charles Rowley
Sapaque Valley Ranch

From: [Spencer, Craig x5233](mailto:Spencer.Craig.x5233)
To: [Nickerson, Jacquelyn x5240](mailto:Nickerson.Jacquelyn.x5240)
Subject: FW: Outdoor Grows Study Sessions for Monterey County
Date: Thursday, September 1, 2016 2:10:26 PM

From: Steve Craig [mailto:stevecraig.turtlecreek@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 8:48 AM
To: Onciano, Jacqueline x5193; Spencer, Craig x5233; Holm, Carl P. x5103
Cc: Nickerson, Jacquelyn x5240; Paula Getzelman; Fred Kenyon; Fred & Carol Kenyon; Erin McKenna; Jeff Kuyper; Mike Splain; Linda Plumb; Charles Rowley; Linda Plumb; Hesperia Hall; Jay Brown; 100-District 2 (831) 755-5022; 100-District 1 (831) 647-7991; 100-District 3 (831) 385-8333; 100-District 4 (831) 883-7570; 100-District 5 (831) 647-7755
Subject: Re: Outdoor Grows Study Sessions for Monterey County

Jacqueline

Please be sure to include the persons listed above in **any** stakeholder meetings.

I doubt if the staff knows the terrain or the issues all that well as south County gets little attention from staff, certainly in terms of field visits; we know this from the sad examples of efforts to do Code Enforcement on homes built in road right-away and in the demolition of abandoned homes. We and others have lived here now for decades and could help prevent mistakes from being made.

We would be pleased to see you set up a tour of illegal growing operations and the constraints on outdoor grows, and some examples of good outdoor grow structures, if you would like to avail yourselves of the expertise of the local community. This could easily be set up through the LUAC I would think.

You should also look to us as a resource in studying this issue. My partner is a Landscape Architect, graduated UC Berkeley, has operated a nursery for years that provided plants to Fish and Game, the Corps, and Fish and Wildlife. I am a former Community Development Director. We have worked for the federal government, state governments in three states, and cities including Palm Springs, Malibu, Calabasas, Santa Monica, Arcadia, Ventura, Fillmore, Santa Paula, Santa Barbara and other cities in the tri-counties area. We prepared unreinforced masonry ordinances to preserve historic downtowns in many California cities, and were given a state planning award for these efforts; a modified version of our ordinance was ultimately adopted by the State legislature as the state model ordinance for this issue. I have worked for the City and County of LA, Agoura, Thousand Oaks and other cities, and once specialized in redevelopment of downtowns before Jerry Brown eliminated this feature of the law, after using Redevelopment law himself to transform downtown Oakland.

Please forward this suggestion to the committee. If the LUAC cannot or is afraid to undertake a tour of the issues and area for your subcommittee, we should be able to accommodate you.

We will keep generating information, ideas for application complete status requirements, types of outdoor grow structures, and conditions for land use permits as the days proceed ahead.

We will also be contacting all the many federal landholders in south County, as I think their

presence is under-estimated and they have a different legal standard for Marijuana than the Medical Marijuana State Law. This could lead to serious conflicts we believe. Primary among these land holders are BLM, Los Padres National Forest, and Fort Hunter Liggett.

Steve Craig
Charles Rowley

Sapaque Valley Ranch

On Jul 20, 2016, at 10:54 AM, Onciano, Jacqueline x5193
<oncianoj@co.monterey.ca.us> wrote:

Good morning. Mr. Craig:

Thank you for your email and comments. Staff noted to the BOS that we will be meeting with the ad hoc committee early August. The ad hoc meetings are working sessions with staff that are not open public meetings. However, we anticipate having stakeholder meetings and will notify the public when the schedule has been established.

Kind regards,

Jacqueline Onciano

~Jacqueline R. Onciano
RMA Services Manager/Zoning Administrator
Monterey County Resource Management Agency

168 W. Alisal St. 2nd Floor
Salinas, CA 93901
Office: (831) 755-5193
Fax: (831) 757-9516
oncianoj@co.monterey.ca.us

-----Original Message-----

From: Steve Craig [<mailto:stevecraig.turtlecreek@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2016 7:37 PM

To: Nickerson, Jacquelyn x5240; Spencer, Craig x5233; Holm, Carl P. x5103;
Onciano, Jacqueline x5193

Cc: Paula Getzelman; Fred Kenyon; Fred & Carol Kenyon; Erin McKenna; Jeff Kuyper; Mike Splain; Charles Rowley; Linda Plumb; Hesperia Hall; Jay Brown; 100-District 2 (831) 755-5022; 100-District 1 (831) 647-7991; 100-District 3 (831) 385-8333; 100-District 4 (831) 883-7570; 100-District 5 (831) 647-7755
Subject: Outdoor Grows Study Sessions for Monterey County

Craig:

1. Looking at the actions taken and language of the Supervisors from the most recent hearings, it appears some form of study sessions or subcommittee meetings will be held on “outdoor grows” potentially in Rural Grazing or other designations. I am unsure what this means, but you cannot grow a forb like Marijuana in the back country without building a greenhouse or plant shelter to protect them from ubiquitous bird life, voles, mice, wood rats, voles, deer and pigs. So, I am not sure exactly what an outdoor grow is; currently most outdoor grows are shoddy little affairs, with plastic pipe, plastic covers, somewhat like the “non complying” conditions in the last hearing’s Powerpoint.

2. Will these study sessions be open the public?

3. Will the recommendations go to the LUAC before the Planning Commission hears them if they effect south County Zoning?

4. If these sessions will be public, please include my partner Charles and I, at the emails above, on the time and place of all study sessions.

5. Unlike the Greenhouse Grows passed to date for Commercial Grows, open field grows will have many potential water, biological, cultural, and other impacts. I don’t see how one could start, as Supervisor Parker did, with a presumption that an EIR level analysis, or much expanded Mitigated Negative Declaration with Conditions can be used to make any further alterations to the zones and methods of growing thus far adopted.

6. If any such modifications include moving growing operations to within 10 to 15 miles of federal lands (Fort Hunter Liggett and its boundary set back parcels or the Monterey District, or the Silver Peak or Ventana Wilderness), I think it will be very difficult to make such activities compatible with federal law and standards, watershed management requirements, etc., and I can definitely see a possibility of conflict between federal and local law and policy. I will contact both the Commander at Fort Hunter Liggett and the Forest Supervisor about this development to be sure their inputs are brought to the table in implementing this suggestion. There is as well the watershed protection of waters in south County Reservoirs and intermixed BLM lands in this part of the County. We will also contact BLM on this to be sure they can express their preferences.

I think the general feeling in south County, except among professional commercial pot growers, is that personal grows provide sufficient access to growing marijuana already in the inner regions of south County. On property backing to federal lands, it may be unwise to introduce this land use.

Thank you,

Steve Craig
Sapaque Valley Ranch

From: Spencer, Craig x5233
To: Nickerson, Jacquelyn x5240
Subject: FW: Are you interested in a state license for cannabis?--thanks for the info
Date: Thursday, September 1, 2016 2:09:37 PM

From: Steve Craig [mailto:stevecraig.turtlecreek@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 10:28 AM
To: Spencer, Craig x5233
Subject: Re: Are you interested in a state license for cannabis?--thanks for the info

Craig

FYI on any extensions of grows other than personal, into PG, RG and RC zones: we have met with BLM and are now set to meet with FHL. FHL will likely have a letter for the County asking for a buffer zone about to the G-14 as a no grow area. We are mapping their no grow area, BLM's suggestions, the proposals by Streamkeepers, Citizen Planning and others.

We will see what the agencies finally decide to say, or not say.

BLM will not issue any easements to reach a grow parcel; this has come up, possibly in Copperhead.

We are trying to see if this was a case, or a legal opinion, or something less formal.

Hope all is well.

I thought the registry was for commercial only, but did want to check. Are you taking down APN Nos. of the interested parties, and their zone, cause if not, this is a quick way to measure compliance. Just a suggestion.

We just had a new parcel in Forest River (no. 32) return to grow, will confirm. Probably an 8 week clone since it is grow weather till October. The water import has begun so they must have bottommed their well.

Lots of nasty out here, Charles was run off the road. Called in to the Sheriff. We will have a pretty long case history before this is over. Just hope we don't make it to Law and Order Special Victims Unit as a plot line.

Yo, take care,

Steve

On Jul 28, 2016, at 9:37 AM, Spencer, Craig x5233
<SpencerC@co.monterey.ca.us> wrote:

Hello Mr. Craig,

The survey applies only to “commercial cannabis” not to personal.
Personal grows are exempt from State licensing requirements.

Thank you

Craig W. Spencer
RMA - Planning Department
County of Monterey
phone: (831) 755-5233
e-mail: spencerc@co.monterey.ca.us

From: Steve Craig [<mailto:stevecraig.turtlecreek@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 8:27 AM
To: Nickerson, Jacquelyn x5240
Subject: Re: Are you interested in a state license for cannabis?

Jacquelyn:

Does this apply only to Commercial Grows, or Personal Grows, or both.

Steve Craig

On Jul 26, 2016, at 8:30 AM, Nickerson, Jacquelyn x5240
<NickersonJ@co.monterey.ca.us> wrote:

Good Morning,

On behalf of Craig Spencer, please see the email below.

Thank you.

Begin forwarded message:

Subject: Are you interested in a state license for cannabis?

Calling all cannabis industry members interested in a state license!

The California Department of Food and Agriculture's Medical Cannabis Cultivation Program (MCCP) is preparing to issue state cannabis cultivation licenses beginning in January 2018. We would like to get a sense of how many applicants the State can expect

to:

- Apply for licensure
- Use the Track and Trace system

We would appreciate if you would take a few minutes to complete the short survey at the following link:

www.surveymonkey.com/r/JH5RZVC

Feel free to forward the survey link to others that may not have received it directly. As we move forward in our program planning process, surveys will be one of the tools MCCP uses to gather information we need from the industry. A more detailed survey specific to cultivation sites will be sent through our listserv and posted to our website (www.cdfa.ca.gov/is/mccp) in the coming weeks, so keep an eye out! If you haven't already, please sign up for our automatic emails through our listserv at: www.cdfa.ca.gov/subscriptions/?cdfa_list_isd_medical_cannabis.

We appreciate your feedback and would like your input. Feel free to contact us if you have questions at cdfa.mccp@cdfa.ca.gov or by phone at (916) 263-0801.

MCCP Team

Note: Cdfa is not capturing any information that would indicate who is submitting information through this survey.

<image001.jpg>

From: Spencer, Craig x5233
To: Nickerson, Jacquelyn x5240
Subject: FW: Jardine 's
Date: Thursday, September 1, 2016 2:07:58 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: Steve Craig [<mailto:stevecraig.turtlecreek@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 7:54 AM
To: Fred Kenyon
Cc: Spencer, Craig x5233
Subject: Re: Jardine 's

Fred:

Mike Jardine told us he is pulling water from Hames Valley, the Porter Ranch, possibly even spoils water from the Trio Petroleum drilling, knowing that ownership. This would make for some pretty poisonous product. The ownership of Porter Ranch includes one son who was jailed for starting a fire while being a fire fighter because he wanted the overtime (5 years ago).

Mike himself is decent; but I think he is running the risk of being an accessory to illegal grows. He did our compression on our pad years ago.

We need signage approved by the Sheriff stating clearly grows over 100 square feet are not permitted in this zone.

I would report the incident to the Sheriff or to the Federal DEA agency in SF.

We have reported about 6 incidents.....this way we establish a record, both federal and state.

I also understand grading in the backcountry for expanding marijuana grow shelters caused the fire called the Chimney or Nacimeinto fire which is currently ruining grape harvests due to settling ash on ripening fruit. Yesterday, the investigators backed off this story to say they were studying the onset of the fire more before making a final determination. Very strange.

Also, forward your complaint to all five Districts and Craig Spencer who is managing the issue for the County. "Spencer, Craig x5233" <spencerc@co.monterey.ca.us>

Let me know what you end up doing.

Steve

> On Aug 14, 2016, at 7:48 PM, Fred Kenyon <fred.tintent@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> water wagom nearly ran Robin (Freeman) off the road yesterday. Is there anything we can do to stop this?

>

> Sorry, but I've resolved to stop all washboard work until the growers are disarmed while hoping that the water wagons bust an axel.

>

> & Thanks again for the updates.

>

> cheers, f<Screen Shot 2016-08-13 at 4.45.13 PM.png>

From: [Spencer, Craig x5233](#)
To: [Nickerson, Jacquelyn x5240](#)
Subject: FW: More Water Truck Deliveries today for Marijuana Grows in Copperhead
Date: Thursday, September 1, 2016 2:10:02 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: Steve Craig [<mailto:stevecraig.turtlecreek@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 1:18 PM
To: Onciano, Jacqueline x5193; Spencer, Craig x5233; Holm, Carl P. x5103
Cc: 100-District 3 (831) 385-8333; 100-District 2 (831) 755-5022; 100-District 1 (831) 647-7991; 100-District 4 (831) 883-7570; 100-District 5 (831) 647-7755
Subject: More Water Truck Deliveries today for Marijuana Grows in Copperhead

FYI:

While waiting for a tech contractor to arrive to do some work on our house at the G14 and Bryson Hesperia, there were two more deliveries of water today, this time, one unmarked, the other from the Jardines, both 3,000 gallon haulers, headed down from Copperhead on return to King City/Jolon.

It seems the growers just don't have the water in this area to make a go of it, as this is the second full month of deliveries from out of the area.

One wonders why you can't water a lawn in King City, but truckloads of water are at the same time being diverted from beneficial use by overlying users, for grows in Copperhead, Bryson and other parts of the RG/PG zone.

Today was something of a record with four deliveries in less than six hours in Copperhead and Sapaque Valley (Forest River).

I hope this information is kept in mind in considering the suitability of this area for "outdoor grows".

Steve Craig

This page intentionally left blank.