OBJECTIONS

Thanks, John

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Mail Delivery Subsystem** <mailer-daemon@googlemail.com>
Date: Fri, May 8, 2020 at 8:15 AM
Subject: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)
To: <tanainacommunity@gmail.com>

Error Icon

Address not found

Your message wasn't delivered to marijuana.licening@alaska.gov because the address couldn't be found, or is unable to receive mail.

The response from the remote server was:

```
550 5.1.1 User Unknown
```

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: TCC <tanainacommunity@gmail.com>
To: marijuana.licening@alaska.gov
Cc: John Meising <scarlet1939@hotmail.com>, "miller.greg@live.com" <miller.greg@live.com>, Aaron Edwards <princeaaronj@hotmail.com>, Corine Hickey <corinehickey@gmail.com>, Gretchen Watson <gretchgreg11@gmail.com>, Michelle Larose <michla01234@gmail.com>, Rachel Lund <rachellund04@gmail.com>, "alex.strawn@matsugov.us" <alex.strawn@matsugov.us>
Bcc:
Date: Fri, 8 May 2020 08:17:07 -0800
Subject: an opposition letter

In order to object to this application at 1125 W. Gail Drive in Wasilla, we are providing a written statement of reasons for the objection to both the applicant for the marijuana establishment, and AMCO at marijuana.licening@alaska.gov. The statement will be sent to the applicant at the email address provided to us from Mr. Miller, Thanks for your input on how to file our response electronically. Enclosed with our opposition letter is our vision statement and sustainable growth policy and procedures.

Thanks,
John Meising
TCC President

TCC

TANAINA COMMUNITY COUNCIL INC.
PO Box 870236
Wasilla, AK 99687
tanainacommunity@gmail.com

06 May 2020

Greg Miller
1125 W. Gail Drive
Wasilla, AK 99654

Dear Mr. Miller,

Thank you for contacting us regarding your application for a limited marijuana grow operation at your property located at 1125 W. Gail Drive in Wasilla. Your input at our General Meeting on 28 April 2020 showed concern, understanding, and the importance to you.

As a recognized entity by the Mat Su Borough, The Tanaina Community Council's position whether to endorse or deny your application was not taken lightly. We ultimately concluded there are too many negative mitigating factors to allow us to freely accept your proposal and support your decision at this time:

-- establishing a limited marijuana grow operation, with the possibility of expansion, in a densely populated residential area
-- opposition from direct neighbors with children
-- a failure t o obtain a nonconforming use premit, regarding utility easments, for required security fencing
-- an indecisive business plan with the words "hobby", "science experiment", and " no concern for profit or loss"
-- overall security in relation to existing g reenhouse location
-- no plan for removal of proposed limited cultivation operation

TCC

TANAINA COMMUNITY COUNCIL INC.
PO Box 870236
Wasilla, AK 99687
tanainacommunity@gmail.com

-- no projected affect regarding immediate and surrounding property values. What if the applicant moves in a year or two?

-- the proximity of proposed location to a park and school

-- not satisfied with answers about safety, setback from right of way, and access is questionable

-- very concerned with introducing the risk/rise of crime within an established residential community

The intention of the TCC is an objective examination of any community proposal submitted and rendering a decision on what is best for the entire community and residential neighborhood as a whole.

Enclosed with this letter you will find our TCC Vision Sta tement as well as our Sustainable Growth Policy and Procedures outline.

Thank you,

John Meising,
TCC President

cc: TCC Board Directors -- Aaron Edwards, Corine Hickey, Gretchen Watson, Michelle La Rose, Rachel Lund. Alcohol & Marijuana Control Office r TJ Zielinski. Matanuska Susitna Borough Officer Alex Strawn

TCC

TANAINA COMMUNITY COUNCIL INC.
PO Box 870236
Wasilla, AK 99687
tanainacommunity@gmail.com

The Tanaina Community Council Vision:

- The Tanaina Community Council has a vision for the future of our local community. We envision a safe community, relatively free from crime. A community of individuals, families, and businesses who should be unified in the healthy development of our communi ty. We look forward to planned, sustainable growth, which aligns with the strong family oriented nature of the community in unison with the residents and businesses within.

- Regarding Marijuana businesses:

The Tanaina Community Council would like to ha ve an opinion limiting the number and location of marijuana businesses within our boundary area. Also, it's our opinion that growing, manufacturing, or selling controlled and intoxicating substances in a densely populated residential community does not generally benefit the safety and wellbeing of the entire community.

The council will review proposed applications and may provide the applicant time for a presentation and comments at the General Meeting. After a brief, yet extensive deliberation, a vote will be taken regarding the application. If not immediately, and if time constraints allow, we will probably not vote till our next Board Meeting. After the vote, we wil l draft an approved and official response in writing.

TANAINA COMMUNITY COUNCIL INC.
PO Box 870236
Wasilla, AK 99687
tanainacommunity@gmail.com

Sustainable Growth Policy and Procedures

Policy: The Tanaina Community Council Inc. (TCC) is tasked with providing opinions to the Mat Su Borough, State of Alaska, and the general public on a number of subjects such as: Conditional Use, Legal Nonconfroming Use, or Limited Business permits.

In order to address each new topic individually and without prejudice the following guidelines are in place to ensure consistency of the evaluation. The future and safety of the local community is to be considered. Healthy development should align with the strong family oriented nature of the community and its residents.

Procedures: 1. The Tanaina Community Council will require business applicants to submit a request in writing to the TCC via USPS mail or other electronic means.

2. The applicant's request must be received by the TCC at least two weeks (2) prior to a general meeting for inclusion to the agenda.

3. If the applicant is scheduled on the agenda they would be allowed up to 10 minutes to present their topic and field questions.

4. The requestor will be required to leave the room after the presentation, during any further related discussion, and may be brought back in for additional questions or clarification if needed.

5. TCC Board members will evaluate and return a vote in a timely fashion of in favor, not in favor or non opposition.

TANAINA COMMUNITY COUNCIL INC.
PO Box 870236
Wasilla, AK 99687
tanainacommunity@gmail.com

6. The requestor is not permitted to be present for the vote relating to their application. Decisions will be made by the board, typically at their next meeting. The decision will be provided to the requestor and other con cerned parties in writing by the next general meeting.

7. If necessary, written response or electronic communications will be provided to the Mat Su Borough, State of Alaska, or the general public.

The following conditions are to be considered by the TCC B oard:

Type and location of business or request

A site visit may be considered to ensure understanding of location

Proximity within miles as to similar businesses (no saturation)

Visibility of business as it relates to residential areas

An attempt to appro ach neighboring residents for their understanding, opinions, and input

Access to business: aka traffic (volume, entering and exiting)

Hazardous and/or Environmental conditions (debris removal, garbage and road conditions)

If controlled substances are invol ved; How close is the business located to Schools, Daycares, and Churches?

Plans or Plat Maps, including aerial views, should be gathered to validate the proposal if necessary

TANAINA COMMUNITY COUNCIL INC.
PO Box 870236
Wasilla, AK 99687
tanainacommunity@gmail.com

February 28, 2021

Dear AMCO Board,

I was disappointed to receive an opposition from Tanaina Community Council (TCC). I am responding with an explanation for the negative factors they listed. I am a family man with integrity and moral standards. I care about the safety of my neighborhood. I also feel that a limited marijuana cultivation in my private greenhouse does not contradict with the values of a safe community.

I will be addressing the list of factors from TCC in the space below. I hope to prove that TCC concerns are capricious, arbitrary, and unreasonable.

1) They assume that I am going to expand and I have made no mention of that. I am simply applying for one 500 square foot limited cultivation.

2) TCC is incorrectly identifying my residential area as a densely populated residential area. Directly behind my property line is a huge greenbelt that will never be built on because it is a swamp. Adjacent to my property's east side is a vacant one-acre lot that the neighbor uses as a buffer. Across the street are several large two- acre lots and a large lake. (Refer to the enclosed satellite view of Gail Drive and surrounding area. My property is circled in yellow. Please notice the greenbelt, the lake, and multiple undeveloped lots along Gail drive). Our house is on a one-acre parcel, as are the majority of homes on Gail Drive, many have two acres.

3) They state that my direct neighbors with children are opposed. My direct neighbor with children, Jamaya and Neil Randall, (1151 Gail Drive) are not opposed, in fact, they are interested in learning about the industry. We have no other direct neighbors with children. We have lived here for over 18 years and all of our direct neighbors except for the above mentioned, Randall's, are all senior citizens, like us.

4) TCC states that I failed to obtain a non-conforming use permit regarding utility easements for required security fencing. I had contacted the local power company Matanuska Electric Association (MEA) and they emailed me their management easement encroachment policy number 703-54, (I am attaching a copy of the policy). Last spring, MEA sent out their public relations officer accompanied by the TCC president, John Meising. The MEA officer found NO ISSUE with my proposal. I followed up with a phone call to MEA and they replied by sending me an email and giving me verbal permission to go ahead and build the fence with the understanding that they will not give up their right of way, meaning they will remove the fence if they need to access the area.

5) TCC said I had an indecisive business plan with no concern with profit or loss. I presented my limited cultivation plan as an opportunity for me to learn how to grow marijuana. I am not asking TCC for financing, therefore they have an invalid concern about my profit or loss. I have time in my retirement and I have always been curious about marijuana growing. Now that it is legal within the state of Alaska, I want to take advantage of my resources (greenhouse, excellent top soil, my ability) I have here.

6) TCC states that they have an issue with overall security in relation to existing greenhouse location. I emphasized my intentions of following the AMCO security requirements of lights, fencing, camera, and restricted access. My house is right next to the greenhouse and it is of utmost importance that we are safe and that unauthorized access to the property is locked out. I also informed TCC only one crop during the summer season would be harvested.

AMCO

MAR 11 2021

7) They state that I have no plan for removal of proposed limited cultivation operation. It's a greenhouse that I have been growing tomatoes in for five years, and I am just switching plants. If I want to remove my operation, I will simply forfeit the license and stop growing.

8) TCC is concerned that I have no projected affect regarding immediate and surrounding property values. The cannabis industry is profitable and is increasing real estate values in the valley. When licensing becomes limited, it will add value to the property if the new owner qualifies for the license transfer.

9) They wonder what will happen if I move in a year or two. Like all homeowners, I will try to sell my property for the most I can get and my home and property will be in good shape. The license would have to be transferred to someone else or forfeited.

10) TCC states my home's proximity to a school and park is a concern. My home is over one mile away from the nearest school (Tanaina Elementary) and more than two miles from a park.

11) TCC board was not satisfied with my answers about safety, setback from right of way and access to the greenhouse. I was very clear with my intentions of following ALL of AMCO requirements concerning security, access, and accountability. MEA public relations officer told John Meising while standing on my property looking at my proposed site for fencing "there is not a problem with my fence location and utility setback."

12) TCC is very concerned with introducing the risk/rise of crime within an established residential community. I have lived in this neighborhood for 18 years and am a law abiding citizen. I have a clean record, so does my wife. I would not be growing cannabis if it was a crime.

In closing, TCC's list of negative factors mitigating factors are capricious, arbitrary and unreasonable and expose their bias against anyone involved with cannabis as a drug dealer or criminal.

Sincerely yours,

Greg Miller

Greg Miller

AMCO

MAR 11 2021

MATANUSKA ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION, INC.
Palmer, Alaska

Management Policy 703-54

EASEMENT ENCROACHMENT

MEA has many thousands of miles of facilities that are primarily located within Utility Easements granted to MEA and Utility Easements granted to a municipality. MEA is occasionally requested to issue a Letter of Non-Objection regarding an easement granted to MEA for a landowner's improvement that is, or is proposed to be, located within an easement. In these cases the following guidelines apply:

1. MEA will not issue a Letter of Non-Objection to fences and moveable structures, generally allowing them with the understanding that MEA is not responsible to repair or replace them as a result of activities in the easement by MEA, its contractors, or assigns.
2. MEA will not issue a Letter of Non-Objection to an improvement that is located within a roadway, deferring that decision to the agency responsible for managing the roadway.
3. MEA may issue a Letter of Non-Objection to other improvements after evaluation by the MEA Operations and Right-of-Way Departments for safety, access and current/future MEA use of the easement. Any Letter of Non-Objection issued under this section will be subject to the following conditions where applicable:

    a. The improvement will in no way restrict or limit the current or future ability of MEA to fully enjoy the benefits of the easement for any and all utility purposes that it presently enjoys under the easement.
    b. MEA will be held harmless by the landowner from liability for any and all damages or injury to any person or property that may result from the existing and future use of the easement by MEA, its contractors, or assigns.
    c. MEA will be held harmless by the landowner for any and all liability arising out of or relating to any use of the easement by others under a Letter of Non-Objection.
    d. The landowner will be liable for any damages caused to MEA facilities by the improvement in the easement.
    e. The landowner will be responsible for any special construction costs incurred by MEA due to the improvement in the easement.
    f. The landowner will assure compliance with all applicable safety codes relating to the improvement in the easement.
    g. Use of this letter by the landowner, their successors or assigns will constitute acceptance of these conditions.

Evan J. Griffith
EVAN J. GRIFFITH, GENERAL MANAGER

Effective: 4/8/2011

AMCO
MAR 11 2021