

Taylor Day

From: +15303886491
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 6:57 PM
To: Public Comments
Subject: Voice Mail (5 minutes)
Attachments: audio.mp3

This is Sandra Spargo. I live at 230 illicium place in Morgan ranch. Dear City Council members, I submitted a letter to you for the City Council meeting of June fourteenth. The letter points out the contrast between Morgan Ranch West and Morgan Ranch unit seven funded resolutions regarding the city 's future drainage improvements. These improvements contrasts with the neglect of the city stormwater drainage on the landscape easement that parallels Rich wrote. The easement is composed of nineteen private lots, nineteen owners who have no expertise regarding stormwater laws, and frankly, they cannot stop the dishes. Pollution directly into Slate Creek. This storm water drainage is a shallow ditch and online built of river rock that is sinking into mud. Drainage was built in two thousand one and is covered with pine needles and flora. There is a dilemma between Morgan ranch restrictions and the cities funded landscape resolutions of June fourteen first Morgan Ranches, declaration of restrictions states owners are responsible for maintaining all such easements and all facilities there in at the same time, home owners pay tax to the city for the landscape easement upkeep that includes a storm water drainage, second stormwater drainage paralleling Ridge Road is an improvement for the city 's definition of Morgan ranch units. Evans and Morgan Ranch, West landscape resolutions. They define stormwater drainage as an improvement. So what takes precedence? A stormwater drainage is an improvement. The city's resolution, supported by the landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972 and the Benefit Assessment Act of 1982, or Morgan Ranch, is declaration of restrictions. I have yet to hear from the City Council regarding this dilemma. A written response from the City Council would be appreciated. Please contact me if you have questions. Thank you. And my phone number is 530-388-6491. Thank you.

You received a voice mail from [WIRELESS CALLER](#).

Thank you for using Transcription! If you don't see a transcript above, it's because the audio quality was not clear enough to transcribe.

[Set Up Voice Mail](#)

Taylor Day

From: Sandra Spargo <writingconnection@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 6:50 PM
To: Public Comments
Subject: June 28, 2022, city council public hearing/beginning of meeting

You don't often get email from writingconnection@icloud.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

June 28, 2022

Sandra Spargo
PO Box 2244
230 Elysian Place
Grass Valley, CA 95945
530-388-6491
writingconnection@icloud.com

Dear City Council Members:

I submitted a letter to you for the city council meeting of June 14. The letter points out the contrast between Morgan Ranch West's and Morgan Ranch Unit 7's funded resolutions regarding the City's future drainage improvements. These improvements contrast with the neglect of the City's stormwater drainage on the landscape easement that parallels Ridge Road. The easement is composed of 19 private lots, 19 owners, who have no expertise regarding stormwater laws, and, frankly, they cannot stop the ditch's pollution directly into Slate Creek.

This stormwater drainage is a shallow ditch, non-lined, built of river rock that is sinking into mud. Drainage was built in 2001 and is covered with pine needles and flora.

There is a Dilemma with Between Morgan Ranch Restrictions and the City's Funded Landscape Resolutions of June 14.

First, Morgan Ranch's *Declaration of Restrictions* states *OWNERS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTAINING ALL SUCH EASEMENTS AND ALL FACILITIES THEREIN*. At the same time, homeowners pay tax to the City for the landscape easement's upkeep that includes stormwater drainage.

Second, stormwater drainage paralleling Ridge Road is an *improvement* per the City's definition of Morgan Ranch Unit 7's and Morgan Ranch West's landscape resolutions. They define stormwater drainage as an improvement.

So, what takes precedence? A stormwater drainage is an improvement. The City's Resolutions, supported by the *Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972* and the *Benefit Assessment Act of 1982* or Morgan Ranch's *Declaration of Restrictions*?

I have yet to hear from the city council regarding this dilemma. A written response from the city council would be appreciated.

Please contact me if you have questions.

Thank you.



June 28, 2022

Good evening, Council, and Staff:

I am General Counsel of the Northern California Cannabis Alliance. Please accept this comment in support of allowing two cannabis retail dispensaries in the City of Grass Valley. Specifically, I would like to urge City Council to direct staff to read a broader interpretation of existing Ordinance 5.60.070 and issue a permit to Sierra Flower Co., the second-place applicant.

In the State of California, fewer than 40 percent of jurisdictions license commercial cannabis retail activity. This means that consumers are underserved. When people do not have access to licensed, tested cannabis, they turn to the illicit market. Restricting access to legal cannabis necessarily results in increased demand for illegal cannabis and adds to the already significant law enforcement and public health burdens in our great state. Equally as important, consumers deserve a choice regarding where to purchase cannabis.

A second dispensary aligns with the City's Strategic Goal of Economic Development and Vitality by bringing an additional, highly taxed business to the City. Since some surrounding cities have not authorized cannabis retail, consumers travel to Grass Valley to purchase cannabis, further increasing the number of potential customers to be served by Grass Valley retail cannabis dispensaries. The demand exists, not only in Green Valley but in surrounding communities, and this should be considered when interpreting Ordinance 5.60.070.

Further, narrowly construing Ordinance 5.60.070 effectively creates a monopoly for retail cannabis in Green Valley. It goes without saying that monopolies are bad for consumers and for the marketplace. The negative externalities a monopoly creates certainly outweigh any concerns about issuing a second retail dispensary license.

Adding a second retail dispensary license will provide consumers with a choice about where to purchase cannabis, will create competition that will benefit the consumer, and will support the existing ecosystem of farmers, manufacturers and distributors in Grass Valley and Nevada County, who need licensed retailers to sell their products.

Finally, the City already has the legal authority to issue a second permit. Grass Valley's daytime population is 20,234. With one permit per 7,500 residents, the daytime population is more than 5,000 people beyond the threshold the City designated to permit a second cannabis retail dispensary. The City therefore has the authority to issue permits for two cannabis retail businesses under paragraph D.1 of Ordinance 5.60.070. No amendment is necessary to grant a permit to Sierra Flower Co.

Allowing Sierra Flower Co. to open a second retail cannabis business, as considered in the Ordinance, will ensure that consumers have a choice about where to purchase cannabis, create a fair market, and support licensed cannabis farmers in Nevada County. This second retail

dispensary is contemplated within the existing Ordinance. I urge you to please direct staff to interpret the existing Ordinance to allow for two cannabis retail dispensaries.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Chris Czaplak', with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

Chris Czaplak
General Counsel, Northern California Cannabis Alliance

Taylor Day

From: Alicia Brown <alicia.brownn@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 6:46 PM
To: Public Comments
Subject: Support of 2 dispensary's in Grass Valley

[You don't often get email from alicia.brownn@outlook.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Good evening,

We live in the Auburn area and my family supports having 2 dispensaries in Grass Valley. We currently have to drive to Nevada city, I also know of some elderly neighbors that drive that far as well! I also find female ran businesses empowering, Sierra Flower & Co. has our full support!

Alicia Brown
9168657708

Sent from my iPad