

## Re: The meeting of 9-12-2024 cannabis Permit for Archon

francesca duchamp <francescaduchamp@att.net>

Wed 9/11/2024 2:54 PM

To: Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

PC 09/12/2024

Item #2

4 Pages

 3 attachments (542 KB)

canabis measures 2018.png; measures Q ans S.png; comment 9-9 24.png;

---

### This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hello board,

I have a few concerns about allowing a cannabis permit for Archon. First of all I voted "no" on all the cannabis measures. Back then the Sheriff held meetings in favor of the measures because of economic development, which the AG community had assured him was a good thing. I still thought nope--people were not going to read all the pages of measures. The Sheriff pulled back his support after several issues with a few cannabis people not being up front. So here are my concerns...

1. There are still Federal laws that prohibit issues with Cannabis. The State has decided that it is okay to overlook these laws and allow counties to decide for themselves. Again, if a county makes a wrong choice--those involved are breaking federal laws.
2. People keep throwing around the percentage of 80% of the voters (back in 2018) as being in favor of both medicinal and recreational cultivation of cannabis--not true. (see picture below.) These numbers presented below are from the El Dorado County Election office...and could/should of have been broken down even more. Such as what were the counts in just dist.2, where all the permits seem to be focused.? (The election office can do that. I have done it on another election before.)
3. The issue of water. People in that area are concerned with water. Attached is a comment the planning board has received...and is concerning.
4. Lastly, for now is a question and my biggest concern. Was this candidate for this permit, really looked at during this process. During the Supervisor campaign, which this permit candidate was running for dist. 2 many truths were omitted...not lies per se...but not truths either of what companies he represented and which school he was associated with,( KOLAS University.)

Again to remind people--this action of growing is still a federal law.

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.  
Fran DuChamp

**COUNTY OF EL DORADO**  
**CONSOLIDATED GUBERNATORIAL GENERAL ELECTION**

Date:12/04/18  
 Time:14:36:16  
 Page:6 of 7

→ **TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2018**  
 → **OFFICIAL FINAL REPORT**

→ Registered Voters 121192 - Cards Cast 90730 74.86%

Num. Report Precinct 166 - Num. Reporting 166 100.00%

State Proposition 10		
	Total	
Number of Precincts	166	
Precincts Reporting	166	100.0 %
Vote For	1	
Times Counted	90730/121192	74.9 %
Total Votes	86392	
YES	23676	27.41%
NO	62716	72.59%

Measure P - County Cannabis		
	Total	
Number of Precincts	166	
Precincts Reporting	166	100.0 %
Vote For	1	
Times Counted	90730/121192	74.9 %
Total Votes	83371	
YES	50475	60.54%
NO	32896	39.46%

State Proposition 11		
	Total	
Number of Precincts	166	
Precincts Reporting	166	100.0 %
Vote For	1	
Times Counted	90730/121192	74.9 %
Total Votes	85386	
YES	55633	65.15%
NO	29753	34.85%

Measure Q - County Cannabis		
	Total	
Number of Precincts	166	
Precincts Reporting	166	100.0 %
Vote For	1	
Times Counted	90730/121192	74.9 %
Total Votes	83115	
YES	49234	59.24%
NO	33881	40.76%

State Proposition 12		
	Total	
Number of Precincts	166	
Precincts Reporting	166	100.0 %
Vote For	1	
Times Counted	90730/121192	74.9 %
Total Votes	85722	
YES	42204	49.23%
NO	43518	50.77%

Measure R - County Cannabis		
	Total	
Number of Precincts	166	
Precincts Reporting	166	100.0 %
Vote For	1	
Times Counted	90730/121192	74.9 %
Total Votes	82665	
YES	50587	61.20%
NO	32078	38.80%

Measure J - County TOT		
	Total	
Number of Precincts	166	
Precincts Reporting	166	100.0 %
Vote For	1	
Times Counted	90730/121192	74.9 %
Total Votes	84009	
YES	36869	43.89%
NO	47140	56.11%

Measure S - County Cannabis		
	Total	
Number of Precincts	166	
Precincts Reporting	166	100.0 %
Vote For	1	
Times Counted	90730/121192	74.9 %
Total Votes	82012	
YES	49226	60.02%
NO	32786	39.98%

Measure N - County Cannabis		
	Total	
Number of Precincts	166	
Precincts Reporting	166	100.0 %
Vote For	1	
Times Counted	90730/121192	74.9 %
Total Votes	83428	
YES	53937	64.65%
NO	29491	35.35%

Measure U - County Charter		
	Total	
Number of Precincts	166	
Precincts Reporting	166	100.0 %
Vote For	1	
Times Counted	90730/121192	74.9 %
Total Votes	81517	
YES	19079	23.40%
NO	62438	76.60%

number. The measures that were voted on in 2018 are as follows:

Measure N, El Dorado County Marijuana Business Tax

Measure P, El Dorado County outdoor and Greenhouse Cultivation of Marijuana for Medicinal Use

Measure Q, El Dorado County Outdoor and Greenhouse Cultivation of Marijuana for Recreational Use

Measure R, El Dorado County Medicinal Marijuana Sales and Indoor Cultivation

Measure S, El Dorado County Recreational Marijuana Sales and Indoor Cultivation

I'm including a helpful link with more information, however it looks like each one of these measures passed at about 60% not 80%.

[El Dorado County, California ballot measures - Ballotpedia](#)

**Subject:** FW: Request for Feedback on El Dorado County CCUP21-0008 Omo Ranch Cannabis Cultivation Project

**From:** Leslie Schoenfeld <leslies@mailfence.com>

**To:** <info5@waterboards.ca.gov>

**Date:** Sep 7, 2024, 1:01:01 PM

Dear Water Resources Control Board Region 5 Staff,

I live and own property in El Dorado County in Somerset and am writing to get your feedback on the Archon Omo Ranch cannabis cultivation project CCU21-0008 that is scheduled to be approved by the county next Thursday (9/12).

I recently read the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and accompanying appendices and exhibits associated with the project and am concerned that water quality impacts were not fully assessed nor addressed.

According to the documents there are two "riverines" that cross the project site (see exhibit page 94 of the Proposed Initial Study Appendices A-H) and the southern half of the project parcel drains into Brownsville Creek, then Cedar Creek and the northern half of the project parcel flows west into Cedar Creek, then Scott Creek then into the Cosumnes River (see page 11 of the MND attached).

This is a large cannabis project and I don't see evidence that the California State Water Resources Board was contacted to ensure the project complies with California State Water Resource Board's Order WQ 2019-0001-DWQ nor the Clean Water Act Section 401. In addition the wetland definition the Biological Resource Assessment uses when determining whether there are jurisdictional water resources within the project site is the California Forest Practice Rules definition (p.79 of the Proposed Initial Study Appendices A-H) not the latest California State Water Resource Board's definition.

Please provide feedback at your earliest convenience on whether this project is known to you and whether an NOI has been submitted to the Water Board for your review. Also what steps can be taken to ensure a thorough water quality assessment takes place for this project?

Thank you,