

From: [Jason Verrinder](#)
To: [planningweb](#)
Cc: [Lee, Jessie](#); [McBride, Scott](#); [Quintero, Frank](#); [Smith, Shane](#)
Subject: Conditional Use Permit #1277
Date: Monday, September 16, 2024 4:48:47 PM

To Whom it May Concern,

I, Jason Verrinder, resident at [REDACTED] am writing in regards to Conditional Use Permit #1277. At the July 3rd, 2024 Planning Commission meeting the Staff Report provided no reason for saying "no" to potential sites at Rahilly Park and Black Rascal Strip Park. At that meeting, I was told they did not even know why "no" was the answer. Since then, the applicant requested more time to research potential sites owned by the city and an updated staff report has been posted on the city's website and scheduled to be discussed on September 18th, 2024. The staff report includes no new potential sites owned by the city that were reviewed/taken into consideration, and no additional insight was provided for why the city continues to say "no" for the Rahilly Park and Black Rascal Strip Park sites. So my question remains the same. Why does the city say "no?" The public deserves more insight and analysis before a decision is made on our behalf on what is in the city's best interests regarding Conditional Use Permit #1277.

Sincerely,

Jason Verrinder
[REDACTED]

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of Merced -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]