



Darryl Cotton <indagrodarryl@gmail.com>

FW: Following up from last week...

1 message

Jason Browne <jason.browne@cllca.org>

Thu, Nov 12, 2020 at 11:48 AM

To: indagrodarryl@gmail.com

Here's the most previous letter, concerning a dispensary group from Sacramento that appeared to have gained favor with (or retained the services of) a member of our Cannabis Committee or City Council, in order to secure themselves a possible license, before we even have an ordinance.

There were denials all around, but we learned a lot behind the scenes that confirmed our suspicions.

From: Jason Browne <jason.browne@cllca.org>**Sent:** Sunday, October 25, 2020 7:54 AM**To:** 'Johnna Jones' <sunsray88@gmail.com>**Cc:** 'Daniele Eyestone - City Council' <deyestone@cityofredbluff.org>; 'Clay Parker - City Council' <cparker@cityofredbluff.org>; 'Kris Deiters' <kdeiters@cityofredbluff.org>; 'Amanda Jenkins - City Council' <ajenkins@cityofredbluff.org>; 'Anita Rice' <arice@cityofredbluff.org>; 'Rick Crabtree' <rkrabtree@cityofredbluff.org>; 'Robert Halpin' <robert.halpin@cllca.org>; 'Kenn Rieders' <noodledude@att.net>; 'Liz Merry' <lizmerry58@gmail.com>; 'John Prinz' <johnprinz@hughes.net>**Subject:** RE: Following up from last week...

Johnna,

I hope this finds you well. Power may be out here in my area for a few days, due to wind (sigh).

My email was only to you, as you had requested at the previous Council meeting (you suggested that I should have contacted you personally, before airing my grievances publicly). We can still have that kind of conversation, any time you like. Since you c.c.'d some of the group and made this public, I'm doing likewise. If you would like to reign this conversation in, just reply to me individually and we can take this to a personal discussion.

What I disclosed to the City Council was not a rumor. It was a series of facts. I was in receipt of an email sent from one Jennifer Luna (Community Outreach Coordinator for a Sacramento based dispensary called Perfect Union), to the group known as Tehama Together. I would be happy to share this email with you, if you like. In the email, Ms. Luna stated "we are a cannabis dispensary that will soon be in the City of Red Bluff". This obviously implied that this dispensary had an inside source on the council or the committee, and that they were under the impression they would receive special treatment or a leg up to apply for a license. When I contacted her, she told me they had someone on the City Council, but refused to say whom it was. It's possible that she meant someone on the Committee, and didn't know the

difference. In either case, she definitely knows someone involved in this process, and that was the subject of my inquiry.

When I asked her if they worked with HDL, she abruptly hung up the phone and then refused to answer when I called her back. You can draw your own conclusions from that. We can't validate any conclusions without more facts, but what we know so far does paint a picture.

I did a little research on Perfect Union. Here's what I initially discovered (see attached). I haven't followed up any more on this, as I have a lot on my plate that doesn't involve this issue. But we can certainly dig a little deeper, with all hands on deck, if we want to learn more. As I stated in my email, it's not a conflict of interest if someone was merely trying to help a friend or associate to apply once there is a process. Unless of course that person was being paid to do so, while working on behalf of the Committee or the City Council. Or, if some guarantees were being made to an outside interest, before we even have a public application process. These are the only two possible conflicts I see here, and at this point, I have no proof. But I have presented evidence, and we shouldn't take that lightly.

I'm heartened to know that the City is not considering bans on personal cultivation or creating another local abatement program. Thank you for this clarification. I won't waste any more of your time on these issues, moving forward.

The smell issue is obviously something the Committee needs to address. Our side has provided you all with quantifiable information regarding the Terpenes, and that is literally where this conversation should begin. The smell of cannabis is not dangerous. Neither is knowledge of the existence of cannabis. No other valuable possessions are treated this way. People have many things of value that can be seen or otherwise discovered, and this may lead to acts of thievery. This applies to both personal locations (expensive vehicles, appliances, jewelry, cash, guns, etc.) and commercial locations (orchards, banks, liquor stores, pharmacies, etc.). No other product is held to this standard of complete invisibility. This is what I'm talking about when I refer to "reefer madness". I hope the Committee will agree to discuss the smell issue in more detail. Is it only certain terpenes? Is it really just the idea of cannabis? Is the knowledge of cannabis so dangerous that we should consider carbon filtration? If that's the case, then Mixed Light (greenhouses) could implement the same visual barriers, security features and odor reduction that indoor cultivation does, while also reducing the carbon footprint and negating the CEQA issues associated with purely indoor cultivation.

Law enforcement bears some responsibility for the "dangers of cannabis crimes" in our communities. Their Associations and Unions have lobbied for years to promote forcing the public disclosure of all commercial and private cannabis facility locations, and denying 2nd amendment rights and other self defense rights of cannabis facility operators. And law enforcement chiefs have publicly disclosed (in newspapers of record and other local media) that they will refuse to pursue criminal investigations against people who rob or burglarize cannabis facility operations. I'm not making this up. They have a long history of creating the very problem they're complaining about, and they've put countless individuals' lives at risk in the pursuit of their "war on weed". So I don't want to see their crocodile tears about how lawful cannabis operations endanger our communities. It's the police who are endangering our communities, by refusing to enforce our laws whenever it doesn't personally suit their own interests.

In closing, the sinister nature of reefer madness and the war on cannabis is without question, in my mind. I certainly wasn't comparing it to genocide. On a scale of 1-10, I guess it might rank somewhere around 7 or 8. This is a completely harmless plant (zero deaths associated with its use) with numerous medicinal,

nutritional, industrial and spiritual uses, that humanity has used for tens of thousands of years. Our government has spent billions of our tax dollars and destroyed millions of people's lives over this "war". Everything said to justify the war is based on lies. These lies are so ingrained, that even when Voters decree to legalize it for medical, industrial and adult use purposes, we're still dancing around issues like "smell" to justify establishing arbitrary and capricious mechanisms to impede the will of the people. I hope you understand where I'm coming from. To many of us, this plant is an essential part of our health and well-being.

Thanks for your time and consideration. I look forward to fine tuning this Ordinance, and hopefully we can all get final language in front of the Committee, before the new year.

Sincerely,

Jason Browne

530-736-6801

From: Johnna Jones <sunsray88@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 2020 7:19 PM

To: jason.browne@cllca.org

Cc: Daniele Eyestone - City Council <deyestone@cityofredbluff.org>; Clay Parker - City Council <cparker@cityofredbluff.org>; Kris Deiters <kdeiters@cityofredbluff.org>; Amanda Jenkins - City Council <ajenkins@cityofredbluff.org>; Anita Rice <arice@cityofredbluff.org>; Rick Crabtree <rcrabtree@cityofredbluff.org>

Subject: Re: Following up from last week...

Mr. Brown

Don't worry about upsetting me, it's not easy to do at this point. I will say that due diligence is just that, due. If you cannot prove it or can even say with certainty its a fact, then it is a rumor which does not carry validity. Making blanket accusations of impropriety against officials & successful attorneys can lead to a lack of credibility in the very least, which isn't a risk I'd be quick to take.

There has been no pursuance by the committee to limit personal cultivation, as it is protected by state law. The smell concern is not just a concern of public distain for the odor emitted. We all know there is a security issue with cannabis, one of the reasons for it being necessary to keep out of sight. However the scent(s) are very telling & if you can smell it then you know it's there. That increases the likelihood of theft & vandalism, which needs to be avoided both for public safety as well as 1st responder safety. I have had no discussion, nor do I know of any discussion; regarding the need or want to administer an abatement program of the counties' variety. I do not see the need for that kind of program now, nor do I believe this ordanance will necessitate such.

I do however have to disagree about your take on reafer madness. I have to say that this is far from "The most sinister ordeal ever concocted by man." That phrase in my mind brings about images of the holocaust, war torn villages in Africa where children are ripped from their families & forced into unspeakable things.

I'm not planning to abandon this committee, I do not however believe an ordinance will be finalized this year as not meeting until June has impacted our progress. In my opinion a year for this committee did not start until then.

Thank you for you input & your concern.

On Sun, Oct 11, 2020, 8:16 PM <jason.browne@cllca.org> wrote:

Johnna,

I apologize if what I had to say at last week's City Council meeting upset you. If I had more time, or we were able to conduct these meetings in person, I would have reached out to you beforehand. The information I was provided had literally been discovered earlier that day, so there was really no time to get to the bottom of things before asking the questions publicly. I appreciate what you had to say and want to be clear that nobody had assumed any impropriety on your part. Rather, there are two smoking guns here, and they may have each outed themselves based on their own comments and behavior.

It seems very likely that Clay Parker has a personal or financial interest in promoting the HDL Contract. I wasn't watching the meeting last week (was sitting outside the Chambers on my cell phone). So I missed the fireworks. By all accounts, Clay threw a temper tantrum and resigned from the Committee after the Council rejected the HDL Contract. That seems telling to me. Did he personally respond when I asked if anyone had a vested interest? I don't recall hearing any response from him.

Carolyn Walker is personally related to people who had dispensary licenses in Sacramento. I don't personally know whether or not they grandfathered in after the passage of Prop. 64, or if they are the same people behind "Perfect Union" (or it's subsidiaries). However, she did have a rather bizarre response to an email from Kenn Rieders. There is a distinct possibility that she has a personal or financial interest in that dispensary gaining a license here in Red Bluff. I can't prove it, and I don't know it to be true. But my understanding of human nature, coupled with what I do know and what she has recently stated online lead me to suspect the possibility. In any case, we seem to have rooted out some issues, as the tree had been shaken. Let's see where the dust settles.

We'll submit a revised Ordinance within the week, with some of the amendments that have come up in conversation...moving the Points and Authorities back to the front, adding the Definitions, and adding every zoning code in each Section. Beyond that, the final language really needs to be an organic process, where each Committee Member adds, deletes and amends the document, until the whole Committee reaches a consensus, or at least a majority vote on the final draft. The last time the group discussed this, there was talk of incorporating parts of Cody's Ordinance and maybe language from some other local north state ordinances. We have our version and have been working with that, in the absence of any direct participation from other Committee Members.

What we primarily oppose are three things:

1. The total exclusion of patients (and adult users) from being able to reasonably cultivate their own cannabis, at home;
2. The use of the "smell excuse" to ban all outdoor or greenhouse (mixed light) cultivation. Requiring only indoor cultivation leads to excessive costs and energy usage, and may violate State guidelines and CEQA requirements. Mixed light can be filtered just like indoor, to reduce "smells". And we presented the Terpene issue to the Committee. Nobody had discussed it. If we're talking about "smells", we really need to actually talk about smells. Maybe a whole meeting dedicated to this subject would help to clear the air, so to speak.

3. Setting up any parallel "abatement scheme" to what Tehama County already employs would be a non-starter. TC loses between \$600K and \$1 million per year on this scheme. There is a statewide organization, of which Bob Williams and Arthur Wylene are both members. They are tied with real estate interests, and have conspired to deprive hundreds of people of their homes / properties, under color of law. This is RICO level criminality. It started here in TC, and then expanded to include around 30 jurisdictions (everywhere that cannabis is locally banned). Red Bluff must NOT join this club. Targeting patients for growing their own medicine, on their own property, with tens to hundreds of thousands of dollars in "fines" that become liens, that become public auctions to steal their land, is ABOMINABLE. And that's exactly what these monsters are doing. The FBI will be notified of this, and I pray they decide to investigate.

I'm sorry that you have to deal with this level of corruption and deception. But the war against cannabis is among the most sinister ordeals ever concocted my man. Reefer madness is real, and it infects the brains of those who choose to believe it. The old adage of "follow the money" applies here perfectly. There is a lot of money riding on cannabis prohibition. Those people who personally benefit the most from its continuation will do everything in their power to deprive everyone else of the benefits of legalization. Instead of increasing our general funds, or paving our roads, or setting up community broadband, or putting more police on the beat, or housing the homeless, they would rather see all the money funneled into "enforcement" and "addiction treatment". Instead of funding things our society needs, they would rather fund their own pockets, with land grab schemes that cost the taxpayers millions of dollars to enforce. This is what we're up against.

In closing, thank you for voting against the HDL Contract. I hope that the Committee will continue holding public meetings and that it can produce a reasonable and simple Red Bluff Cannabis Ordinance for consideration of the City Council by 2021. I will do my part to assist in this endeavor, and I welcome any dialog that you would like to have on this subject, in private or in public. Thank you for your service to the citizens of Red Bluff.

Sincerely,

Jason Browne

530-736-6801



Perfect Union.docx

18K