

From: [George MacDonald](#)
To: [Trish Turner](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Update
Date: Wednesday, September 13, 2023 3:12:29 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

Hello Ms. Turner,

I am continuing to review this matter with my clients. Since our call, we have also received additional documents and information and what appears to be a new site plan from the County that we had not previously seen. We are continuing to review the significance of these documents.

Best,
George MacDonald

George MacDonald
Attorney at Law
Katzoff & Riggs LLP
9779 Broadmoor Way
Kelseyville, CA 95451
Tel: 707.277.9200
gmacdonald@katzoffriggs.com

CONFIDENTIAL AND PRIVILEGED: This transmittal is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the transmittal to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

From: [George MacDonald](#)
To: [Trish Turner](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Opposition to UP 21-17
Date: Wednesday, September 13, 2023 5:17:07 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[Grant Deed for 11635 Seigler Springs North.pdf](#)
[3472_001.pdf](#)

Dear Planner Turner,

My office represents The Divine Avataric Holy Domains of Adidam Ruchiradam, a California nonprofit religious organization recognized as a church (“Holy Domains”), regarding Major Use Permit 21-17 and the commercial cannabis project (the “Project”) proposed for 11615 and 11625 Seigler Springs North Road, Kelseyville, CA 95451. Among other properties in the direct vicinity of the Project, Holy Domains owns two properties adjoining the Project site that are located at 11635 Seigler Springs North Road (APN 115-007-07) (the “11635 Property”) and 11715 Seigler Springs North (APN 115-015-03) (the “11715 Property”). Holy Domains opposes the Project based on the following grounds, in addition to many other grounds that will be presented during the public comment period.

As discussed during our telephone call on September 6, 2023, the Project application and description provide that access to the Project site for construction, development, commercial cannabis cultivation, operation of the commercial cannabis enterprise, and the transport and distribution of finished cannabis product will be over the 11635 Property pursuant to authorization provided by the owner of that property. No easement is discussed in any of the materials. During our call, you told me that the applicant submitted a letter from an individual named “Prather” authorizing access over and use of the 11635 Property for the cannabis Project. In response, I told you that Holy Domains owns the 11635 Property and that the organization opposes the Project and objects to any use of, or access over, the 11635 Property for the Project. On September 11, 2023, your office provided a copy of a letter from Danny Prather as “owner of 11635 Seigler Springs North Road, parcel number 115-007-070” (the “Prather Letter”) dated May 25, 2021 relating to the Project application.

The applicant of the Project is not authorized or entitled to use the 11635 Property as access for the Project or for any other reason. Attached is the Grant Deed for the 11635 Property in the name of Holy Domains, as you requested. Danny Prather does not own the 11635 Property, is not a member of the Holy Domains organization, is not an agent for Holy Domains, and has absolutely no authority with respect to the 11635 Property. It is very concerning to my office and my client that the applicant submitted this apparently false authorization letter in connection with the Project application. Also concerning is that the applicant intends to build a road on the 11635 Property and use it as the access for the cannabis Project without any discussion with my client, who owns the property as part of their religious sanctuary.

We also note the purported “Grant of Easement” recorded October 29, 1993 referenced in your email below. However, contrary to the position of your email below, the Official Records for the County of Lake establish that the Grant of Easement does not provide “ingress and egress access easement rights” over the 11635 Property to the Project site.

Our understanding of the Official Record in this regard is as follows: The Grant of Easement was signed by James Phillip Gerace on October 22, 1993. On January 12, 1993, James Gerace conveyed his right, title and interest in the 11635 Property to Lucille O. Gerace by Document No. 93-000613 that was recorded that same day. Then on March 29, 1993, James Gerace again conveyed all right, title, or interest of his in the 11635 Property to Lucille O. Gerace by Document No. 93-006002, that was recorded on April 2, 1993. Then on February 4, 1994, Lucille O. Gerace conveyed her right, title and interest in the 11635 Property to James Phillip Gerace by Document No. 94-002388 that was recorded the same day. The Grant of Easement was signed by James Gerace on October 22, 1993, at a time when Lucille Gerace, not James Gerace, owned the 11635 Property. Therefore, the Grant of Easement is invalid and unenforceable against Holy Domains or any owner of the 11635 Property. Moreover, no easement or right of way, including the Grant of Easement, were described in any of the legal descriptions in the current vesting deeds for the involved properties. This is likely for good reason as the Grant of Easement is invalid and unenforceable and no other purported easement exists. The conclusion is that the Project site has no legal access and therefore cannot proceed.

As further mentioned in our September 6 call, the Project site is proposed for properties located within the cannabis exclusion area, which goes entirely unaddressed in the Project application materials that were provided to us by your office. The application of the cannabis exclusion area to the Project site must be thoroughly addressed and explained in writing by the applicant in the Project application materials, and by your office in review thereof. We understand that the applicant is planning to squeeze the growing of the cannabis into the extreme north-west corner of the Project site to avoid application of the exclusion area. This should not be permitted and it would be an arbitrary and irrational application of the rule. Art. 27 provides that “commercial cannabis cultivation is prohibited” in the exclusion areas. The term “cannabis cultivation area” is not defined or used in Art. 27 pertaining to the exclusion areas and their application, and therefore, that term has no application to this analysis. Art. 68 defines “cannabis cultivation” as “any activity involving the germinating, cloning, seed production, planting, growing, and harvesting of cannabis plants and the on-site drying, curing, grading, or trimming of cannabis plants.” The Art. 68 definition of cannabis cultivation appears to be intentionally broad and encompasses *any activities involving cannabis*. Is the Project applicant certifying that it will conduct absolutely no activities whatsoever involving cannabis on the remainder of the Project site, and how does the County intend to police compliance with the exclusion area for this Project? Allowing commercial cannabis cultivation to take place on parcels located within the commercial cannabis exclusion area contradicts the plain intention of the exclusion area ordinance and would also be impossible for the County to police. This simply cannot be permitted to occur and our position is that any such interpretation of the application of the exclusion area ordinance would be contrary to law.

The last point mentioned in our September 6 call concerns the water study and analysis provided by the applicant in the Project application. The water study and analysis is inadequate because, among other reasons, it fails to analyze or consider the multiple water wells located on the properties owned by Holy Domains that are used by their community for both potable water and other residential and religious uses. For example, no drawdown tests or any other analysis were performed on the wells used by the Holy Domains community. The water study also fails to consider or discuss the water usage needs of the Holy Domains community, which is a relatively large residential community directly adjacent to the Project site. One of the wells, and an important water sources, used by the Holy Domains community

is located on the real property identified by APN 115-015-02, which is a small parcel located south and downhill very close from the Project. The water study and hydrology report for the Project should analyze the impacts of the water usage and pollution by the Project on this particular well, in addition to the other wells used by Holy Domains.

It is concerning that the applicant has never reached out to Holy Domains about its water uses and needs or the applicant's proposal to build a road on the lands of Holy Domains (i.e., the 11635 Property) for the Project. The applicant should be a "good neighbor" and should have been candid, forthright, and communicative about its plans in regard to the Project and the 11635 Property. Based on the foregoing, and for additional reasons that may be presented in these proceedings, Holy Domains opposed UP 21-17.

Sincerely,
George MacDonald

Best,
George MacDonald

George MacDonald
Attorney at Law
Katzoff & Riggs LLP
9779 Broadmoor Way
Kelseyville, CA 95451
Tel: 707.277.9200
gmacdonald@katzoffriggs.com

CONFIDENTIAL AND PRIVILEGED: This transmittal is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the transmittal to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

From: Trish Turner <Trish.Turner@lakecountyca.gov>
Sent: Friday, September 8, 2023 3:54 PM
To: George MacDonald <gmacdonald@katzoffriggs.com>
Subject: RE: Follow Up

Thank You.

I would like to note that there is a recorded easement on 115-007-07 that was recorded October 29, 1993, that gives ingress and egress access easement rights to 115-007-03, 115-007-06, and 115-015-01.

Have a Great Weekend!!

Trish Turner
Assistant Planner II

I appreciate your help with this.

Sincerely,

Heather Critser
Office Manager

Katzoff and Riggs
9779 Broadmoor Way
Kelseyville, CA 95451
707-277-9200

CONFIDENTIAL AND PRIVILEGED

This transmittal is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the transmittal to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

KATZOFF & RIGGS LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
9779 BROADMOOR WAY
KELSEYVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95451
www.katzoﬀriggs.com

Telephone (707) 277-9200
Direct Dial (707) 277-9203

Writer's E-Mail: gmacdonald@katzoﬀriggs.com

August 16, 2023

VIA EMAIL AND U.S. MAIL

Trish Turner – Assistant Planner II
Community Development Department
County of Lake
255 North Forbes Street
Lakeport, CA 95453
Tel: (707) 263-2221
Email: trish.turner@lakecountyca.gov


Re: REQUEST FOR NOTICE re Major Use Permit 21-17; IS 21-18; EA 21-17
Project: Seigler Springs North Cultivation Project, Major Use Permit 21-17,
Initial Study 21-18; Early Activation 21-17
Project Location: 11615 and 11625 Seigler Springs North Road, Kelseyville, CA
95451

Dear Planner Turner:

This letter constitutes a formal Request for Notice pursuant to Lake County Zoning Ordinance, 57.4 concerning the Seigler Springs North Cultivation Project, Major Use Permit 21-17, Initial Study 21-18; Early Activation 21-1754 (collectively, the "Project"). This office represents The Divine Avatic Holy Domains of Adidam Ruchiradam, a California nonprofit religious organization recognized as a church ("Holy Domains") as interested persons concerning the Project. Please provide Holy Domains, in care of the undersigned, with any and all notices involving the Project, including notices of public comment periods, hearings, deliberations, or other action items on the Project.

Please provide all such notices relating to the Project to: Holy Domains, c/o George MacDonald, Katzoff & Riggs LLP, 9779 Broadmoor Way, Kelseyville, CA 95451 or by email to gmacdonald@katzoﬀriggs.com.

Sincerely,



George MacDonald, Esq.

GM:krl

Sent: Friday, July 28, 2023 12:40 PM
To: Trish Turner <Trish.Turner@lakecountyca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Request for Documents

Hi Trish,

I spoke to you on the phone regarding a project titled “Seigler Springs North, UP 21-17, IS 21-18” located at 11615 and 11625 Seigler Springs North Road, and am writing to request any documents that you may have regarding this project. They can be sent to this email address or, if it suits you better, I am happy to come pick them up in person. We are willing to pay for copies, should there be a fee. Please feel free to contact me here via email or call my office at 707 277 9200 should you need more information or have questions.

I appreciate your help with this.

Sincerely,

Heather Critser
Office Manager

Katzoff and Riggs
9779 Broadmoor Way
Kelseyville, CA 95451
707-277-9200

CONFIDENTIAL AND PRIVILEGED

This transmittal is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the transmittal to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

From: [George MacDonald](#)
To: [Trish Turner](#)
Cc: [Malgorzata Zuk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Public Comment re Opposition to UP 21-17
Date: Wednesday, February 28, 2024 5:40:24 PM

Hello Planner Turner,

I am writing to touch base on our email below regarding UP 21-17. Will you please let us know times your office is available for an in-person meeting? As of now, next week is fairly open for me. We look forward to it.

Best,
George MacDonald

George MacDonald
Attorney at Law
Katzoff & Riggs LLP
9779 Broadmoor Way
Kelseyville, CA 95451
Tel: 707.277.9200
gmacdonald@katzoffriggs.com
Eligible to Practice in California and Texas

CONFIDENTIAL AND PRIVILEGED: This transmittal is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the transmittal to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

From: George MacDonald
Sent: Monday, February 19, 2024 1:49 PM
To: Trish Turner <Trish.Turner@lakecountycal.gov>
Cc: Malgorzata Zuk <mzuk@holydomains.org>
Subject: RE: Public Comment re Opposition to UP 21-17

Hello Planner Turner,

I am writing regarding the pending application for Use Permit 21- 17 for commercial cannabis cultivation on 11615 and 11625 Seigler Springs North Road, Kelseyville, CA on behalf of The Divine Avataric of Holy Domains of Adidam Ruchiradam (“Holy Domains”), a California nonprofit religious organization recognized as a church.

We would like to schedule an in-person meeting with your office to discuss the application of the Zoning Ord. Art. 27(at)(1)(v) entitled “Commercial Cannabis Cultivation Exclusion Areas”, Subsection “h” which prohibits commercial cannabis cultivation within 1,000 feet of the following “areas or uses:” “A licensed child care facility or nursery school, church or youth-oriented facility catering to or providing services primarily intended for minors.” We invite Lake County Counsel to attend the meeting as well.

As has been discussed in the UP 21-17 proceedings, lands owned by Holy Domains that are adjacent to the project site are part of the church and used as such by Holy Domains and its members, which include minors. We would like to understand how the Community Development Department interprets the cannabis cultivation area concerning lands owned and used as a church when applied to Holy Domains, and more generally, the lands of any church in Lake County. We would also like to understand the Community Development Department's reasoning(s) behind said interpretation(s).

Would you please let us know dates and times for the meeting at your offices? I am available to meet at the following times: February 21, 24 at any time, Feb. 22 before noon, February 23 before noon, or February 27 – March 1 at any time.

Best,
George MacDonald

George MacDonald
Attorney at Law
Katzoff & Riggs LLP
9779 Broadmoor Way
Kelseyville, CA 95451
Tel: 707.277.9200
gmacdonald@katzoffriggs.com
Eligible to Practice in California and Texas

CONFIDENTIAL AND PRIVILEGED: This transmittal is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the transmittal to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

From: George MacDonald
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 10:10 AM
To: Trish Turner <Trish.Turner@lakecountyca.gov>
Subject: Public Comment re Opposition to UP 21-17

Planner Turner,

Attached is a public comment in opposition to UP 21-17. We request that the attached be provided to the Planning Commission in advance of the hearing set for October 26, 2023.

Best,
George MacDonald

George MacDonald
Attorney at Law
Katzoff & Riggs LLP
9779 Broadmoor Way

Kelseyville, CA 95451
Tel: 707.277.9200
gmacdonald@katzoffriggs.com

CONFIDENTIAL AND PRIVILEGED: This transmittal is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the transmittal to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

From: [Malgorzata Zuk](#)
To: [Trish Turner](#)
Cc: wallym@adidam.org
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] UP 21-17
Date: Wednesday, February 14, 2024 9:09:37 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

Good morning, Ms. Turner.

Thank you for a prompt response. The Notice provides for a period of "public review" ending on February 25. How is "public review" different from "public comment", and what types of actions the public could take in response to the application by February 25 that would be barred after that date?

Sincerely,
Gosia

On Fri, Feb 9, 2024 at 3:21 PM Trish Turner <Trish.Turner@lakecountyca.gov> wrote:

Good Afternoon,

Thank you for reaching out to the Community Development Department for the Seigler Springs North project. Please see my responses below in red.

1. Has the application been amended or changed since the last public hearing in October 2023? **No, there have been no changes made to the cannabis cultivation scope of the project, however the applicant did complete a tree study for the tree removal on the property.**
2. Has the hydrology report been updated since Annejanette Dodd submitted a revised report on May 19, 2023? **There has been no change in the scope of the project, so the hydrology study stands.**
3. Please email me the most recent notice sent out by the County regarding the public review period that began on January 26, 2024. **I sent out a new Notice of Intent and recirculated the Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration due to the tree removal and replacement. I also sent out a new AB52 notice to the surrounding tribes, to see if they will request a tribal consultation for the comments made at the Planning Commission.**

It was nice to meet you recently. I am following up on our conversation and writing to request additional information about the current status of the Application for Use Permit 21-17 and Initial Study 21-18:

1. Has the application been amended or changed since the last public hearing in October 2023?

2. Has the hydrology report been updated since Annejanette Dodd submitted a revised report on May 19, 2023?

3. Please email me the most recent notice sent out by the County regarding the public review period that began on January 26, 2024.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Gosia

Małgorzata Żuk

General Counsel

Adidam Holy Domains

(707) 355-2020

From: [Malgorzata Zuk](#)
To: [Trish Turner](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] UP 21-17
Date: Wednesday, February 14, 2024 9:50:06 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

Thank you. Could you point me to a location (a link) where the comments can be posted?

Best regards,
Gosia

On Wed, Feb 14, 2024 at 9:12 AM Trish Turner <Trish.Turner@lakecountyca.gov> wrote:

It is the same thing. The public review period, is the public comment period. With that being said, we will always accept comments even after the public review period closes.



Trish Turner

Assistant Planner II

Department of Community Development

255 N. Forbes St.

Lakeport, CA 95453

Phone: (707) 263-2221 x 38112

Fax: (707) 263-2225

Email: trish.turner@lakecountyca.gov

STAY CONNECTED:



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient of this message or their agent, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply email and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, copying, or storage of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited.

From: Malgorzata Zuk <mzuk@holydomains.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2024 9:09 AM
To: Trish Turner <Trish.Turner@lakecountyca.gov>
Cc: wallym@adidam.org
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] UP 21-17

Good morning, Ms. Turner.

Thank you for a prompt response. The Notice provides for a period of "public review" ending on February 25. How is "public review" different from "public comment", and what types of actions the public could take in response to the application by February 25 that would be barred after that date?

Sincerely,

Gosia

On Fri, Feb 9, 2024 at 3:21 PM Trish Turner <Trish.Turner@lakecountyca.gov> wrote:

Good Afternoon,

Thank you for reaching out to the Community Development Department for the Seigler Springs North project. Please see my responses below in red.

1. Has the application been amended or changed since the last public hearing in October 2023? **No, there have been no changes made to the cannabis cultivation scope of the project, however the applicant did complete a tree study for the tree removal on the property.**
2. Has the hydrology report been updated since Annejanette Dodd submitted a revised report on May 19,2023? **There has been no change in the scope of the project, so the hydrology study stands.**

3. Please email me the most recent notice sent out by the County regarding the public review period that began on January 26, 2024. I sent out a new Notice of Intent and recirculated the Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration due to the tree removal and replacement. I also sent out a new AB52 notice to the surrounding tribes, to see if they will request a tribal consultation for the comments made at the Planning Commission.

Sincerely,



Trish Turner

Assistant Planner II

Department of Community Development

255 N. Forbes St.

Lakeport, CA 95453

Phone: (707) 263-2221 x 38112

Fax: (707) 263-2225

Email: trish.turner@lakecountycalifornia.gov

STAY CONNECTED:



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient of this message or their agent, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply email and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, copying, or storage of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited.

From: Malgorzata Zuk <mzuk@holydomains.org>
Sent: Friday, February 9, 2024 3:12 PM
To: Trish Turner <Trish.Turner@lakecountyca.gov>
Cc: Wally Muszynski <wallym@adidam.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] UP 21-17

Planner Turner,

It was nice to meet you recently. I am following up on our conversation and writing to request additional information about the current status of the Application for Use Permit 21-17 and Initial Study 21-18:

1. Has the application been amended or changed since the last public hearing in October 2023?
2. Has the hydrology report been updated since Annejanette Dodd submitted a revised report on May 19,2023?
3. Please email me the most recent notice sent out by the County regarding the public review period that began on January 26, 2024.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Gosia

Małgorzata Żuk

General Counsel

Adidam Holy Domains

| | (707) 355-2020

SEIGLER SPRINGS NORTH UP 21-17 eComments for 10/26/2023

Meeting: Planning Commission on 2023-10-26 9:00 AM - Please see agenda for public participation information and eComment submission on any agenda item.

Item: 6a. 23-1168 Consideration of Proposed Major Use Permit (UP 21-17), and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS 21-18), for Approval of Commercial Cannabis Cultivation Consisting of 174,240 sf of Outdoor Canopy Located within 196,020 sf Cultivation Area; for Seigler Springs North/Brian Pensack; located at 11615 and 11625 Seigler Springs North Road, Kelseyville (APNs 115-007-03 and 115-007-06)

Paul Edoa submitted a new eComment.

eComment: This project would disastrously erode the water table, bring harmful chemicals into the naturally beautiful landscape and be a greater burden on the energy costs of the county. No bueno.

Gosia Zuk submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I strongly oppose the proposed cannabis project because it will dangerously reduce the amount of water available for the community, create noise, air pollution, and unwanted light at night. It will attract noisy vehicle traffic into what is now a peaceful and quiet area. A cannabis operation of this size may attract crime and require armed guards, all of which would threaten people who happen to walk in the area. I say "no" to chemical contamination of water and soil, and ugly greenhouses on a hill overlooking the land that was recognized as sacred since ancient time.

Michael Goforth submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I have lived in Lake County for 27 years and visited often for the 12 years before that. My father, water skied here as a young man. I am a member of the Adidam Religious Community that has the Mountain of Attention Meditation Center that is next to the proposed Cannabis Grow. This is to industrial, an operation for this area. The developers of this property should find another location in Lake County, not in a residential area near a Meditation Retreat Center. Additional reasons to deny this use permit are: 1) Overuse of limited water; 2) Pollution of water that runs through the Meditation Retreat Center; 3) Noise, air and light pollution; 4) Traffic congestion; 5) Guards may intimidate and threaten people who stray near the plantings. Sincerely, Michael Miguel Goforth: Internet, Search, Social Media, Marketing Consultant & Tutor at Web GoForth ISSMMCT: Retired. Home Owner Kelseyville Riviera. 9570 Fairway Dr. Kelseyville Ca 95451 home 707-928-4796, Cell 7072921215.

Isabelle Trudeau submitted a new eComment.

eComment: As a resident of the area I oppose the granting of a use permit for this very large scale cannabis cultivation. My concerns are many: transformation of a calm and secure neighborhood into a busy commercial zone (with lots of road traffic, noise and light pollution), and the inevitable pollution of the watershed (including the nearby protected wetlands by the side of North Seigler road)

D. Hal submitted a new eComment.

eComment: The idea of putting a grow in this area, most likely because it is considered 'remote', is absurd and irresponsible. This area happens to not only have a concentration of long time residents and home owners, but frequent out-of-county visitors who come to specifically enjoy the serenity and peace of the area. Putting in a grow of this magnitude is irresponsible for the following reasons: 1) there is no well on the proposed property so the full environmental impact on the local water table is unknown, 2) the roads into this area are poorly maintained and narrow, while also having high foot traffic in some places, 3) the smell of a grow would destroy quality of life for the concentration of residents and visitors in the area, 4) the potential for criminal activity and resulting security measures would disrupt and darken the neighborhood.

Shasta McBride submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I oppose this project because of the severe use of water it will require in an already drought-stricken environment. I also oppose this project because the cannabis market is already oversaturated which creates very low pay for workers and owners, bad investments, and overuse of Lake County's resources. These are not good things to help a community flourish.

Indigo Perry submitted a new eComment.

eComment: The extreme use of water in such a fire-prone area is utterly irresponsible, not to mention the blight on the landscape. Property values will almost certainly be affected.

Alexandra Gandolf submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I strongly oppose the granting of this major use permit. The proposed cannabis operation would significantly alter the natural environment and disturb the serenity of the surrounding neighborhoods. It would severely deplete scarce water resources, cause air and water pollution, and increase traffic on a narrow country road. There is a spiritual sanctuary very close by that people come to from all over the world for peaceful retreat. Please do not allow this huge commercial operation to forever change this beautiful landscape and the lives of residents of the area.

Julie Payette submitted a new eComment.

eComment: We are in a high risk fire area. Most are even having trouble getting fire insurance. We should not deplete our water supply by a sizeable commercial undertaking such as this.

Steve Alexander submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I am a 30 year resident of the area and a homeowner a short distance from the proposed grow. Our neighborhood has faced some significant impact from commercial farming operations already including Snow's Lake Vineyard which destroyed thousands of acres of native countryside, increasing noise, traffic and introducing the use of pesticides very close to residential areas. There is also already a commercial cannibals operation a short distance away which as increased traffic and noise. One of my biggest concerns is also the effect on the water table which was already greatly impacted by the vineyards. I feel that will negatively impact our quality of life here. I have also heard that many commercial cannabis operations push the limits of what they are permitted to do and I am concerned that their are sufficient resources now to keep on top of this. Our area is still a healthy and happy place for people to live and I hope it remains so.

Francis Scott submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I'm very concerned about the severe environmental impact this large scale commercial/industrial operation will have on this area. Particularly the retreat Sanctuary property adjacent. Not to mention the impact and concern this will have on the existing wells that the Sanctuary retreat Property rely on. Are there not protective zoning laws that inhibit large commercial operations from encroaching into Sanctuary areas?

Sandra Hill submitted a new eComment.

eComment: Think a hundred skunks moving into the area and leaving their penetrating lasting stink, this is what it feels like to have a big grow like near, plus all the depletion of water, chemicals, reduced safety increased activity, lights and noise from fans at night. The smell penetrates into the house, you can not leave windows open to cool house and night so bills increase because you need to keep AC on, cant sit outside much of the growing and drying season. We are barely recovered from the fires, less water will endanger our own supply and fire safety. I was not able to rent my home due to stink. Property values will go down. Please have mercy. If you do not want a grow yourself near you, please do not force others to accept the same. Small grows happen all the time in this area, and I had a illegal grow next to me with 100 plants. I eventually moved. When a new grow started near my burned property later, I decided to sell the property and not built. Its that bad for many of us already.

tom shannon submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I am very concerned about water usage and water pollution. This operation will severely tax the aquafer. I live near by and rely on well water. We have already experienced lack of water,

many times due to the already existing marijuana operations in the area. There is also the matter of noise pollution, increased traffic, and a huge carbon footprint. Please do not allow this operation.
thank you

Michela Barcus submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I am opposed. This project will deplete resources on several levels, create increased fire risk, create noise to an area that for decades has been home to a Spiritual Retreat Sanctuary, bring industry into a rural and quiet residential area, negatively affect the water resources. It really is not appropriate use of this land.

Matthew Spence submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I oppose granting the Major Use Permit for Commercial Cannabis Cultivation on North Siegler Road in Middletown. The proposed cultivation area of 196,020 sf would constitute an industrial agricultural installation that is inconsistent with and would significantly change the ecology of the surrounding untouched rural landscape by: • Using vast quantities of water, thereby depleting aquifers • Causing 24/7 industrial noise pollution from drying fans • Causing industrial-level ecological pollution through the discharge of sediments, pesticides, fertilizers, and petroleum products into the watershed • Causing light pollution throughout the night • Significantly increasing auto and truck traffic on an unpaved rural road • Eroding the community's safety and trust by attracting criminal interest in the area.

Saleen Hinds submitted a new eComment.

eComment: Small farms, in contrast to large corporate farming, offer a more positive impact on the environment and communities. They use fewer pesticides and herbicides, preserving pollinators. Conservation practices like reduced tillage enhance soil health, reducing erosion. Shorter supply chains cut transportation emissions, and sustainable practices capture carbon. Small farms optimize resource use, while corporate farms overuse resources. Smaller farms are community-focused, creating jobs and supporting local economies. They distribute income equitably, reducing inequality. Small farms prioritize soil health, community, and sustainability. Supporting small farms is vital for a sustainable and equitable agricultural future. - Cyril Hinds, Lake County resident.

Charles Syrett submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I have been on meditation retreat at The Mountain Of Attention Sanctuary many times over the years, and I greatly value the peace and quiet of the area. This current proposal would be right on the periphery of the Sanctuary. It would utterly alter the landscape of the region and compromise water supply and many other environmental issues.

Rick Evans submitted a new eComment.

eComment: Cannabis operations like this are noisy and smelly. We already have a couple of them on the outskirts of our Seigler Springs neighborhood and it would impact us negatively in many ways to have an even larger one closer by. A major consideration is that the proposed grow would divert a huge amount of water in a dry area that needs to prioritize fire protection. For me personally the worst thing would be the disturbance created at the adjacent retreat Sanctuary which is used by many of us in the local community and others from around the world. We greatly value the peacefulness therein.

Rosamond Groves submitted a new eComment.

eComment: to whom it may concern, I'm concerned about several things regarding a proposed cannabis operation On North Seigler Springs Road -pesticides, fertilizers, petroleum products used for the operation and trash generated by the operation could make their way into the streams that feed the Sanctuary springs and local watershed• -depletion of water (cannabis operation of this size would use a vast quantity of water) -increased traffic ,the project description states that there will be several employees on site, among many other things Please respect the concerns of neighbors and reject this proposal Thank you, Rosamond Groves

William Stranger submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I live at 11475 Seigler Springs North Road just a few hundred yards away from the proposed outdoor cannabis grow. I am deeply opposed to the permitting of either an indoor or an outdoor cannabis grow on the property. It took me two years to return here after the Valley Fire of 2015. It has taken eight years since that fire for the deer population to be replenished. The proposed grow site is key habitat for those deer, who sleep there at night and come down to the lake on the Mountain Of Attention Sanctuary in the late afternoon and evening. Most importantly, the proposed grow immediately adjoins and overlooks that Sanctuary, which is a place of retreat for hundreds of Lake County and Northern California residents and a place of religious and spiritual pilgrimage for people from around the world. Besides drawing yet more water from our wells and creating unwanted activity, noise, and traffic, any grow would irrevocably compromise the privacy and repose of that Sanctuary.

Melani Jordan submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I am deeply opposed to this proposal of a commercial cannabis operation of this magnitude in the area. It is time that policy makers and community leaders take responsibility for the profound impacts of their decisions on the environment and human life locally and globally, given the compound effects we are seeing all over the world at this time. Commerce cannot rule and our choices, however small, have impacts for generations. Please heed all the opposition to this

operation on the grounds of water rights, pollution of all kinds, and preservation of the rural peace of Lake County. Thank you.

Harold Barcus submitted a new eComment.

eComment: The applicant property directly abuts a religious retreat center known as The Mountain of Attention Sanctuary. This facility is used for contemplative purposes only. Its caretakers spent decades preserving the pristine qualities of the grounds and surrounding environment. The proposed agricultural operation could seriously threaten continuation of religious practices as traditionally conducted on this uniquely maintained property. Of particular concern are noise, odors, chemical drift, degradation of water supplies, and general environmental alteration detrimental to the peaceful and serene nature of the sanctuary vicinity that has well supported religious activities there for many years. In order to support and maintain the unaltered continuation of sacred activities as traditionally practiced at the long-established religious retreat facility adjacent to the applicant property, I oppose granting of the use permit and urge denial of the application.

Rachel Key submitted a new eComment.

eComment: Hi, my name is Rachel Key (56 y.o) I live 5 minutes from the Mountain of Attention and work there several times a week. I am a member of a peaceful and quiet retreat Centre (the Mountain of Attention) which is owned by the Adidam non-profit community. This Retreat Centre sits right next to this potential grow. We run quiet retreats and value the peace and quiet and natural environment. A large grow would cause huge disturbance. Traffic on the shared road. Potential loud humming of lights, loud generator in the case of power outages. The "pong" of "skunk" throughout our Sacred Holy land. These are only the negative factors I can take a guess at. My fellow Adidam members will have more specifics to write. I ADAMANDLY OPPOSE this grow near our Retreat Centre. Thank you for the opportunity to protest.

Robert Shaffer submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I am a resident of the Seigler Springs area on Seigler Springs North Road, Many vineyards and cannabas operations have set up in this area in recent years. These are heavy water users. The aquifer we use, which has been reliable for many years, is reaching its limit and beginning to show signs of overuse. Rainfall in Northern California is becoming less reliable, as shown by the multi-year drought before last year. Expanded demands on this aquifer will have significant negative impacts on existing residents. The proposed project will also create additional traffic and noise, as well as pollution, in this quiet, secluded neighborhood. The Adidam facility has occupied this site for fifty years. For centuries humans have come to the natural hot springs here as a center for healing. To damage this resource in the name of short term extractive profits would be a tragedy and a travesty. Please do not approve the major cannabis operation at 11625 and 11625 Seigler Springs North Road.

Aspen Asperiny submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I oppose granting the Major Use Permit for Commercial Cannabis Cultivation on North Siegler Road in Middletown. The proposed cultivation area of 196,020 sf would constitute an industrial agricultural installation that is inconsistent with and would significantly change the ecology of the surrounding untouched rural landscape by: Patricia Royman Rosen on October 25, 2023 I oppose the above legislation. We live in Cobb Calif on Fox Drive • Using vast quantities of water, thereby depleting aquifers • Causing 24/7 industrial noise pollution from drying fans • Causing industrial-level ecological pollution through the discharge of sediments, pesticides, fertilizers, and petroleum products into the watershed • Causing light pollution throughout the night • Significantly increasing auto and truck traffic on an unpaved rural road • Eroding the community's safety and trust by attracting criminal interest in the area.

Laura DeBaun submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I vehemently oppose the proposed Cannabis Cultivation on 11615 and 11625 Seigler Spring North. There are multiple reasons why this is a disastrous proposal for our area. The monoculture leaches the land; the deep aquifers would suffer as they already are from other grows in our area. So for the sake of the land, water, air and other resources do not permit this mega cultivation to take root here!

Sally Schumacher submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I live on Ridge Road, which is very close to the proposed site as well as to the Mountain of Attention Sanctuary. I am strongly opposed to a large-scale commercial cannabis operation, which would have an extremely negative impact on the sanctuary and the surrounding neighborhood in terms of depleting our local water supply, causing significant ecological damage, as well as noise and light pollution. Please preserve the peace and quiet of our local environment and do not give permission to this project.

Chris Shanney submitted a new eComment.

eComment: This project represents a dramatic impact on the neighborhood as well as environmental risks. The applicant appears to be dramatically understating the impact on water tables, and dramatically understating the number of plants they will grow. I strictly oppose this effort. The benefit to the county is over ridden to the impact to many county residence in this area environmental concerns depletion of water table noise air pollution ecological destruction grading may cause discharge of sediments into the watershed pesticides, fertilizers, the streams that feed the Sanctuary springs and local watershed toxic chemicals light pollution (lights carbon footprint carbon foo(use of electricity, natural gas, water, fertilizers, greenhouse gas emissions) increased traffic esthetics of the natural surroundings

Jonathan Cottrell submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I have been a regular visitor to the unique sacred sanctuary known as Mountain of Attention since 1989. I am opposed to a proposed commercial cannabis cultivation on land adjacent to the sanctuary for many reasons, some are: ** Strong smell wafting onto the sanctuary. Hundreds of people regularly attend outdoor sacred events there. Strong odors will detract from sacred occasions ** Depletion of water resources. The main area of the sanctuary is 400 acres and requires a regular supply to maintain the plant environment. The proposed cannabis cultivation will disrupt this long-established water use. ** Many people visit the sanctuary from all over the world to enjoy its outstanding natural beauty. As a resident of Lake Co. and a naturalized US citizen originally from Britain. I came here because of the attraction of the Mountain of Attention Sanctuary. A commercial cannabis cultivation does not attract anyone except more traffic and potential criminal element.

Robert Rothemich submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I live on Shenandoah Road near this proposed cannabis farm, and am a member of the Adidam Community at the former Seigler Springs resort. I oppose the cannabis grow and the threat that it proposes to the environment due to extreme water use, increased traffic, industrial waste and pollution, and the risk of crime and criminal elements. Our retreat sanctuary at Seigler Springs is a pristine and peaceful place for meditation and religious practice and this operation is adjacent to the sanctuary property. Our church has been at this sanctuary for 50 years, and we have had to preserve the property in the past from geothermal development, a proposed airport, and expanding vineyards. We ask for Supervisors support to preserve this sacred place.

Wendy Weiss submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I strongly oppose the proposed Cannabis Cultivation on 11615 and 11625 Seigler Spring North. It is too close to residents and will forever alter and impact the residents and natural beauty, serene quiet, and safety that draws residents to this area. There will be a vast depletion of water for the area and residents. This extremely large grow will add air pollution. There will be ecological destruction from grading causing a discharge of sediments into the watershed. Pesticides, fertilizers, and petroleum products could make their way into the streams that feed the local area, animals, and are used by local residents. The increased traffic and need for security will greatly impact the area and change it forever. A grow of cannabis this large may attract a criminal element, forever eroding the community's sense of safety and trust. For all these reasons please do not approve the major cannabis operation at 11625 and 11625 Seigler Springs North Road.

Nancy Dent submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I live in this neighborhood and am completely opposed to more cannabis production in our area. The water levels are down already, and who knows what kind of chemicals are leaching into the wells. Also the prospect of light pollution with lots of night production or harvesting does not belong in a rural residential neighborhood. Lastly, I used to enjoy walks down the north Seigler

Springs Road, but when the last cannabis operation was started, there were guards with rifles and guard dogs inside their gates, and it felt very threatening in what used to be a friendly community! I seriously oppose this move. There must be another way for Lake County to invite new revenue into our county without selling out to more and more cannabis or vineyard development.

Thomas McBroom submitted a new eComment.

eComment: Excessive use of water. Borders a religious sanctuary!

Brenda Yeager submitted a new eComment.

eComment: As a resident of the Siegler Springs area, I oppose this development. Please do not allow a large-scale commercial enterprise to drain our neighborhood's natural resources & destroy our & our wildlife's quality of life for their own profit. We already face armed guards at the outdoor grow on Siegler Rd when we drive to visit our friends. Please do not invite even more 24-hour armed security into this quiet community. We have watched our friends squeezed out of their uninhabitable homes after vineyards ran their wells dry. The noise, smell, light pollution, constant activity, drain on our aquifer & loss of open land will significantly negatively impact our wildlife's delicate ecosystem after wildfire & mar the unique mountain landscape that residents here steward. This also borders Sacred land at the Mountain of Attention, where people gather for meditative retreat—please consider the impact such a grow would have next door to your own Church. I implore you to protect our neighborhood.

Mark Travis submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I live on North Seigler Springs Rd., near the proposed development, and I (as well as my neighbor) am strongly opposed this project, based on the following facts: 1. The developer has a history of flagrant violations of a previous Use Permit (Vista Farms) that resulted in a Stop Order for illegal grading, etc.. 2. Traffic - We already are impacted by a another very large cannabis operation within a mile of the newly proposed site, (who are already using vast amounts of water and) they have had a substantial impact on local traffic flow - including tractor-trailer and other large delivery trucks. The County does not properly maintain Seigler Springs North Rd. and the width of the road in several blind-curve sections does not comply with County or State standards. In the developer's application, they state the following: "project will include three employees during peak season". There would be at least 6-10 employees required during peak season, possibly many more.

Pamela Williamson submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I moved to Seigler Springs 28 years ago. I oppose this new cannabis project.

Jessica Haigh submitted a new eComment.

eComment: • depletion of water (cannabis operation of this size would use a vast quantity of water) • grading may cause discharge of sediments into the watershed • pesticides, fertilizers, petroleum products used for the operation and trash generated by the operation could make their way into the streams that feed the Sanctuary springs and local watershed • poisoning with toxic chemicals • light pollution (lights during the night could be seen from the neighboring parcels and the Sanctuary) • large cannabis grows have a huge carbon footprint (use of electricity, natural gas, water, fertilizers, greenhouse gas emissions) • increased traffic (the project description states that there will several employees on site, with around 11 – 23 daily car trips estimated to the property, including deliveries) • cannabis grows may attract criminal element, erode the community's sense of safety and trust • guards may intimidate and threaten people who stray near the plantings

Iris Harms submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I and a property owner in the area and strongly oppose the planned cannabis cultivation. The use of fertilizer, pesticides, other toxic chemicals and petroleum products pose a risk to the environment and watershed. I really oppose that growing drugs is the best use of our resources and landscape and it is certainly not for the benefit of the community who will loose the sense of safety and trust. Iris Harms

Frank Hayes submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I oppose the planned project for approval of commercial cannabis growing. Such a project will threaten the environment, watershed, and resources for the -good people of Lake County. I vote against and hope you will oppose this proposed project as well. Thanks, Frank Hayes

Charles Campbell submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I live close to the proposed cannabis cultivation site in Seigler Springs. I oppose the use permit for these reasons: 1) Its industrial size. 2) Its ecological footprint - these grows consume huge amounts of water and electricity 3) The noise of the huge fans used to dry the cannabis is horrendous. 4) There is a retreat center on that road, a place hundreds of people come to for meditation retreats - do we really want to subject them to the smell, noise, and other disturbances that large grows create? 5) The intensive use of fertilizers, pesticides and other chemicals - we've already seen what toxic runoff into Clear Lake has done to this precious resource. 6) It's a question of the direction we want the county to take - support large operations like this or take care of the natural beauty of the county, and head into the future (a future with many questions about climate, water, etc) with a smarter, big-picture approach? Sincerely, Charles F. Campbell 12200 Shenandoah Rd.

Jan Wennes submitted a new eComment.

eComment: To Whom it May Concern: Please do not allow this Permit at 11615 and 11625 Seigler Springs North Road, Kelseyville. I live near this property and am already disturbed by other cannabis cultivation that occurs in the area, such as the fans running late into the night. I moved to Lake County to be in the peace and quite of the countryside. I do not want to live in an industrial center. There will also be traffic impact on a road that is already quite dangerous with a blind corner and an additonal 90 turn on it. We also have seen the impact in this area of industrialization depleting our water supplies. Please do not let this permit. Thank you. Thank you.

eliot hurwitz submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I live about 1 mile from the proposed grow site. I first moved to this area in 1981 and retired back here in 2015, only to have my home burn in the Valley Fire. Since 2015 I have been active full time serving the local Cobb Mt. community's efforts to become a sustainable, resilient eco-adapted place, with special attention to the health of our creeks and our limited water resources. I do not oppose all cannabis but I strongly feel that this project is way out of scale and will have a negative cumiulative impact on the local creeks, already under tremendous stress. Climate changes underway will only make this worse. Seigler Creek is one of the creeks important for Clearlake Hitch spawning and any further degradation of its flow will have a negative impact. The project proposes pumping 86K gallons in April, which is key Hitch time. I also note that the project has not consulted with the proper tribal authorities for cultural assessment. All in all a very bad project for this area.

eliot hurwitz submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I live about 1 mile from the proposed grow site. I first moved to this area in 1981 and retired back here in 2015, only to have my home burn in the Valley Fire. Since 2015 I have been active full time serving the local Cobb Mt. community's efforts to become a sustainable, resilient eco-adapted place, with special attention to the health of our creeks and our limited water resources. I do not oppose all cannabis but I strongly feel that this project is way out of scale and will have a negative cumiulative impact on the local creeks, already under tremendous stress. Climate changes underway will only make this worse. Seigler Creek is one of the creeks important for Clearlake Hitch spawning and any further degradation of its flow will have a negative impact. The project proposes pumping 86K gallons in April, which is key Hitch time. I also note that the project has not consulted with the proper tribal authorities for cultural assessment. All in all a very bad project for this area.

Darcy Skarada submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I oppose permits at 11615 and 11625 Seigler Springs North Kelseyville. We live very near the proposed site. We have already been disturbed by grows not quite as near. Noise at times all day and night prevent enjoyment outside and preclude open windows during sleep. We have also already seen the degradation of the environment due to water usage and replacement of natural countryside with mono-crops. Despite the liabilities of rural living we chose to make our retirement home here due to our overriding desire for quiet and natural habitat. The industrial grow would impact

traffic on very vulnerable roads and deprive us of both our priorities in choosing our home location. Please do not allow these permits. Thank you.

Ronld Hudak submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I oppose this because cannabis is very deluding. And I really do want to see it being grown so close to home. May it be so!

Aimee Kartzman submitted a new eComment.

eComment: This area is already becoming threatened by additional traffic and vulnerable to commercial movements. It is a residential area and should be persevered and protected.

Elizabeth DeBrine submitted a new eComment.

eComment: Water usage would be significant and effect our well nearby. Rural area asthetics would be effected by air and light pollution, increased traffic and destruction of animal habitates (bear, mountain lions, deer, etc.) Attraction of criminal element Already have 2 other grow industries on Seigler Springs North Rd.

Daniel Apte submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I oppose the grow permits at 11615 and 11625 Seigler Springs due to all the problems such an operation is likely to cause such as water depletion, noise, air pollution, watershed damage, and chemical pollution in the ground,

Perry Strauss submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I oppose this project: Air Pollution Water usage Potential criminal activity Excess Traffic Strain on electric grid Pesticide contamination of land and air

Rita Siglain submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I feel that I have to speak up for the zoo that is right in the area proposed for this grow facility. The zoo stretches for many acres. We have a herd of 15 camels, 10 horses, llamas, and goats. Called Fear-No-More Zoo, it was created in 1974 by Avatar Adi Da Samraj as a place to go to feel how we are all one. The animals at this zoo don't live in cages but live in a happy, free

environment. I have served there for many years and I know that depleting the water supply, polluting the air, increasing noise and so on will have a damaging effect on the health and happiness of these animals and on the possibility of sustaining this peaceful place into the future. The world is so terrifying right now for everyone. This zoo, along with the Sanctuary that supports it, is one of the few places on earth where human beings all over the earth can come to let go and feel the Spiritual nature of themselves and all of life. It's a place of Joy and Love. Please don't destroy this.

Emily Grinnell submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I am unable to be present this morning. I have lived around this greater neighborhood since 1975. The introduction of a large cannabis operation will forever mar the character of this beautiful and unspoiled area. It is the site of a meditation Sanctuary that has been there since 1974. Among my main concerns are: I have been informed that they may be misstating the number of plants they intend to grow, that on 88,000 sq ft, they will grow not 2,000, but 20,000 plants. There may be an added criminal element, and certainly the threatening presence of guards; Increased traffic on poor roads; Large grows could seriously deplete the water table, already affected by a local vineyard. Fans will create noise. Lights will create light pollution. The fumes of the cannabis product will carry across the area and possibly affect peoples' health; use of pesticides, fertilizers, and other toxic products will get into streams and the environment. I urge the denial of this use permit. Thank you!

Alfred Young submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I oppose granting the Major Use Permit for Commercial Cannabis Cultivation on 11615 and 11625 Seigler Spring North. I am resident in the area and a member of Adidam, and have enjoyed the peace and sanctity of the Sacred environment at The Mountain of Attention Sanctuary, which is located adjacent to this proposed Cannabis Grow-Op. The proposed Cannabis Grow-Op will have a profoundly negative impact on the local community, environment and residents: Large cannabis grows, in combination with the expansion of vineyards in Lake County, deplete water tables and have a large carbon footprint regarding greenhouse gas emissions. As well, fertilizers and chemicals leach into and contaminate groundwater and the natural springs in the Seigler Springs area. For the purpose of creating revenue, Lake County officials must approve permits for commercial cannabis grows in locations that are not adjacent to residential or sacred environments.

Betty Attardi submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I vehemently oppose the proposed Cannabis Cultivation on 11615 and 11625 Seigler Spring North. There are multiple reasons why this is a disastrous proposal for our area. The monoculture leaches the land; the deep aquifers would suffer as they already are from other grows in our area. So for the sake of the land, water, air and other resources do not permit this mega cultivation to take root here!

Timothy Toye submitted a new eComment.

eComment: The staff report assumes that the project is going to only grow 2000 cannabis plants at any one time. The hydrology report was based on this amount of growth on the property, and even then, appears to have significant omissions. Yet there is proposed to be 22 hoop houses totaling 88,000 sf. Based on my conversations with professionals in the cannabis industry this is just not remotely believable, and so the staff report is based on an erroneous assumption that the applicant with only grow 2000 plants at any one time. As far as monitoring, the applicant, who has a history of not following county regulations relative to the growing of cannabis, is supposed to submit an annual report, and the county may inspect the property once a year, though it also says they may not even do that. This is grossly inadequate to ensure that this project is not detrimental to the local residents.

David Rosen submitted a new eComment.

eComment: As a twenty year resident of Lake Count and a homeowner I strongly oppose giving this cannabis business a permit to operate here. First is the fact that such a large growing operation of cannabis will take significant amount of water. Cannabis plants need a lot. This will significantly affect the water table for the residents in the area proposed. We have a few good years of water and then alot of severe drought. Lake County residents the first to priority. I don't believe that the 174,240 sf will be not be accurate. If they get the permits, they will grow much more than that. Cannabis business also always attract a criminal element... even legal businesses. Please, please make Lake County residents priority protect our circumstances first and do not allow such a business to create real difficulties for us.

Susan Hughes submitted a new eComment.

eComment: BAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD FOR ENVIRONMENT AND WATER USE DON'T NEED MORE POT FARMS IN LAKE COUNTY KEEP LAKE COUNTY CLEAN AND FREE OF BIG POT BUSINESS.

Timothy Toye

I have been selling real estate in Lake County for the last 30 years and currently manage a brokerage here, as well as owning numerous properties in the county including in the general vicinity of the proposed project. During my time in real estate here, I have witnessed an exponential growth in vineyard acreage, very often replacing walnut and pear orchards, but also much acreage in new cultivation and then, more recently, growth in licensed cannabis farms. All of this growth in agriculture requires water for irrigation

and has had a significant toll on our water table, which has steadily reduced over that time with residential wells diminishing in their output or drying up, and formerly year-round creeks drying up or puddling. Anyone involved in testing wells will verify this.

It is the responsibility of the county planning staff and the planning commission to ensure that not only does new development conform to planning regulations, including CEQA, but also, and more importantly, that growth is managed in a responsible manner so that the ability of residents of Lake County continue to enjoy, as is their right, the benefits of living here. This will not happening if this project is approved.

I'm writing to you today out of concern regarding the hearing that would approve a permit for a very large commercial/industrial cannabis operation.

This large scale operation will certainly threaten what is otherwise a pristine area set aside as a significant Sanctuary Retreat area and Center. It will not only have a significant environmental impact via constant humming noise, constant lights, constant smell--all of which will threaten and disrupt this Sanctuary Retreat Area.

The other very major concern is the impact this will have on our water well systems. Please do not approve of this project.

Francis Scott

minister Adidam Lake County

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I live on North Seigler Springs Rd., near the proposed development, and I (as well as my neighbor) am strongly opposed this project, based on the following facts:

1. Fact: The developer has a history of flagrant violations of a previous Use Permit in Burns Canyon (Vista Farms) that resulted in a Stop Order for illegal grading, failure to properly insure against environmental damage, and housing illegal workers in a non-residential building, amongst other things. Why should we expect anything different a second time around?

2. Fact: Traffic - We already are impacted by a another very large cannabis operation within a mile of the newly proposed site, (who are already using vast amounts of water and) they have had a substantial impact on local traffic flow - including tractor-trailer and other large delivery trucks on a narrow, poor roads with one-lane sections in blind curves. The County does not properly maintain Sigler Springs North Rd. and the width of the road in several blind-curve sections does not

comply with County or State standards. Approval of this Project would make an already-dangerous situation even worse.

3. Fact: Traffic (2) – In the developer’s application, they state the following: “*As proposed the project will include three employees during peak season*”. This is an absurd statement that anyone familiar with cannabis grows is aware of; for a grow of this size there would likely be at least 6-10 employees required during peak season, possibly many more, just in order to harvest, trim, and dry the plants, etc.

4. Water – the only hydrology information comes from an obviously biased source, and there is no independent confirmation of facts, just as the last time this developer applied for the denied Use Permit for Vista Farms. I don’t see how this new, heavy ag use of water will not affect us as neighbors. The report furnished by the developer’s paid-consultant proposes taking over 2 million gallons a year out of the water table. And in her determinations of average rainfall she uses over 100 years of records that in no way reflects the new average rainfall due to current drought and climate change. This does not reflect reality.

5. The grow site is on a parcel that directly adjoins a church parcel. Is this permitted? I know there are setbacks for ‘personal-use’ cannabis grows and expect there would be such for a commercial operation similar to the personal grows, which are measured from the church parcel edge to the grow parcel edge, not the grow area within the grow parcel.

I urge the Commissioners to deny this Use Permit application.

Jeanne Martin submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I strongly oppose the approval of this proposed Cannabis project. A couple of years ago, my neighbor’s well (the Adidam Sanctuary), ran dry and they had to dig a much deeper well at great cost. This had never happened in over 40+ years. It was due to the deep unremitting drought the area has been suffering from - a drought that is only going to intensify as global warming intensifies. Another factor was the establishment of a large outdoor marijuana grow and a large vineyard down the road. Please do not approve this project further allowing businesses to draw down the water table at the expense of long term residents. This is in an area where many of us regularly walk for exercise. They will no doubt have guard shacks and guards now along that road which is totally intimidating. It's just so destructive to the peace and serenity in this area.

jill sanna submitted a new eComment.

eComment: i oppose this consideration because there is another cannabis grow organization in my neighborhood and they race back and forth on the road and also there has been a lot more large delivery trucks and propane trucks and outhouse trucks driving back and forth and literally tearing up the road. There is just a small country road here and it is not made for these large 18 wheelers constant use. Also they seem to be using up a lot more of the underground water, even more than the

vineyards. Way out of proportion to all others living here. In addition, the other grow organization located near here has posted very unfriendly guards that are scaring the locals.

Valerie Ann Baldisserotto submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I lived in the area for the proposed grow operation during the 1980's, and then returned 7 years ago during my retirement for the peace and quiet it offers. Please do not allow this Permit at 11615 and 11625 Seigler Springs North Road, Kelseyville. I live near this property. The disturbance of previously placed grow operations in the neighborhood upon the environment and the water table is already remarkably negative. This very large operation will have major impact. on an already narrow and dangerous road. Other operations already add too much noise with fans running late into the night. Please do not let this permit. Thank you.

Paul Augspurgen submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I'm extremely opposed. The operation would use lots of water, create noise, pollute the air, have a gigantic carbon footprint, create a disturbing increase in traffic, and may likely attract criminal element and increase vandalism. I live nearby and I say NO.

Blythe Massey submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I live in the Seigler Springs area just down the road from the proposed site for commercial cannabis cultivation. We are already being impacted by recent additional commercial grows to this area: more traffic on a quiet road (that many of us walk on daily), unfriendly security, and most importantly the impact to the watershed and well water. Please do not allow these chemicals and pesticides to tarnish this natural environment, and wildlife, which has been restoring since the 2015 Valley Fire. This peaceful residential area should not have more water depletion, noise pollution, light pollution, and security for commercial cannabis.

Via email to: trish.turner@lakecountyca.gov October 26, 2023 Ms. Trish Turner
Community Development Department County of Lake 255 North Forbes Street
Lakeport, CA 94543 Re: Response to Katzoff & Riggs October 25, 2023 Letter Seigler
Springs North Project (UP 21-17, IS 21-18) Dear Ms. Turner This firm represents
Seigler Springs Investments, LLC ("SSI"), the applicant for the above-references
Seigler Springs North Project ("Project"). We understand that the firm of Katzoff &
Riggs LLP ("Katzoff") submitted a letter dated October 25, 2023 objecting to the Project
on several grounds on behalf of the Divine Avataric Holy Domains of Adidam
Ruchiradam (hereafter, the "Adidam Holy Domains"). We received Katzoff's letter
yesterday afternoon. Katzoff asserts, among other things, that SSI's access easement
to the Project Site is invalid, and that SSI therefore lacks legal access to the Project

Site. Katzoff is mistaken; SSI's easement is valid under long-standing California law. We explain below.

Relevant Facts The Project is located at 11615 and 11625 Seigler Springs Road on property identified by Assessor Parcel Numbers ("APNs") 115-007-03, 115-007-06, and 115-015-01 (the "Project Site"). To access the Project Site SSI will utilize an existing ranch road ("Ranch Road") that passes through a parcel located at 11635 Seigler Springs Road and identified by APN 115-007-07 (the "Neighbor Property"). Adidam Holy Domains acquired the Neighbor Property in 2017. A recorded easement, dated October 22, 1993 and recorded October 29, 1993 (Lake County Recorder Doc. No. 93-022093) (the "Easement") authorizes the use of the Ranch Road across the Neighbor Property to access the Project Site. A copy of the Easement is attached as Exhibit 1.

Katzoff's Claim Katzoff asserts that the Easement is "invalid and a legal nullity because it was not granted by a person who owned the [Neighbor Property] at the time the instrument was executed or recorded." (Katzoff Letter, p. 3.) Katzoff frames this argument as follows:

- The Easement was signed and granted by James Phillip Gerace on October 22, 1993.
- However, on January 12, 1993, James Phillip Gerace conveyed his interest in the Neighbor Property to Lucille O. Gerace. (See Exhibit 2.) This conveyance was re-recorded on April 2, 1993.¹ (See Exhibit 3.)

A minor correction is warranted here: Katzoff states that James Phillip Gerace "again conveyed all right, title or interest" in the Neighbor Property to Lucille O. Gerace on April 2, 1993. (Emphasis added.) The recorded document, however, states that "This Document Is Being Re-Recorded To Correct The Notarial Acknowledgment". (See Exhibit 3.) The April 2, 1993 recording is not a new conveyance.

October 26, 2023 Response to Katzoff & Riggs LLP October 25, 2023 Letter 2

- Lastly, Lucille O. Gerace reconveyed the Neighbor Property to James Phillip Gerace on February 4, 1994. (See Exhibit 4.)

Based on these facts, Katzoff concludes that because James Phillip Gerace did not apparently hold title to the Neighbor Property on October 22, 1993, when he conveyed the Easement, the Easement conveyance was and is invalid. (See Katzoff Letter, pp. 3-4.)

Applicable Law Katzoff is correct that, in general, a person must either own or have the power to create an easement in the property the easement will burden. If this were the only applicable rule, then Katzoff would likely be correct that the Easement is invalid because it appears, at least from the recorded documents, that James Phillip Gerace did not own or have the power to create an easement in the Neighbor Property as of October 1993. However, Katzoff failed to consider the long-established legal doctrine of after-acquired title. The court in *Noronha v. Stewart* (1988) 199 Cal.App.3d 485 ("Noronha") explains the doctrine this way: The general rule is that if the grantor in a conveyance of real property has no title, a defective title, or an estate less than that which he assumed to grant, but subsequently he acquires the title or estate he purported to convey or perfects his title, the after-acquired or perfected title will inure to the grantee or his successors by way of estoppel, i.e., the grantor is estopped to deny that the after-acquired title passed by his conveyance. (Noronha at p. 489 [determining that this rule applied in the case of an easement].) In other words, if a person who does not own Property A grants an easement over Property A, the

easement is invalid. But, if that person later acquires Property A, the easement is revived and validated as if the person held title to Property A at the time the easement was granted. The Noronha decision (attached as Exhibit 5) is still one of the leading decisions on the doctrine of after-acquired title. Conclusion While James Phillip Gerace appears to not have held title to the Neighbor Property on the date that he conveyed the Easement, as Katzoff acknowledges in its letter, Mr. Gerace did subsequently acquire or perfect his title to the Neighbor Property. Consequently, the doctrine of after-acquired title applies here, and the Easement exists and is valid. Katzoff's claim regarding the Easement is wrong; established California law upholds the Easement's validity. Thank you for the opportunity to clarify this matter. Sincerely, Bradley B. Johnson, Esq. Everview Ltd.

Fiona Syme submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I am a resident of Lake County and I live very close to this proposed development and I vehemently oppose it. It will further strain our water resources, have a negative impact on the environment in terms of air and soil pollution, increase traffic and noise, use large amounts of electricity that will affect the night life habitat, and potentially bring a criminal element to this peaceful Count

Vicky McKie submitted a new eComment.

eComment: This will significantly increase water, air noise pollution. I believe this indoor operation will be way too large. It likely will have to be guarded against criminals therefore decreasing a sense of peace and security. The increase in traffic will be horrible

Damon Schoeffler submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I strongly oppose the development of any further cannabis cultivation operations in the Seigler Springs area. Please take into account the well considered opinions of the many long time residents of this county who recognize and cherish it for what it is; a peaceful place.

Gina Macioce submitted a new eComment.

eComment: The residents in this area already endure, every day, the environmental damage with Snow's Vineyard: pesticides, and the excessive use of water that we don't have the luxury to use. Please do not allow more, large "grow" operations into our neighborhood! I owned property across the street from Snow's Vineyard. A lot of the wildlife was driven out. We also endured the headlights of all their little tractors, spraying the pesticides in the middle of the night, with toxic residue wafting over to our homes. Please don't bring more air pollution into our neighborhood! At the Mountain Of Attention, there are some days where our water reservoir is empty. Please do not allow the excessive use of water to grow more cannabis! At the Mountain Of Attention, we host retreats for interested public and children. Please don't bring a security risk into our neighborhood, or the stench of cannabis. The Mountain Of Attention is on the historic register. Please help us preserve this sacred land.

Jordan Reyes submitted a new eComment.

eComment: Imposing a commercial cannabis cultivation on Seigler Springs Road in Kelseyville would be detrimental to the health of the surrounding environment. The area runs through shared areas of both Big Valley Rancheria and Middletown Rancheria and to which both have a Tribal Historic Preservation Officer that would need to be consulted with to understand why this area is important to both Tribes. Both Tribes are pushing for safekeeping of the environment to preserve Tribal heritage and knowledge. Increase use in water will have severe impacts on the process of revitalizing ecosystems in the area.

Annie Rogers submitted a new eComme

eComment: I hope I am not too late as I strongly oppose this proposition. We have so few places left in our county that are natural, quiet, beautiful, and without the intrusion of noise, chemicals, traffic and intense electrical activity. Please disregard this proposition and do not vote it in. We need sanctuary here in Lake County – all of us. We are so fortunate to live away from cities and city life. Let's not turn Lake County into that. Thank you.

Lewis Richardson submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I reside on land adjacent to the land covered in the major use permit. I strongly oppose granting the permit. My house uses well water, and the water source could be significantly or entirely depleted by large agricultural use of water via the common aquifer. Toxins from agricultural operations could also get into the aquifer (and be carried in the air to a wide area). Such a large commercial agricultural operations would have negative impact on the quality of life and health of the residents in the area and the overall ecology: much more traffic (much of it dirt road, and much of it commercial), noise, clearing and reshaping the land, removal of animal species, need to protect and guard the cannabis. This permit request does not benefit the residents nor the ecology of the area.

Lynnzee Elze submitted a new eComment.

eComment: Please please please do not allow this massive cannabis grow to happen in my neighborhood. The environmental impacts could easily be disastrous, affecting water supply and quality in this natural hot springs area, as well as bringing potential criminal elements, increased traffic, and undesirable air quality impacts.

Mimi Unanue submitted a new eComment.

eComment: I currently own 5 properties in this area and am very concerned about this cultivation proposal. The entire area needs to have a large multiyear water study done before any more cultivation projects are allowed especially ones that consume so much water. The wells in the area are already failing and the water had become increasingly contaminated. Before approval the effects that this and any future projects will have on its neighbors and surrounding area need to be examined. The potential of negative impact on the community needs to be addresses with scientific studies.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 6050A014-C533-8BDD-81C3-11AB2082CFDA

Support for Seigler Springs North UP 21-17


RE: Seigler Springs Holdings LLC - 11615 & 11625 Seigler Springs Rd,
Kelseyville CA

To Lake County Planning Commission:

As a neighbor and resident of Lake County, I fully support the Seigler Springs North and applicant, Forest Nikola Elie. Forest is a good farmer, rancher, and neighbor who presents the kind of hardworking agricultural stewardship our county should encourage. The property's private location, productive water source, flat usable ground, fresh mountain air, and abundant sunshine make it well suited for responsible agricultural use. This project has the potential to create jobs, support the local economy, and positively contribute to the community .

Forest Nikola Elie would be a great addition to the neighborhood, and I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to approval of the Use Permit # 21-17.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

DocuSigned by:

7BC72FD89CDE4DF...

5/20/2026 | 9:09 AM PDT



Lake County, California

Support for Seigler Springs North UP 21-17

RE: Seigler Springs Holdings LLC - 11615 & 11625
Seigler Springs Rd, Kelseyville CA

To Lake County Planning Commission:

As someone with over 10 years in agriculture and the cannabis industry, I fully support the Seigler Springs North project and applicant, Forest Nikola Elie. I have worked closely with Forest and I can honestly say he is a hard working farmer, rancher, father, and a businessman who cares about the community.

Forest deserves the opportunity to operate a 3-acre canopy farm to continue building his future while bringing jobs, revenue, and responsible agricultural growth to Lake County for years to come.

Thank you for your consideration.

DocuSigned by:
Robert Skalla
32307274C0BF431...

5/20/2026 | 7:51 AM PDT



Lake County, California

Support for Seigler Springs North UP 21-17

RE: Seigler Springs Holdings LLC - 11615 & 11625
Seigler Springs Rd, Kelseyville CA

To Lake County Planning Commission:

As someone with over 10 years in agriculture and the cannabis industry, I fully support the Seigler Springs North project and applicant, Forest Nikola Elie. I have worked closely with Forest and I can honestly say he is a hard working farmer, rancher, father, and a businessman who cares about the community.

Forest deserves the opportunity to operate a 3-acre canopy farm to continue building his future while bringing jobs, revenue, and responsible agricultural growth to Lake County for years to come.

Thank you for your consideration.

Signed by:

Chris Johns

5/29/2026 | 7:42 AM PDT

AFEDA8AAABFD4BC...



Lake County, California

Support for Seigler Springs North UP 21-17


RE: Seigler Springs Holdings LLC - 11615 & 11625 Seigler Springs Rd,
Kelseyville CA

To Lake County Planning Commission:

As a neighbor and resident of Lake County, I fully support the Seigler Springs North and applicant, Forest Nikola Elie. Forest is a good farmer, rancher, and neighbor who presents the kind of hardworking agricultural stewardship our county should encourage. The property's private location, productive water source, flat usable ground, fresh mountain air, and abundant sunshine make it well suited for responsible agricultural use. This project has the potential to create jobs, support the local economy, and positively contribute to the community .

Forest Nikola Elie would be a great addition to the neighborhood, and I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to approval of the Use Permit # 21-17.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

DocuSigned by:

0898A04FBF884D7...

5/18/2026 | 5:34 AM PDT



Lake County, California

DocuSign Envelope ID: 8C7B7F72-015D-8CBA-83AD-40493924C73F

Support for Seigler Springs North UP 21-17


RE: Seigler Springs Holdings LLC - 11615 & 11625 Seigler Springs Rd,
Kelseyville CA

To Lake County Planning Commission:

As a neighbor and resident of Lake County, I fully support the Seigler Springs North and applicant, Forest Nikola Elie. Forest is a good farmer, rancher, and neighbor who presents the kind of hardworking agricultural stewardship our county should encourage. The property's private location, productive water source, flat usable ground, fresh mountain air, and abundant sunshine make it well suited for responsible agricultural use. This project has the potential to create jobs, support the local economy, and positively contribute to the community .

Forest Nikola Elie would be a great addition to the neighborhood, and I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to approval of the Use Permit # 21-17.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

DocuSigned by:

AD14FEF5E625477...

5/19/2026 | 11:41 AM PDT



Lake County, California

Support for Seigler Springs North UP 21-17


RE: Seigler Springs Holdings LLC - 11615 & 11625
Seigler Springs Rd, Kelseyville CA

To Lake County Planning Commission:

As someone with over 10 years in agriculture and the cannabis industry, I fully support the Seigler Springs North project and applicant, Forest Nikola Elie. I have worked closely with Forest and I can honestly say he is a hard working farmer, rancher, father, and a businessman who cares about the community.

Forest deserves the opportunity to operate a 3-acre canopy farm to continue building his future while bringing jobs, revenue, and responsible agricultural growth to Lake County for years to come.

Thank you for your consideration.

DocuSigned by:

4B9B9D9AB9A54ED...

5/29/2026 | 8:21 AM EDT

I think that in addition to meeting all requirements for the state and county. It is important for the applicants that are approved to be experienced and knowledgeable on how to operate a cannabis business and I believe that Forest is one of those individuals with the grit to run a cannabis farm.



Lake County, California

Support for Seigler Springs North UP 21-17

RE: Seigler Springs Holdings LLC - 11615 & 11625
Seigler Springs Rd, Kelseyville CA

To Lake County Planning Commission:

As someone with over 10 years in agriculture and the cannabis industry, I fully support the Seigler Springs North project and applicant, Forest Nikola Elie. I have worked closely with Forest and I can honestly say he is a hard working farmer, rancher, father, and a businessman who cares about the community.

Forest deserves the opportunity to operate a 3-acre canopy farm to continue building his future while bringing jobs, revenue, and responsible agricultural growth to Lake County for years to come.

Thank you for your consideration.

Signed by:

Edward Fussell

8FF512D1548444D...

5/17/2026 | 9:40 AM PDT



Lake County, California

Support for Seigler Springs North UP 21-17


RE: Seigler Springs Holdings LLC - 11615 & 11625 Seigler Springs Rd,
Kelseyville CA

To Lake County Planning Commission:

As a neighbor and resident of Lake County, I fully support the Seigler Springs North and applicant, Forest Nikola Elie. Forest is a good farmer, rancher, and neighbor who presents the kind of hardworking agricultural stewardship our county should encourage. The property's private location, productive water source, flat usable ground, fresh mountain air, and abundant sunshine make it well suited for responsible agricultural use. This project has the potential to create jobs, support the local economy, and positively contribute to the community .

Forest Nikola Elie would be a great addition to the neighborhood, and I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to approval of the Use Permit # 21-17.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

DocuSigned by:

08F4F215497642A...

5/17/2026 | 10:47 PM PDT



Lake County, California

Support for Seigler Springs North UP 21-17

RE: Seigler Springs Holdings LLC - 11615 & 11625
Seigler Springs Rd, Kelseyville CA

To Lake County Planning Commission:

As someone with over 10 years in agriculture and the cannabis industry, I fully support the Seigler Springs North project and applicant, Forest Nikola Elie. I have worked closely with Forest and I can honestly say he is a hard working farmer, rancher, father, and a businessman who cares about the community.

Forest deserves the opportunity to operate a 3-acre canopy farm to continue building his future while bringing jobs, revenue, and responsible agricultural growth to Lake County for years to come.

Thank you for your consideration.

DocuSigned by:

Kyle Truesdell
4E683A40F85940A...

5/17/2026 | 10:42 AM PDT



Lake County, California

Support for Seigler Springs North UP 21-17

RE: Seigler Springs Holdings LLC - 11615 & 11625
Seigler Springs Rd, Kelseyville CA

To Lake County Planning Commission:

As someone with over 10 years in agriculture and the cannabis industry, I fully support the Seigler Springs North project and applicant, Forest Nikola Elie. I have worked closely with Forest and I can honestly say he is a hard working farmer, rancher, father, and a businessman who cares about the community.

Forest deserves the opportunity to operate a 3-acre canopy farm to continue building his future while bringing jobs, revenue, and responsible agricultural growth to Lake County for years to come.

Thank you for your consideration.

Signed by:

Mario Baroza

5/17/2026 | 12:06 PM PDT

B8B8A615E1FA4F3...



Lake County, California

Support for Seigler Springs North UP 21-17


RE: Seigler Springs Holdings LLC - 11615 & 11625 Seigler Springs Rd,
Kelseyville CA

To Lake County Planning Commission:

As a neighbor and resident of Lake County, I fully support the Seigler Springs North and applicant, Forest Nikola Elie. Forest is a good farmer, rancher, and neighbor who presents the kind of hardworking agricultural stewardship our county should encourage. The property's private location, productive water source, flat usable ground, fresh mountain air, and abundant sunshine make it well suited for responsible agricultural use. This project has the potential to create jobs, support the local economy, and positively contribute to the community .

Forest Nikola Elie would be a great addition to the neighborhood, and I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to approval of the Use Permit # 21-17.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Signed by:

A303705D0ADF44A...

5/19/2026 | 12:15 PM PDT



Lake County, California

Support for Seigler Springs North UP 21-17


RE: Seigler Springs Holdings LLC - 11615 & 11625
Seigler Springs Rd, Kelseyville CA

To Lake County Planning Commission:

As someone with over 10 years in agriculture and the cannabis industry, I fully support the Seigler Springs North project and applicant, Forest Nikola Elie. I have worked closely with Forest and I can honestly say he is a hard working farmer, rancher, father, and a businessman who cares about the community.

Forest deserves the opportunity to operate a 3-acre canopy farm to continue building his future while bringing jobs, revenue, and responsible agricultural growth to Lake County for years to come.

Thank you for your consideration.

DocuSigned by:

85770A12E2C34F7...

5/17/2026 | 11:27 AM PDT



Lake County, California

Support for Seigler Springs North UP 21-17

RE: Seigler Springs Holdings LLC - 11615 & 11625 Seigler Springs Rd,
Kelseyville CA

To Lake County Planning Commission:

As a neighbor and resident of Lake County, I fully support the Seigler Springs North and applicant, Forest Nikola Elie. Forest is a good farmer, rancher, and neighbor who presents the kind of hardworking agricultural stewardship our county should encourage. The property's private location, productive water source, flat usable ground, fresh mountain air, and abundant sunshine make it well suited for responsible agricultural use. This project has the potential to create jobs, support the local economy, and positively contribute to the community .

Forest Nikola Elie would be a great addition to the neighborhood, and I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to approval of the Use Permit # 21-17.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Signed by:

Mike Burleson

3F65535D3CC94BA...

5/18/2026 | 7:03 AM PDT

MB



Lake County, California

Support for Seigler Springs North UP 21-17

RE: Seigler Springs Holdings LLC - 11615 & 11625 Seigler Springs Rd,
Kelseyville CA

To Lake County Planning Commission:

As a neighbor and resident of Lake County, I fully support the Seigler Springs North and applicant, Forest Nikola Elie. Forest is a good farmer, rancher, and neighbor who presents the kind of hardworking agricultural stewardship our county should encourage. The property's private location, productive water source, flat usable ground, fresh mountain air, and abundant sunshine make it well suited for responsible agricultural use. This project has the potential to create jobs, support the local economy, and positively contribute to the community .

Forest Nikola Elie would be a great addition to the neighborhood, and I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to approval of the Use Permit # 21-17.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

DocuSigned by:
Mike Yuen
C0272F8D73DE411...

5/16/2026 | 9:26 PM PDT



Lake County, California

Support for Seigler Springs North UP 21-17

RE: Seigler Springs Holdings LLC - 11615 & 11625 Seigler Springs Rd,
Kelseyville CA

To Lake County Planning Commission:

As a neighbor and resident of Lake County, I fully support the Seigler Springs North and applicant, Forest Nikola Elie. Forest is a good farmer, rancher, and neighbor who presents the kind of hardworking agricultural stewardship our county should encourage. The property's private location, productive water source, flat usable ground, fresh mountain air, and abundant sunshine make it well suited for responsible agricultural use. This project has the potential to create jobs, support the local economy, and positively contribute to the community .

Forest Nikola Elie would be a great addition to the neighborhood, and I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to approval of the Use Permit # 21-17.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

DocuSigned by:
Sam Magruder
1450517E774343E...

5/16/2026 | 10:21 PM PDT

Samuel Magruder



Lake County, California

Support for Seigler Springs North UP 21-17

RE: Seigler Springs Holdings LLC - 11615 & 11625
Seigler Springs Rd, Kelseyville CA

To Lake County Planning Commission:

As someone with over 10 years in agriculture and the cannabis industry, I fully support the Seigler Springs North project and applicant, Forest Nikola Elie. I have worked closely with Forest and I can honestly say he is a hard working farmer, rancher, father, and a businessman who cares about the community.

Forest deserves the opportunity to operate a 3-acre canopy farm to continue building his future while bringing jobs, revenue, and responsible agricultural growth to Lake County for years to come.

Thank you for your consideration.

DocuSigned by:
Sean Garland
9EB9252238354B8...

5/19/2026 | 12:16 PM PDT



Lake County, California

Support for Seigler Springs North UP 21-17


RE: Seigler Springs Holdings LLC - 11615 & 11625
Seigler Springs Rd, Kelseyville CA

To Lake County Planning Commission:

As someone with over 10 years in agriculture and the cannabis industry, I fully support the Seigler Springs North project and applicant, Forest Nikola Elie. I have worked closely with Forest and I can honestly say he is a hard working farmer, rancher, father, and a businessman who cares about the community.

Forest deserves the opportunity to operate a 3-acre canopy farm to continue building his future while bringing jobs, revenue, and responsible agricultural growth to Lake County for years to come.

Thank you for your consideration.

DocuSigned by:

2B9FB0269028440...

5/16/2026 | 3:33 PM PDT



Lake County, California

DocuSign Envelope ID: 04E4C6F2-738A-86DC-814E-5F916DCD24FE

Support for Seigler Springs North UP 21-17

RE: Seigler Springs Holdings LLC - 11615 & 11625 Seigler Springs Rd,
Kelseyville CA

To Lake County Planning Commission:

As a neighbor and resident of Lake County, I fully support the Seigler Springs North and applicant, Forest Nikola Elie. Forest is a good farmer, rancher, and neighbor who presents the kind of hardworking agricultural stewardship our county should encourage. The property's private location, productive water source, flat usable ground, fresh mountain air, and abundant sunshine make it well suited for responsible agricultural use. This project has the potential to create jobs, support the local economy, and positively contribute to the community .

Forest Nikola Elie would be a great addition to the neighborhood, and I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to approval of the Use Permit # 21-17.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Will Peterson

Signed by:
Will Peterson
078C8919A4A641D...

5/17/2026 | 10:26 AM PDT



Lake County, California

Support for Seigler Springs North UP 21-17

RE: Seigler Springs Holdings LLC - 11615 & 11625 Seigler Springs Rd,
Kelseyville CA

To Lake County Planning Commission:

As a neighbor and resident of Lake County, I fully support the Seigler Springs North and applicant, Forest Nikola Elie. Forest is a good farmer, rancher, and neighbor who presents the kind of hardworking agricultural stewardship our county should encourage.

The property's private location, productive water source, flat usable ground, fresh mountain air, and abundant sunshine make it well suited for responsible agricultural use. This project has the potential to create jobs, support the local economy, and positively contribute to the

Forest Nikola Elie would be a great addition to the neighborhood, and I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to approval of the Use Permit # 21-17.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

DocuSigned by:
Yoel Chetrit
D66F066D6B654CF...

5/19/2026 | 6:17 AM PDT



Lake County, California