

# ATT. F

## Public Comments Received

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Commenter Name</b>	<b>Date</b>
1	C. Williams	May 12, 2023
2	Candice Shaer	May 14, 2023
3	Brian & Gretchen Paddock	May 16, 2023
4	Sue Ramsey Collentine & Brian P. Collentine	May 20, 2023
5	Pamela & David Bateman	May 26, 2023
6	Judith Redmond	May 30, 2023
7	Caitlin Collentine	May 31, 2023
8	Multiple Signatories	May 2023
9	Sandi & Ron Lutsko	June 1, 2023
10	Ron Lutsko	June 2, 2023
11	Pamela & David Bateman, Chrstine Hildebrand, Sue Collentine, Christi Hanson, Kim & Rebecca Kersten, Candice Schar-Johnson	September 16, 2024
12	Kim Consol	April 16, 2025
13	David & Pamela Bateman	April 24, 2025
14	Sue Ramsey Collentine	April 27, 2025

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Jeff Anderson](#)  
**Subject:** Cannabis Use Permits  
**Date:** Friday, May 12, 2023 11:01:58 AM

---

Jeff,

Thank you for welcoming comments for the above mentioned subject.

I am a Guinda resident and I am in support of Cannabis Use permits for all 5 current licensed cannabis sites.

Sincerely,

C. Williams

Sent from my iPhone

[THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED FROM OUTSIDE YOLO COUNTY. PLEASE USE CAUTION AND VALIDATE THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE EMAIL PRIOR TO CLICKING ANY LINKS OR PROVIDING ANY INFORMATION. IF YOU ARE UNSURE, PLEASE CONTACT THE HELPDESK (x5000) FOR ASSISTANCE]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Jeff Anderson](#)  
**Subject:** Concerns relating to Cannabis Use Permit Zone File #2022-0083 for Outdoor Properties  
**Date:** Sunday, May 14, 2023 5:11:04 PM

---

As a neighbor of outdoor Properties cannabis operation at 16520 County Road 56, Guinda, CA 95637, I would like to relay my concerns to the permitting agency.

1. The ODOR of cannabis frequently invades my property, even coming indoors, especially when my windows are open. It is not pleasant. My next door neighbors with horses have much less (in fact very rare) odor than Outdoor Property's cannabis operation. ADDITIONALLY, I have concerns about the effects of cannabis ODOR on my grandchildren when they are here. No one has provided me with scientific evidence that this is safe for children. However, I have heard of "CONTACT HIGHS" for adults. More research needs to be done before I can accept ODOR as being safe for children.
2. The NOISE involved with Outdoor Property's cannabis operation is significant. I can totally understand why my other neighbors complain about the noise. If I go onto my porch after dark, the hum from whatever they are doing (be it generators or fans, I don't know) is very annoying. I am thankful that my bedroom windows face AWAY from Outdoor Property's operation.
3. The TRAFFIC is only annoying when it destroys the pavement on the County Road, especially the turning corners. AND my neighbors have told me of their driveway and private road being blocked by the large vehicles associated with Outdoor Properties. Luckily this has not happened to me, yet.
4. Blocking the LIGHT emitted at night is appreciated.

SPECIAL NOTE OF CONCERN: I have called your office and spoken with someone. He said he would check the odor, after notifying Outdoor Properties that he was coming. I assume the same procedure applies to noise complaints. I remember when I was an Agricultural Biologist for Yolo County enforcing various agricultural laws. We never made appointments to perform inspections. That would defeat the purpose of finding out what was going on during a normal operation.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Candice Schaer  
PO Box 72  
7840 County Road 49  
Guinda, CA  
[REDACTED]

[THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED FROM OUTSIDE YOLO COUNTY. PLEASE USE CAUTION AND VALIDATE THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE EMAIL PRIOR TO CLICKING ANY LINKS OR PROVIDING ANY INFORMATION. IF YOU ARE UNSURE, PLEASE CONTACT THE HELPDESK (x5000) FOR ASSISTANCE]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Jeff Anderson](#)  
**Subject:** RE: COURTESY NOTICE: ZF 2022-0083 Outdoor Properties Cannabis Use Permit  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 16, 2023 8:56:10 AM

---

My Comments:

This area is already much over concentrated with pot farms.

Owner should be required to actually grow (vegetables, etc) which they have stated in the permit and make it contingent upon permit approval and continued use. Does anyone actually believe "The applicant stated that they plan to use the currently undeveloped land for the vegetable crops (lettuce, micro greens, spinach, kale, and swiss chard)."

"ten homesites located within 1,500 feet from the cannabis greenhouses, with the closest residence approximately 700 feet to the south." That's a lot of impacted people. I would suggest owner and Yolo BOS needs to work more cooperatively with so many residences nearby.

This is clearly another case that Yolo BOS cares more about the income and padding their own pockets than what is truly pure and good for the county. This appears to be yet another carpet bagger who really cares less about the community and more about trying to make a buck despite impact on the community and neighbors

Brian & Gretchen Paddock  
Esparto, CA

---

**From:** Jeff Anderson [mailto:Jeff.Anderson@yolocounty.org]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 12, 2023 4:52 PM  
**To:** Jeff Anderson <Jeff.Anderson@yolocounty.org>  
**Subject:** COURTESY NOTICE: ZF 2022-0083 Outdoor Properties Cannabis Use Permit

**ATTENTION: RESIDENTS, PROPERTY OWNERS & INTERESTED PARTIES**

The attached proposal for a Cannabis Use Permit has been filed with the Department of Community Services. You are invited to comment because the proposal or project impacts may affect your property or services/district or jurisdiction. Please provide comments by **June 2, 2023** to aid in staff's review of the application. However, comments will be taken up to the time of the project decision. If you have no comment, a reply is not necessary. Please note that all comments received are part of the public record.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions about the project or the Cannabis Use Permit process in general.

Regards,  
Jeff

**Jeff Anderson**

Senior Planner

Yolo County | Department of Community Services  
292 West Beamer Street | Woodland, CA 95695  
Direct: (530) 666-8043 | Main: (530) 666-8775

[THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED FROM OUTSIDE YOLO COUNTY. PLEASE USE CAUTION AND VALIDATE THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE EMAIL PRIOR TO CLICKING ANY LINKS OR PROVIDING ANY INFORMATION. IF YOU ARE UNSURE, PLEASE CONTACT THE HELPDESK (x5000) FOR ASSISTANCE]

May 20, 2023

Dear Jeff Anderson and Leslie Lindbo,

My name is Sue Ramsey Collentine and I am writing to share my husband's and my great concern about the application for a cannabis use permit to allow cultivation and self-distribution by Outdoor Properties at 16520 road 56 in Guinda, CA. (zone file #2022-0083).

We are not alone in opposing this industrial giant in our backyard. Our neighbors and community members agree that this particular company has shown little regard for its impact on our area just south of Guinda. The Capay Valley's qualities are precious and can never be replaced if lost. As planners, you hold an enormous responsibility for this area that is so important to so many, now and forever.

My grandfather, Samuel A. Ramsey, lived in Capay Valley as a boy and attended the school house on Route 16. Later he moved to the big town of Woodland where my Dad was raised in a small house on Pendegast St. My dad called Capay Valley "the valley that time forgot" when he recalled hunting and fishing here and later selling Fuller brushes door to door.

It was and is a source of pride that my husband Brian and I were able to buy our 14.96 acre homesite in 1999. We hold our family gatherings here, we celebrated our oldest daughter's wedding here, and we hope our place will be loved and cared for by our children and grandchildren in the future. Protection of the peaceful rural quality is of the utmost importance to us.

We have received the Courtesy Notice to neighbors. In reviewing the project description, we noted real concerns, outlined here.

1. The project description is brief and includes contradictory statements. For example, the applicant requests " a license for up to one acre of canopy (indoor cultivation)". The first paragraph states that Outdoor Properties now has, "approximately five acres for cannabis uses." This is misleading in terms of light, noise and even traffic from all cannabis growing activities.
2. Another example is "There are approximately ten homesites within 1500 feet from (sic) the cannabis greenhouses." Yet there are quite a few more than that, as shown by the number of homeowners who received the Courtesy Notice. Two new houses are going in just at the end of Road 56 along Road 49. Unoccupied for now, they will certainly be affected by the cannabis operation. Further, even ten homesites is way too many for this operation's impact. All close neighbors live on small parcels of land, fewer than 20 acres in almost every case. Small parcels need protection from Yolo County to support stewarding of the land on a small scale.
3. An important goal of the CLUO is "neighborhood compatibility." This project is not compatible with its surroundings. Permitting this use would significantly change this rural area into an industrial one, exacerbating the issues neighbors have already experienced: noise round the clock, traffic on the unpaved roads, odors at all hours, and absent licensees .
4. The project description for Outdoor Properties states that operational hours are "7am to 4pm" but "work may occasionally occur outside of normal hours as needed." This is not what

we as neighbors have observed. We have observed the cultivation site is at full operation 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. We see and hear and smell activity day and night and weekends, too. Easter Sunday was no exception. We heard awful noise from Outdoor Properties that extended into the late evening.

5. Outdoor Properties has been in operation since receiving a license in 2016. Therefore we know exactly what to expect if they are given the last and final permit for Capay Valley. Not considerate neighbors or neighbors at all - - all the licensees live outside of Capay Valley. The applicant lives in Rocklin - - 70 miles away! They demonstrate a ceaseless amount of traffic, construction, operational noise, and a complete lack of concern for neighbors. We oppose this giant in our quiet corner of Capay Valley.

6. The maps included with the permit are misleadingly skewed to show little impact on a neighborhood. The map shows Guinda and states it is .2 miles from Outdoor Properties. While technically in an unincorporated area of Yolo County, Road 56 and neighboring roads are very much a part of Guinda.

7. The CLUO aims to protect rural areas that are traditionally attached to a town, such as Guinda. So not only does the cannabis operation impact our little town, it very directly impacts the increasingly dense neighborhood that supports Guinda. Please notice how the maps make the small parcels surrounding the cannabis operation look unoccupied. I assure you this land within earshot of 16520 is occupied and has been since long before Outdoor Properties arrived.

8. The project description refers to light mitigation of the greenhouses, no mention is made of how noise or other quality of life concerns by neighbors will be addressed. Based on our past experiences, will any mitigation of light, noise or odor happen?

9. If a permit is granted, complaints and concerns about Outdoor Property are likely to increase. They would increase because Outdoor Properties has already demonstrated a pattern of moving ahead with development with no regard for the impact on others. Neighbors are already impacted and that impact would increase. It would fall to Yolo County to investigate and attempt to solve the many complaints and concerns..


10. The CLUO specifies cannabis cultivation for unincorporated areas of Yolo County, likely intending licensees to seek out areas much less populated than the town of Guinda and its environs. The project description states a close distance from the town (.2 miles), but does not state an even closer proximity to all the homes that support Guinda.

11. Overall, the project description is filled with questionable facts like the number of homesites affected and vague language like "does not anticipate needing to hire additional employees." In short, they would be free to overdevelop as they already have, leaving Yolo County to supervise every infraction and destroying the quiet peace of the southern backyard of Guinda.

We hope you will carefully consider our concerns and those of the other interested parties. It has been a long haul since 2016 when we first saw the cement trucks lumbering up the dirt road. Since then, we have experienced a loss of peaceful enjoyment of our homes and land. Please help us restore what has been lost.

Respectfully,

Sue Ramsey Collentine and Brian P. Collentine



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Leslie Lindbo; Jeff Anderson](#); [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Cannabis Use Permit for Outdoor Properties  
**Date:** Friday, May 26, 2023 10:23:38 AM  
**Attachments:** [Yolo County letter Cannabis Use Permit.pdf](#)

---

Leslie Lindbo and Jeff Anderson,

Please see the attached letter in regards to a courtesy notice we received about a Cannabis Use Permit for Outdoor Properties - 16520 County Road 56 Guinda, California. I am also attaching photos of road damage, truck traffic, and flooding in order to give you a visual description of the problems.

Zone File # 2022-0083

Applicant- Thomas Christy

APN - 060-080-010

Thank you for you time

Pamela & David Bateman

[THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED FROM OUTSIDE YOLO COUNTY. PLEASE USE CAUTION AND VALIDATE THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE EMAIL PRIOR TO CLICKING ANY LINKS OR PROVIDING ANY INFORMATION. IF YOU ARE UNSURE, PLEASE CONTACT THE HELPDESK (x5000) FOR ASSISTANCE]

Leslie Lindbo and Jeff Anderson

May 2023


Concerning  
Cannabis Use Permit  
Outdoor Properties  
16520 County Road 56  
Guinda, California  
Zone File #2022-0083  
Applicant: Thomas Christy

We are writing to the county as a continued protest against the a cannabis growing business, Outdoor Properties, located within the rural residential section of the town of Guinda, California. The location of this cannabis growing business is on a land locked parcel that must use narrow roads, Forest Avenue and Road 49, an unpaved unmaintained county road, Road 56, and then an adjoining farm to access the property. This business is surrounded by small farms that have been negatively impacted by the sounds, smells, lights, and traffic of the industrial sized greenhouses used for indoor cannabis cultivation. Many letters, complaint forms, phone calls, photo documentation and emails have been sent to Yolo county with angry concerns about how this business has changed the rural character of this section of our small town. From the moment construction began we have had to suffer damage to our roadways, crushed culverts with resulting flooding, road blockage from large trucks, and dust from heavy trucks driving down the narrow paved and unpaved roads. The noise pollution started with greenhouse construction and has continued non-stop from the heating, cooling and ventilation that the indoor crops require. We have explained in great detail to the county how the twenty four hour a day sound pollution has disturbed and disrupted our lives. Many of the surrounding farms are owned by recently retired residents that had hoped to supplement their income with farm tourism. However, because of the close proximity of these greenhouses to their land and the associated problems, the prospect of drawing tourists to our farms has been destroyed. We have seen no reduction in the number or intensity of these problems and no effort to address them from Outdoor Properties. We, therefore, must conclude that Outdoor Properties, an investor owned business, has no regard for our community or our livelihoods. We strongly oppose the renewal of any licenses or land use permits for this business.

Thank you for your time,

Pamela and David Bateman  
8151 County Road 49  
Guinda, California

#5 cont.



Outdoor Properties entrance

Drainage culvert damage

Road 56

Drainage culvert damage

Drains to dead end

Road 49

Road 56



Damage from oversized trucks



Road 49  
Road 56

ROAD 56

Crushed drainage pipes  
from heavy trucks entering  
and leaving Outdoor Properties  
Road 56


Outdoor Properties  
16520 Road 56  
Guinda, California

August 2022

Outdoor Properties  
16520 Road 56  
Guinda, California

#5 cont.

Road damage from trucks turning from Road 49  
onto one lane Road 56 - crushing drainage pipes  
Also note low hanging electrical lines



#5 cont.



Heavy truck turning from unpaved one lane Road 56 onto  
narrow unpaved driveway to Outdoor Properties

Outdoor Properties  
16520 Road 56  
Guinda, California

November 19th, 2022

#5 cont.

Road 49

Outdoor Properties  
16520 Road 56  
Guinda, California

Road 56

Damage to drainage pipes  
from heavy trucks leaving  
Outdoor Properties from  
Road 56

January 2023

Outdoor Properties  
16520 Road 56  
Guinda, California

Flooding results from drainage pipes damaged by  
heavy truck deliveries to Outdoor Properties



#5 cont.



Outdoor Properties  
16520 Road 56  
Guinda, California

Heavy truck deliveries to Outdoor Properties  
damage drainage pipes leading to flooding on Road 56  
Road 49

#5 cont.



Outdoor Properties  
16520 Road 56  
Guinda, California  
April 24, 2023

Heavy trucks on unpaved one lane Road 56 and narrow gravel driveway leading to Outdoor Properties damages air quality for adjoining farms

Outdoor Properties  
16520 Road 56  
Guinda, California

Industrial greenhouses blight the bucolic landscape



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Jeff Anderson](#)  
**Subject:** Outdoor Properties zone file #2022-0083  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 30, 2023 10:09:45 AM

---

To Jeff Anderson and Leslie Lindbo,

I am writing regarding the Outdoor Properties request for a cannabis Use Permit southwest of Guinda. I have lived in the Capay Valley since 1989 and I am very familiar with Road 49 and the site of the proposed greenhouse operation. Although I live on Road 43 (north of Guinda), I walk on Road 53 (just west of the Outdoor Properties operation) very regularly.

Prior to the current rule that no more than five cannabis Use Permits would be allowed in the Capay Valley, I observed cannabis operations in several locations that I visited regularly, including one operation adjacent and immediately to the south of our home property on Road 43. Unfortunately, my observations lead me to believe that it could be difficult for the County to enforce some of the regulations governing these operations. As you know, the cannabis grows are more industrial than most of the agriculture in the Capay Valley requiring noisy activities at all hours of day and night, protection from vandalism, plus significant water use and chemical fertilization. As with Outdoor Properties, they are frequently owned by individuals that do not live nearby and have no long-term stake in the community or sustainable land uses on their property. I appreciate that Outdoor Properties will be required to use internal blackout curtains to prevent light escape from the greenhouses, but I am concerned that the County will have a hard time enforcing this regulation.

Many of the cannabis operations that have now shut down, left behind a terrible mess and were exceedingly un-neighborly. This gave the entire industry a very bad name locally. Outdoor Properties includes 18- 96'x30' greenhouses plus ten- 42'x120' greenhouses. This is basically an industrial operation that is much better suited to land that is zoned for light industry rather than agricultural uses.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Judith Redmond  
16050 County Road 43  
Guinda CA 95637

[THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED FROM OUTSIDE YOLO COUNTY. PLEASE USE CAUTION AND VALIDATE THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE EMAIL PRIOR TO CLICKING ANY LINKS OR PROVIDING ANY INFORMATION. IF YOU ARE UNSURE, PLEASE CONTACT THE HELPDESK (x5000) FOR ASSISTANCE]

Dear Jeff Anderson,

I object to giving the final permit to Outdoor Properties, and I ask you to make sure that they be given limited permission to use their land for their style of cannabis cultivation. They make so much noise, they cause strife in the valley, they don't follow logical business hours and it feels like they don't respect the fact that they have residential or environmentally conscious neighbors.

The generators or motors for lights and/or fans they are using should be regulated because it is causing the valley to have a loud hum- the type of sound that would be nothing in an industrial area, but out in the serene Capay Valley it's loud and disruptive. Not only that, but the valley is concerned with the water table, and while there is nothing wrong with cannabis, it uses a lot of water, which the valley potentially could not afford to give to a non-sustenance crop. In their permit proposal, they make it seem like there are only residential neighbors in the town of Guinda, colored in yellow. But in fact they have nearby neighbors all over the light green area who are being impacted by their business.

The company needs to adhere to Section 8.2.1402 in Chapter 14 of Title 8 of the Yolo County Code:

B: Protect environmental resources and minimize environmental impact.

F. Recognize cannabis as an agricultural crop with unique challenges including ...energy and water requirements.

H: Avoid establishing undesirable precedents for other agricultural sectors.

Instead of permitting Outdoor Properties to be given their final OK, thorough investigations should be performed as to their actual hours of operation : as an example of their abuse, on Sunday, April 9th, 2023 they were operating well into the night. Also an investigation of their water use. Please ensure that the valley stays usable, sustainable and beautiful.

Thank you for your time,  
Caitlin Collentine

May 2023 - Neighbor Concerns regarding Cannabis Zone File #2022-0083

Dear Jeff Anderson and Leslie Lindbo (and other local government entities)

I have reviewed the project description for Outdoor Properties at 16520 County Road 56 in Guinda, CA. (zone file #2022-0083). In reviewing the project description, I have concerns. Among them:

1. Outdoor Properties has been in operation since receiving a license in 2016, so we know what to expect if they are given the last and final permit for cannabis cultivation in Capay Valley. They have not been considerate neighbors or neighbors at all— all the licensees and owners live outside of Capay Valley. The applicant, Thomas Christy, lives in Rocklin— 70 miles away. They demonstrate a lack of concern for their impact on neighbors including a ceaseless amount of noise, traffic, construction, and odors. We oppose this industrial giant in our quiet corner of Capay Valley.
2. The project description is brief and includes contradictory statements. For example, the applicant requests “a license for up to one acre of canopy (indoor cultivation)”. The first paragraph states that Outdoor Properties now has, “approximately five acres for cannabis uses.” This is misleading in terms of light, noise and even traffic from all cannabis growing activities.
3. Another example of misleading statements is “There are approximately ten homesites within 1500 feet from (sic) the cannabis greenhouses.” Yet there are quite a few more than that, as shown by the number of homeowners who received the Courtesy Notice. Planner Jeff Anderson states that “about 20” households will receive the Courtesy Notice. Further, even ten homesites is way too many for this operation’s impact. All close neighbors live on small parcels of land, fewer than 20 acres in almost every case. Small parcels need protection from Yolo County to support stewarding of the land on a small scale.
4. An important goal of the CLUO is “neighborhood compatibility.” This project is not compatible with its surroundings. Permitting this use would significantly change this rural area into an industrial one, exacerbating the issues neighbors have already experienced and reported: noise round the clock, traffic on the unpaved roads, odors at all hours, and absent licensees, leading to questionable supervision of the site. This is a close knit and quiet community of neighbors.
5. The project description for Outdoor Properties states that operational hours are “7am to 4pm” but “work may occasionally occur outside of normal hours as needed.” This is not what we as neighbors have observed. We have observed the cultivation site is at full operation 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. We see and hear and smell activity day and night and weekends, too. Easter Sunday was no exception. The awful noise from Outdoor Properties extended into the late evening.
6. The maps included with the permit are misleadingly skewed to show little impact on a neighborhood. The map shows Guinda and states it is 0.2 miles from Outdoor Properties. While technically in an unincorporated area of Yolo County, Road 56 and neighboring roads are very much a part of Guinda which has a Post Office, a church, a store, a firehouse, a restaurant, an antiques store, and other growing businesses that serve the community.
7. The CLUO aims to protect rural areas that are traditionally attached to a town, such as Guinda. Not only does the cannabis operation impact our little town, it very directly impacts the increasingly dense neighborhood that supports Guinda. Please notice how the maps make the small

May 2023 - Neighbor Concerns regarding Cannabis Zone File #2022-0083

parcels surrounding the cannabis operation look unoccupied. I assure you this land within earshot of 16520 is occupied and has been since long before Outdoor Properties arrived.

8. The project description refers to light mitigation of the greenhouses, no mention is made of how noise or other quality of life concerns by neighbors will be addressed. Based on our past experiences, will any mitigation of light, noise or odor happen? Will it fall to Yolo County to ensure compliance? What a burden!

9. As one neighbor states: "There is the water issue. This part of Guinda has smaller properties with more residences clustered together than most other parts of the valley and water has been a problem for many of us. It's my understanding that pot takes a lot of water, so having a large pot farm right in the middle of this area has most likely, and will continue to impact water resources."

10. If a permit is granted, complaints and concerns about Outdoor Property are likely to increase. They would increase because Outdoor Properties has already demonstrated a pattern of moving ahead with development with no regard for the impact on others and it seems, little regard for what it is licensed to do. Neighbors are already impacted and that impact would increase. It would fall to Yolo County to investigate and attempt to solve the many complaints and concerns.

11. The CLUO specifies cannabis cultivation only in unincorporated areas of Yolo County, likely intending licensees to seek out areas much less populated than the town of Guinda and its environs. This grower is not away from a populated area as the CLUO intended and that impacts the total environment: water use, pesticide use, run-off, noise that affects humans and wildlife, light at night, and odors become public health concerns when they would not if the grower were in a less populated or unincorporated area.

12. Overall, the project description is filled with questionable facts like the number of homesites affected and vague language like "does not anticipate needing to hire additional employees." In short, they would be free to overdevelop as they already have, leaving Yolo County to supervise every infraction and destroying the quiet peace of the southern backyard of Guinda.

We thank you for considering our concerns along with others that come to your attention. Please help us restore what has been lost by denying this fifth and final permit application by Outdoor Properties and granting it to a company that values its community and respects the Capay Valley.

Neighbors in Guinda:

Name Holly Negi

Signature Holly Negi

Address 7630 Folsom St

Email (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

make the small parcels surrounding the cannabis operation look unoccupied. I assure you this land within earshot of 16520 is occupied and has been since long before Outdoor Properties arrived.

8. The project description refers to light mitigation of the greenhouses, no mention is made of how noise or other quality of life concerns by neighbors will be addressed. Based on our past experiences, will any mitigation of light, noise or odor happen? Will it fall to Yolo County to ensure compliance? What a burden!

9. As one neighbor states; "There is the water issue. This part of Guinda has smaller properties with more residences clustered together than most other parts of the valley and water has been a problem for many of us. It's my understanding that pot takes a lot of water, so having a large pot farm right in the middle of this area has most likely, and will continue to impact water resources."

10. If a permit is granted, complaints and concerns about Outdoor Property are likely to increase. They would increase because Outdoor Properties has already demonstrated a pattern of moving ahead with development with no regard for the impact on others and it seems, little regard for what it is licensed to do. Neighbors are already impacted and that impact would increase. It would fall to Yolo County to investigate and attempt to solve the many complaints and concerns.

11. The CLUO specifies cannabis cultivation only in unincorporated areas of Yolo County, likely intending licensees to seek out areas much less populated than the town of Guinda and its environs. This grower is not away from a populated area as the CLUO intended and that impacts the total environment: water use, pesticide use, run-off, noise that affects humans and wildlife, light at night, and odors become public health concerns when they would not if the grower were in a less populated or unincorporated area.

12. Overall, the project description is filled with questionable facts like the number of homesites affected and vague language like "does not anticipate needing to hire additional employees." In short, they would be free to overdevelop as they already have, leaving Yolo County to supervise every infraction and destroying the quiet peace of the southern backyard of Guinda.

We thank you for considering our concerns along with others that come to your attention. Please help us restore what has been lost by denying this fifth and final permit application by Outdoor Properties and granting it to a company that values its community and respects the Capay Valley.

Name Harvey Threets  
Signature [Signature]  
Address 1016 County Rd 49 Guinda, Ca 95637  
Email (optional) [Redacted]

Name Glenn W Morgan  
Signature Glenn W Morgan  
Address P.O. 32 Guinda CA 95637  
Email (optional) [Redacted]

May 2023 - Neighbor Concerns regarding Cannabis Zone File #2022-0083

parcels surrounding the cannabis operation look unoccupied. I assure you this land within earshot of 16520 is occupied and has been since long before Outdoor Properties arrived.

8. The project description refers to light mitigation of the greenhouses, no mention is made of how noise or other quality of life concerns by neighbors will be addressed. Based on our past experiences, will any mitigation of light, noise or odor happen? Will it fall to Yolo County to ensure compliance? What a burden!

9. As one neighbor states: "There is the water issue. This part of Guinda has smaller properties with more residences clustered together than most other parts of the valley and water has been a problem for many of us. It's my understanding that pot takes a lot of water, so having a large pot farm right in the middle of this area has most likely, and will continue to impact water resources."

10. If a permit is granted, complaints and concerns about Outdoor Property are likely to increase. They would increase because Outdoor Properties has already demonstrated a pattern of moving ahead with development with no regard for the impact on others and it seems, little regard for what it is licensed to do. Neighbors are already impacted and that impact would increase. It would fall to Yolo County to investigate and attempt to solve the many complaints and concerns.

11. The CLUO specifies cannabis cultivation only in unincorporated areas of Yolo County, likely intending licensees to seek out areas much less populated than the town of Guinda and its environs. This grower is not away from a populated area as the CLUO intended and that impacts the total environment: water use, pesticide use, run-off, noise that affects humans and wildlife, light at night, and odors become public health concerns when they would not if the grower were in a less populated or unincorporated area.

12. Overall, the project description is filled with questionable facts like the number of homesites affected and vague language like "does not anticipate needing to hire additional employees." In short, they would be free to overdevelop as they already have, leaving Yolo County to supervise every infraction and destroying the quiet peace of the southern backyard of Guinda.

We thank you for considering our concerns along with others that come to your attention. Please help us restore what has been lost by denying this fifth and final permit application by Outdoor Properties and granting it to a company that values its community and respects the Capay Valley.

Neighbors in Guinda:

Name Carol Owens

Signature Carol Owens

Address P.O. Box 190, 16455 Road 46 95637

Email (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

May 2023 - Neighbor Concerns regarding Cannabis Zone File #2022-0083

parcels surrounding the cannabis operation look unoccupied. I assure you this land within earshot of 16520 is occupied and has been since long before Outdoor Properties arrived.

8. The project description refers to light mitigation of the greenhouses, no mention is made of how noise or other quality of life concerns by neighbors will be addressed. Based on our past experiences, will any mitigation of light, noise or odor happen? Will it fall to Yolo County to ensure compliance? What a burden!

9. As one neighbor states: "There is the water issue. This part of Guinda has smaller properties with more residences clustered together than most other parts of the valley and water has been a problem for many of us. It's my understanding that pot takes a lot of water, so having a large pot farm right in the middle of this area has most likely, and will continue to impact water resources."

10. If a permit is granted, complaints and concerns about Outdoor Property are likely to increase. They would increase because Outdoor Properties has already demonstrated a pattern of moving ahead with development with no regard for the impact on others and it seems, little regard for what it is licensed to do. Neighbors are already impacted and that impact would increase. It would fall to Yolo County to investigate and attempt to solve the many complaints and concerns.

11. The CLUO specifies cannabis cultivation only in unincorporated areas of Yolo County, likely intending licensees to seek out areas much less populated than the town of Guinda and its environs. This grower is not away from a populated area as the CLUO intended and that impacts the total environment: water use, pesticide use, run-off, noise that affects humans and wildlife, light at night, and odors become public health concerns when they would not if the grower were in a less populated or unincorporated area.

12. Overall, the project description is filled with questionable facts like the number of homesites affected and vague language like "does not anticipate needing to hire additional employees." In short, they would be free to overdevelop as they already have, leaving Yolo County to supervise every infraction and destroying the quiet peace of the southern backyard of Guinda.

We thank you for considering our concerns along with others that come to your attention. Please help us restore what has been lost by denying this fifth and final permit application by Outdoor Properties and granting it to a company that values its community and respects the Capay Valley.

Neighbors in Guinda:

Name Barbara Clowers  
Signature Barbara Clowers  
Address 2559 Runsey Canyon Rd  
Email (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

May 2023 - Neighbor Concerns regarding Cannabis Zone File #2022-0083

parcels surrounding the cannabis operation look unoccupied. I assure you this land within earshot of 16520 is occupied and has been since long before Outdoor Properties arrived.

8. The project description refers to light mitigation of the greenhouses, no mention is made of how noise or other quality of life concerns by neighbors will be addressed. Based on our past experiences, will any mitigation of light, noise or odor happen? Will it fall to Yolo County to ensure compliance? What a burden!

9. As one neighbor states: "There is the water issue. This part of Guinda has smaller properties with more residences clustered together than most other parts of the valley and water has been a problem for many of us. It's my understanding that pot takes a lot of water, so having a large pot farm right in the middle of this area has most likely, and will continue to impact water resources."

10. If a permit is granted, complaints and concerns about Outdoor Property are likely to increase. They would increase because Outdoor Properties has already demonstrated a pattern of moving ahead with development with no regard for the impact on others and it seems, little regard for what it is licensed to do. Neighbors are already impacted and that impact would increase. It would fall to Yolo County to investigate and attempt to solve the many complaints and concerns.

11. The CLUO specifies cannabis cultivation only in unincorporated areas of Yolo County, likely intending licensees to seek out areas much less populated than the town of Guinda and its environs. This grower is not away from a populated area as the CLUO intended and that impacts the total environment: water use, pesticide use, run-off, noise that affects humans and wildlife, light at night, and odors become public health concerns when they would not if the grower were in a less populated or unincorporated area.

12. Overall, the project description is filled with questionable facts like the number of homesites affected and vague language like "does not anticipate needing to hire additional employees." In short, they would be free to overdevelop as they already have, leaving Yolo County to supervise every infraction and destroying the quiet peace of the southern backyard of Guinda.

We thank you for considering our concerns along with others that come to your attention. Please help us restore what has been lost by denying this fifth and final permit application by Outdoor Properties and granting it to a company that values its community and respects the Capay Valley.

Neighbors in Guinda:

Name NORMAN ZAHAR

Signature *Norm Zahar*

Address 7725 WEBSTER STREET

Email (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

Name Kayla Webster

Signature Kayla M. Webster

Address 7670 Felton Ave / PO Box 214 Guinda CA 95637

Email (optional) [REDACTED]

Name Marilyn Blume

Signature Marilyn Blume

Address 7840 County Rd. 49

Email (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

Name Lauren Ayers

Signature Lauren Ayers

Address 7677 Webster Street

Email (optional) [REDACTED]

← not for  
graves  
to see !!

Name Robin Ayers-Lee

Signature [Signature]

Address 7677 Webster St, Guinda CA 95637

Email (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

Name Maurice Ayers-Lee

Signature [Signature]

Address 7677 Webster St. Guinda CA 95637

Email (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

Name CANDICE SCHAR-JOHNSON

Signature [Signature]

Address 7840 County Road 49, Guinda CA 95637

[REDACTED]

*Signatures  
Collected by  
Jane Rinka  
16407 Co. Rd. 56  
Guinda, 95637*

May 2023

Dear Jeff Anderson and Leslie Lindbo,

I have reviewed the project description for Outdoor Properties at 16520 road 56 in Guinda, CA. (zone file #2022-0083). In reviewing the project description, I have concerns. Among them:

1. Outdoor Properties has been in operation since receiving a license in 2016, so we know what to expect if they are given the last and final permit for cannabis cultivation in Capay Valley. They have not been considerate neighbors or neighbors at all - - all the licensees and owners live outside of Capay Valley. The applicant, Thomas Christy, lives in Rocklin - - 70 miles away. They demonstrate a lack of concern for their impact on neighbors including a ceaseless amount of noise, traffic, construction, and odors. We oppose this industrial giant in our quiet corner of Capay Valley.
2. The project description is brief and includes contradictory statements. For example, the applicant requests " a license for up to one acre of canopy (indoor cultivation)". The first paragraph states that Outdoor Properties now has, "approximately five acres for cannabis uses." This is misleading in terms of light, noise and even traffic from all cannabis growing activities.
3. Another example of misleading statements is "There are approximately ten homesites within 1500 feet from (sic) the cannabis greenhouses." Yet there are quite a few more than that, as shown by the number of homeowners who received the Courtesy Notice. Planner Jeff Anderson states that "about 20" households will receive the Courtesy Notice. Further, even ten homesites is way too many for this operation's impact. All close neighbors live on small parcels of land, fewer than 20 acres in almost every case. Small parcels need protection from Yolo County to support stewarding of the land on a small scale.
4. An important goal of the CLUO is "neighborhood compatibility." This project is not compatible with its surroundings. Permitting this use would significantly change this rural area into an industrial one, exacerbating the issues neighbors have already experienced and reported: noise round the clock, traffic on the unpaved roads, odors at all hours, and absent licensees, leading to questionable supervision of the site. This is a close knit and quiet community of neighbors.
5. The project description for Outdoor Properties states that operational hours are "7am to 4pm" but "work may occasionally occur outside of normal hours as needed." This is not what we as neighbors have observed. We have observed the cultivation site is at full operation 24

hours a day, 7 days a week. We see and hear and smell activity day and night and weekends, too. Easter Sunday was no exception. The awful noise from Outdoor Properties extended into the late evening.

6. The maps included with the permit are misleadingly skewed to show little impact on a neighborhood. The map shows Guinda and states it is .2 miles from Outdoor Properties. While technically in an unincorporated area of Yolo County, Road 56 and neighboring roads are very much a part of Guinda which has a Post Office, a church, a store, a firehouse, a restaurant, an antiques store, and other growing businesses that serve the community.

7. The CLUO aims to protect rural areas that are traditionally attached to a town, such as Guinda. Not only does the cannabis operation impact our little town, it very directly impacts the increasingly dense neighborhood that supports Guinda. Please notice how the maps make the small parcels surrounding the cannabis operation look unoccupied. I assure you this land within earshot of 16520 is occupied and has been since long before Outdoor Properties arrived.

8. The project description refers to light mitigation of the greenhouses, no mention is made of how noise or other quality of life concerns by neighbors will be addressed. Based on our past experiences, will any mitigation of light, noise or odor happen? Will it fall to Yolo County to ensure compliance? What a burden!

9. As one neighbor states: "There is the water issue. This part of Guinda has smaller properties with more residences clustered together than most other parts of the valley and water has been a problem for many of us. It's my understanding that pot takes a lot of water, so having a large pot farm right in the middle of this area has most likely, and will continue to impact water resources."

10. If a permit is granted, complaints and concerns about Outdoor Property are likely to increase. They would increase because Outdoor Properties has already demonstrated a pattern of moving ahead with development with no regard for the impact on others and it seems, little regard for what it is licensed to do. Neighbors are already impacted and that impact would increase. It would fall to Yolo County to investigate and attempt to solve the many complaints and concerns.

11. The CLUO specifies cannabis cultivation only in unincorporated areas of Yolo County, likely intending licensees to seek out areas much less populated than the town of Guinda and its environs. This grower is not away from a populated area as the CLUO intended and that impacts the total environment: water use, pesticide use, run-off, noise that affects humans and

wildlife, light at night, and odors become public health concerns when they would not if the grower were in a less populated or unincorporated area.

12. Overall, the project description is filled with questionable facts like the number of homesites affected and vague language like "does not anticipate needing to hire additional employees." In short, they would be free to overdevelop as they already have, leaving Yolo County to supervise every infraction and destroying the quiet peace of the southern backyard of Guinda.

We thank you for considering our concerns along with others that come to your attention. Please help us restore what has been lost by denying this fifth and final permit application by Outdoor Properties and granting it to a company that values its community and respects the Capay Valley.

Name Eric Roschen

Signature Eric Roschen

Address 16407 rd 56 Guinda Ca, 95637

Email (optional) [REDACTED]

Name Alan Simonis

Signature Alan Simonis

Address 16605 Co Rd 59 Brooks, CA 95606

Email (optional) [REDACTED]

Name Tiffany Farsham

Signature Tiffany Farsham

Address 11605 County Road 59 Brooks CA 95606

Email (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

wildlife, light at night, and odors become public health concerns when they would not if the grower were in a less populated or unincorporated area.


12. Overall, the project description is filled with questionable facts like the number of homesites affected and vague language like "does not anticipate needing to hire additional employees." In short, they would be free to overdevelop as they already have, leaving Yolo County to supervise every infraction and destroying the quiet peace of the southern backyard of Guinda.

We thank you for considering our concerns along with others that come to your attention. Please help us restore what has been lost by denying this fifth and final permit application by Outdoor Properties and granting it to a company that values its community and respects the Capay Valley.

Name Donna K Shera

Signature Donna K Shera

Address 16639 Forest Ave. Guinda CA 95637

Email (optional) 

Name DAVID L. SHERA

Signature David L Shera


Address 16639 Forest Ave Guinda CA 95637

Email (optional) 

Name Traci Shera

Signature Traci Shera

Address 16760 Forest Ave. Guinda Ca 95637

Email (optional) 

Name Blair Johnson

Signature *Blair J*

Address 16151 Forest Avenue, Guinda CA

Email (optional) 

Name FRANK G JOHNSON

Signature *Frank G Johnson*

Address 16151 Forest Ave Guinda CA

Email (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

Name Joe Luce

Signature *Joe Luce*

Address 7795 CR 49, Guinda

Email (optional) 

Name Cheryl Luce

Signature *Cheryl A Luce*

Address 7795 CR 49, Guinda, CA 95637

Email (optional) 

Name Steve Shera

Signature [Handwritten Signature]

Address 16760 Forest Ave. Guinda Ca. 95637

Email (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

Name Jane Kinka

Signature Jane Kinka

Address 16407 County Rd. 56 (P.O. Box 219) Guinda, CA 95637

Email (optional) [Redacted]

Name Greg Kringsen

Signature Greg Kringsen

Address 4050 Highway 16 P.O. Box 100

Email (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

Name Bob F. Vanucci

Signature Bob F. Vanucci

Address 8095 State Hwy 16 Brooks Ca. 95606

Email (optional) [Redacted]

Name Julie Farnham

Signature Julie Farnham

Address 2455 Co Rd 41, Rumsey 95679

Email (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

Name Erin Goller Vannucci

Signature Erin Vannucci

Address 8095 State Hwy 16 Brooks

Email (optional) 

Name Tracy Nichols

Signature Tracy Nichols

Address 8029 St Hwy 16 Brooks

Email (optional) 

Name Don Nichols

Signature Don Nichols

Address 8029 STATE Hwy 16 Brooks, 95606

Email (optional) N/A

AP# 060-080-010

May 2023

Dear Jeff Anderson and Leslie Lindbo,

I have reviewed the project description for Outdoor Properties at 16520 road 56 in Guinda, CA. (zone file #2022-0083). In reviewing the project description, I have concerns. Among them:

1. Outdoor Properties has been in operation since receiving a license in 2016, so we know what to expect if they are given the last and final permit for cannabis cultivation in Capay Valley. They have not been considerate neighbors or neighbors at all - - all the licensees and owners live outside of Capay Valley. The applicant, Thomas Christy, lives in Rocklin - - 70 miles away. They demonstrate a lack of concern for their impact on neighbors including a ceaseless amount of noise, traffic, construction, and odors. We oppose this industrial giant in our quiet corner of Capay Valley.
2. The project description is brief and includes contradictory statements. For example, the applicant requests " a license for up to one acre of canopy (indoor cultivation)". The first paragraph states that Outdoor Properties now has, "approximately five acres for cannabis uses." This is misleading in terms of light, noise and even traffic from all cannabis growing activities.
3. Another example of misleading statements is "There are approximately ten homesites within 1500 feet from (sic) the cannabis greenhouses." Yet there are quite a few more than that, as shown by the number of homeowners who received the Courtesy Notice. Planner Jeff Anderson states that "about 20" households will receive the Courtesy Notice. Further, even ten homesites is way too many for this operation's impact. All close neighbors live on small parcels of land, fewer than 20 acres in almost every case. Small parcels need protection from Yolo County to support stewarding of the land on a small scale.
4. An important goal of the CLUO is "neighborhood compatibility." This project is not compatible with its surroundings. Permitting this use would significantly change this rural area into an industrial one, exacerbating the issues neighbors have already experienced and reported: noise round the clock, traffic on the unpaved roads, odors at all hours, and absent licensees, leading to questionable supervision of the site. This is a close knit and quiet community of neighbors.
5. The project description for Outdoor Properties states that operational hours are "7am to 4pm" but "work may occasionally occur outside of normal hours as needed." This is not what we as neighbors have observed. We have observed the cultivation site is at full operation 24

hours a day, 7 days a week. We see and hear and smell activity day and night and weekends, too. Easter Sunday was no exception. The awful noise from Outdoor Properties extended into the late evening.

6. The maps included with the permit are misleadingly skewed to show little impact on a neighborhood. The map shows Guinda and states it is .2 miles from Outdoor Properties. While technically in an unincorporated area of Yolo County, Road 56 and neighboring roads are very much a part of Guinda which has a Post Office, a church, a store, a firehouse, a restaurant, an antiques store, and other growing businesses that serve the community.

7. The CLUO aims to protect rural areas that are traditionally attached to a town, such as Guinda. Not only does the cannabis operation impact our little town, it very directly impacts the increasingly dense neighborhood that supports Guinda. Please notice how the maps make the small parcels surrounding the cannabis operation look unoccupied. I assure you this land within earshot of 16520 is occupied and has been since long before Outdoor Properties arrived.

8. The project description refers to light mitigation of the greenhouses, no mention is made of how noise or other quality of life concerns by neighbors will be addressed. Based on our past experiences, will any mitigation of light, noise or odor happen? Will it fall to Yolo County to ensure compliance? What a burden!

9. As one neighbor states: "There is the water issue. This part of Guinda has smaller properties with more residences clustered together than most other parts of the valley and water has been a problem for many of us. It's my understanding that pot takes a lot of water, so having a large pot farm right in the middle of this area has most likely, and will continue to impact water resources."

10. If a permit is granted, complaints and concerns about Outdoor Property are likely to increase. They would increase because Outdoor Properties has already demonstrated a pattern of moving ahead with development with no regard for the impact on others and it seems, little regard for what it is licensed to do. Neighbors are already impacted and that impact would increase. It would fall to Yolo County to investigate and attempt to solve the many complaints and concerns.

11. The CLUO specifies cannabis cultivation only in unincorporated areas of Yolo County, likely intending licensees to seek out areas much less populated than the town of Guinda and its environs. This grower is not away from a populated area as the CLUO intended and that impacts the total environment: water use, pesticide use, run-off, noise that affects humans and

wildlife, light at night, and odors become public health concerns when they would not if the grower were in a less populated or unincorporated area.

12. Overall, the project description is filled with questionable facts like the number of homesites affected and vague language like "does not anticipate needing to hire additional employees." In short, they would be free to overdevelop as they already have, leaving Yolo County to supervise every infraction and destroying the quiet peace of the southern backyard of Guinda.

We thank you for considering our concerns along with others that come to your attention. Please help us restore what has been lost by denying this fifth and final permit application by Outdoor Properties and granting it to a company that values its community and respects the Capay Valley.

Name Deborah Shifer + Jack Shifer

Signature [Handwritten Signature]

Address 7833 County Rd 49, Guinda 95637

Email (optional) [Redacted]

Name Christine Hildebrand

Signature [Handwritten Signature]

Address 7938 Rd 49 Guinda Ca, 95637

Email (optional) [Redacted]

Name Chloe Meier

Signature [Handwritten Signature]

Address 7938 Rd 49 Guinda CA

Email (optional) [Redacted]

Name PAULA & DAVID BATEMAN

Signature PAULA BATEMAN DAVID

Address 8151 ROAD 49 GUNDA, CA 95637

Email (optional) 

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Email (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Email (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Email (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Jeff Anderson](#)  
**Subject:** Fifth Permit Application for Outdoor Properties  
**Date:** Thursday, June 1, 2023 6:45:42 PM

---

Hi Jeff,

We know you have received many letters and emails from residents in the town of Guinda, CA. Please add our letter to the stack. We own a home and a nursery in Guinda and are privy to the lights that stay on all night, the noise that interrupts the sounds of nature that we all love, the excessive water use, the cars going in and out and the excessive water use that effects some of the residents nearby.

My husband Ron and I are very much opposed to your renewing the fifth and final permit to Outdoor Properties. This really is not the proper town for an operation of this size and this burdensome on the community.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandi and Ron Lutsko

[THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED FROM OUTSIDE YOLO COUNTY. PLEASE USE CAUTION AND VALIDATE THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE EMAIL PRIOR TO CLICKING ANY LINKS OR PROVIDING ANY INFORMATION. IF YOU ARE UNSURE, PLEASE CONTACT THE HELPDESK (x5000) FOR ASSISTANCE]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Jeff Anderson](#)  
**Subject:** Outdoor Properties Permit  
**Date:** Friday, June 2, 2023 8:54:29 AM

---

Dear Jeff,

I have had a chance to review the permit application (#2022-0083) for cannabis operations by Outdoor Properties at 16520 Road 56 in Guinda, CA.

I am writing you to oppose the renewal of this permit.

I have farmed olives and apricots for 20 years in Guinda and am a founding board member of the Capay Valley Growers, a cooperative food hub that distributes produce grown by small farmers in the valley. Given this, I have a deep understanding of farming and its relationship to surrounding properties and the community. I would classify Outdoor Properties as an industrial business that operates at all hours (24/7), and ensuing activity impacts the neighbors, is owned by distant operators, and is not connected to the community. People come and go at all hours, and the noise and smell are not compatible with a quiet farming community. We have witnessed the actual operation for a number of years now and have seen how the activities impact the neighborhood. They have not been considerate neighbors, and seem to have a lack of concern for the terms of the permit and their impact on the surrounding neighborhood. Guinda is a small but tight community of family farms with an emphasis in organic production and this is simply not compatible with the living and working patterns of the neighborhood. An important goal of the CLUO is to keep these businesses compatible with the neighborhood, and again, this misses the compatibility mark.

The final concern is one of follow up and lack of enforcement by the county. I understand the limits of resources and time and I suspect the operators of Outdoor Properties do as well. It is one thing to agree to terms but another to not abide by those terms. I believe we need mutual cooperation and community dedication from our property owners and a distant owner not connected to the community and focused on profit is simply not an appropriate match for this location. The CLUO aims to protect rural areas that are traditionally attached to a town such as Guinda and approval of this permit does not serve that goal. I appreciate your consideration of this perspective and ask that you deny this permit request.

Sincerely,  
Ron

**RON LUTSKO**

-----  
**CAPAY OAKS FARM**

16689 Cleveland Street  
Guinda, CA 95637



[THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED FROM OUTSIDE YOLO COUNTY. PLEASE USE CAUTION AND VALIDATE THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE EMAIL PRIOR TO CLICKING ANY LINKS OR PROVIDING ANY INFORMATION. IF YOU ARE UNSURE, PLEASE CONTACT THE HELPDESK (x5000) FOR ASSISTANCE]

Jeff Anderson  
Yolo County Planning Department

September 16, 2024

Regarding  
Outdoor Properties  
16520 County Road 56  
Zone File # 2022-0083  
AP# 060-080-010

Mr. Jeff Anderson,

Concerned citizens are writing you to complain about Outdoor Properties a large industrial cannabis growing operation in the small town of Guinda, California. For several years we have complained to the county about the daily operation of this business and have received no resolution and in fact have been blatantly dismissed and forced to wait until an undetermined date when the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance takes effect. We believe that these issues should be addressed not in some distant future but immediately to show that Outdoor Properties is making an honest attempt to work with our community.

Outdoor Properties halted their operation for a short period of time early in 2024 but have recently resumed. Along with the recent activity come all of the same old problems. For example, Outdoor Properties continues to violate the sound limits set forth in the CLUO. The twenty four hour a day noise pollution is intrusive and unnecessary. The HVAC system can be modified to eliminate the sound that travels past their property lines. Outdoor Properties has made no effort to solve this problem.

The location of Outdoor Properties also is of concern. The close proximity of this business to landowners in the area has had a negative effect on our enjoyment, livelihoods and property values. Yolo County has determined that the Capay Valley should be valued as a tourist destination but no one wants to live or vacation next to a business that destroys the rural atmosphere and its viewshed.

Finally, and most importantly, we are concerned about the safety of our community because young male Outdoor Property employees are cutting through fields and close to homes as they come and go from work. It is alarming to see strangers suddenly on your property. We have several elderly, live alone, neighbors who are vulnerable to crimes of convenience. In order to make a community safe it is important to know your neighbors. This of course is impossible for us with Outdoor Properties because of absentee owners and an ever changing cast of characters working to grow and harvest the crops. The neighbors need easy access to contact information for actual owners and not a management company or employee. Is there an owner who is accountable and willing to take action to address the concerns of the community?

Of course we will bring up these issues with the county and the Capay Valley Citizens Advisory Committee when Outdoor Properties is up for permit renewal but the county needs to be aware of the continued disturbance and dangers posed by this business.

Guinda Neighbors  
Pamela & David Bateman  
Christine Hildebrand  
Sue Collentine  
Christi Hanson  
Kim & Rebecca Kersten  
Candice Schar-Johnson

## Outdoor Properties Cannabis Use Permit

My name is Kim Consol. My husband and I live and own 16298 County Rd 56 in Guinda, which is directly next door to the cannabis farm. We have the house that is closest to the facility and share a short wire fence line.

I was under the impression that the cannabis use permit is supposed to be for one owner and not be transferable. There have been 3 entirely separate groups of people who have operated the facility. In all appearances, it has been sold three times. The first and second group constructed different facilities. Their operation and staff have been very different. The number of employees has always looked to be many more than 3 to 8 people, up until the abandonment of the property in 2024.

The second owner/operator/manager, John, was nice and responsive to our concerns. The first owner, Q, didn't care about how the operation effected neighbors. Some of his employees were locals who were friendly but had no control over the way things were being run. A large group of his employees commuted from the Bay Area and had no ties to Yolo County. The last owner- current owner/manager, Tommy, has been either absent or indifferent to any attempts to communicate. He has been belligerent to our other neighbor. This is not a business that cares about our community.

We share County Road 56. The first third of the road is county road. If we are lucky, the county will grade that part of the road once a year. It is washboard bumpy all the time now. There has been a huge increase in traffic, including semi trucks, since the grow facility came here. At the turn for Outdoor Properties, the road becomes private, which means we are responsible for the road maintenance and purchase of gravel etc. beyond that point. There is a sign but some drivers still miss the turn and drive on our private road, all the way to our home at the end of the road. Many times they walk around until they find us to ask directions on how to get to the cannabis facility. Semi trucks have also missed the turn and a couple have become stuck on our road. The additional traffic ends up costing us more for road maintenance plus it's a security risk to have strangers wandering around our property.

For the first couple years, the strong skunky smell of cannabis was unbearable and unescapable, even when inside our home. Then eight greenhouses went up, which made the stink less noticeable, most of the time but not all. After that, John had ten more, huge, over 5000 sf greenhouses put in. They have fans to control the smell. The fans are so loud that they sound like a jet getting ready for flight. The noise is horrible. We no longer have the peace and quiet of country life.

The greenhouses are lit up at night, visible from far away. One of the pleasures of country life is the night sky full of stars. The stars were no longer visible, just the glare of the greenhouse and facility flood lights. They tried turning the lights on later, but the timers often failed and the lights would come on all night. A couple years ago, John installed black out curtains, also on timers. The curtains block the light when the system is working. Many times the curtains would not work as needed, or they would partially cover but not all. Outside the buildings were flood lights which were on all night and also added to the light pollution.

The property has appeared to have been abandoned during the past year. Buildings, greenhouses and structures are deteriorating. Trash and debris, broken material that gets blown against and over our wire fence has always been a consistent problem ever since the grow facility started. What's changed lately is that the greenhouses and structures are falling apart and there's no one to pick up and dispose of the debris. And it's not little trash, it's huge sheets of plastic, pots and material in addition to garbage. Those of us who live here know that we often get strong north winds. Every time the wind blows, our fence line gets covered with trash and plastic. There has always been trash and materials all over the ground all over much of that property since it has been a grow facility. The greenhouses are massive and tall. It's common for the plastic on the greenhouses to break or come loose during high winds. This has happened every year, not just 2024. The plastic comes loose, flaps in the wind, makes loud noises, terrifying the horses. Pieces of it break off, sail through the air, end up all over our pasture and growing areas. We would need a dumpster to dispose of the amount of trash and debris that gets blown over here every time there are high winds.

The fence between our properties behind the facility house has been knocked down by their eucalyptus trees which often fall over and drop branches. The fence has not been fixed. The grass in that large open area, and the large open area east of the greenhouses is thick and tall. In a couple weeks it will be brown and dry and an extreme fire hazard. There has already been two wildfires burn onto that west part of the property. When John owned/managed the cannabis farm, he would mow or till the grass when asked, and keep the trees cleaned up. John also assisted with fire suppression with his bulldozer. The other owner/managers were/are not willing to do any grounds maintenance, even what is needed for fire safety.

Overall, our quality of life here has been destroyed by the cannabis grow facility. Before it was here, I wanted to stay here forever. I loved the family cattle operation next door with the grumpy old lady.

Now I want to sell and move, but our property values have been affected and no one wants to live next door to a pot farm.

I am not against cannabis grow facilities. I'm against allowing them to be where they affect people who have moved here for rural life. They belong in an industrial zone or far from people.

# Yolo County Planning Department

Concerning Action Item ZF2022-0083

April 24, 2025

## Cannabis Use Permit for Outdoor Properties

Yolo County Planning Department,

We are writing this letter to the Planning Department to call attention, once again, to the business practices of Outdoor Properties in Guinda, California. We have lived close to this operation since they purchased the land in 2017 and began growing cannabis. There are four very important issues we would like to highlight concerning this business. We will be attending the Planning Department's meeting for Outdoor Properties where we can, if necessary, elaborate on the following points.

1. Outdoor Properties have a lengthy and well established history of failing to meet the everyday expenses of property ownership.
2. They entered what they knew would be a tightly regulated industry. Despite years to prepare, they have consistently ignored nearly every rule contained within the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and failed to plan for the eventual enforcement of the CLUO.
3. They have repeatedly failed to respond to the concerns of their neighbors. Their disregard borders on contempt.
4. Outdoor Properties' presentation to the Capay Valley Citizens Advisory Committee was confused, contradictory, opaque, improvised and again failed to take seriously our concerns. In essence they begged to be trusted. They have been absolutely untrustworthy since 2017. We strongly urge Outdoor Properties be denied the permit they have failed to earn.

David & Pamela Bateman  
8151 County Road 49  
P.O. Box 157  
Guinda, California  
95637

RE: Cannabis Business: Outdoor Properties LLC  
Property Owner: Loma West, LLC (Tommy Christy)  
Applicant: Tommy Christy  
APN: 060-080-010  
Parcel Size: ±20 acres  
Address: 16520 County Road 56, Guinda, CA 95637

April 27, 2025

Dear Members of Yolo County Planning Commission,

As a near neighbor of the business at 16520 County Road 56, Guinda, CA 95637, I respectfully request your vote to deny the applicant a cannabis use permit. I know that your primary purpose as commissioners is to make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on land use and development, protecting the land from abuse or misuse and supporting the EIR's goals for ecological health, water, air quality, buildings and waste.

Outdoor Properties has shown themselves to be indifferent to laws, to rules and regulations and unconcerned about their impact on their immediate neighborhood. As business owners who do not live on their property, they chose to exploit the land however they could for profit, a value and goal not in line with the Capay Valley envisioned and protected by its citizens.

Jeff Anderson's summary of the reasons for denial of a permit reads like a rap sheet: years of unpaid taxes both property and cannabis, non payment of recycling and waste bills, illegal generator, illegal and unethical business practices such as lack of "track and trace", and a physical plant in financial trouble and in disrepair.

The disregard this company shows for laws, regulations and expectations is evident in the record provided and summarized above. What can also be noted is a shocking lack of concern, on the part of this absentee business, for the environment. Some examples:

1. The community endured years of high pitched noises, loud humming and grinding sounds day and night, 7 days a week, impacting the peace and natural setting of the area.
2. The darkness of night was gone by the light of greenhouses with no protection from the glare.
3. The traffic increased along with a disregard for speed signs or understanding of a small country road.
4. Water supply in the community was impacted as they overbuilt the site.

Now we might wonder, what else? Did they contaminate the environment by using unapproved fertilizers? Did they pollute the water and air with improper ventilation? What has become of the unoccupied residence on the property?

At a recent meeting with the Capay Valley Citizens Action Committee, a group of neighbors, with Mr. Anderson present along with the applicants for the permit, and the sheriff, I might add, the committee of 6 voted unanimously to uphold Mr Anderson's recommendation to deny this permit.

I am grateful to Mr. Anderson for patient and clear communication throughout this long process and for providing a fair approach to this process for everyone, applicants included.

Thank you for considering all our voices in protest of granting a use permit to Outdoor Properties.

Sincerely,

Sue Ramsey Collentine  
8035 County Road 49  
Guinda, CA 95637