

**From:** [Gillian Mahrt](#)  
**To:** [Crystal Acker](#)  
**Subject:** Pot permit No. UPC17-0020.  
**Date:** June 09, 2022 10:57:16 AM

---

My only concern is the loopholes in the permit that allows the operation to drill additional wells and lower the water table. Our dairy farm depends on ground water and water is very limiting in this area. The water hauling and marketing events hosted by the owners of the pot farm are a nuisance, but we can live with the noise and traffic as long as we still have water. Garry Mahrt. 421 Purvine Road.

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED OUTSIDE OF THE SONOMA COUNTY EMAIL SYSTEM.

**Warning:** If you don't know this email sender or the email is unexpected, **do not** click any web links, attachments, and **never** give out your user ID or password.

**From:** [Deborah Eppstein](#)  
**To:** [Scott Orr](#); [Crystal Acker](#)  
**Subject:** follow up- 334 Purvine  
**Date:** June 14, 2022 5:52:12 PM

---

EXTERNAL

Dear Crystal and Scott,

You may have heard that after the hearing for 334 Purvine, Mike Hardin phone several of us. I was receptive to talk as felt this was a good step towards increasing understanding between growers and the concerns of the Neighborhood Coalition, which I stated up front. However, Mr Hardin only wanted to berate Sanjay Bagai which I was not interested in. Scott, I appreciated you stopping this during his comments at the hearing.

Three statements he made should be of interest to you.

1) He said he purchased that land because Permit Sonoma originally told him it was a good place to put in a cannabis farm. He was proud that he now owns all the parcels on Purvine except for 2 or 3- his idea of neighborhood compatibility is to force the other neighbors out. I know that is not your view, but thought you would appreciate understanding his, which is confirmed by his actions.

2) He openly talked about his promotion of the cannabis again and seemed to think promotion was necessary and fine if not done on site. Yet the prohibition on promotion in the cannabis ordinance is not limited to being on site. I don't think that point was correctly addressed during the hearing. Can you please comment?

3) He said that Rent for Rain only provided the tank, not the water to fill it. The staff report provided the letter from the President of Rent for Rain stating that all water was only used for construction- yet according to Mr Hardin they did not provide the water- so that statement is meaningless. He stumbled when I asked about the unlicensed Petaluma Creamery trucks, saying he did not know what water trucks filled it. I hope that Permit Sonoma will look into that issue further, as well as what is happening to the water table affecting the neighbors' wells drying up.

Finally, I was very disappointed that Permit Sonoma had no response to the clear violation of the state Fire Safe Regulations. Jennifer Klein stated that the prior 2019 local ordinance exempted existing roads, but she neglected to state that the 2019 ordinance specifically states it was subservient to stricter requirements of both the State Fire Safe Regulations and the California Fire Code, each of which require 20 ft wide access roads. However, even the local 2019 regulations expired for the SRA (State Responsibility Area) on Dec 2, 2019, and the county has ONLY been under the state regulations since then so there should be no ambiguity. Yet the county approved new building permits for 334 Purvine in 2021 clearly in violation of the state regulations (Purvine Rd is 14-15 ft wide). Can you please respond?

Thanks,  
Debby

Deborah Eppstein  
deppstein@gmail.com

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED OUTSIDE OF THE SONOMA COUNTY EMAIL SYSTEM.

Warning: If you don't know this email sender or the email is unexpected,  
do not click any web links, attachments, and never give out your user ID or password.