

From: [Maureen Catalina](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: Fwd: Nava ranch expansion 2
Date: Wednesday, May 04, 2022 10:33:36 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an EXTERNAL source. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

Hi Laura,

I'm not sure why this letter is not part of the comments on the new revised staff report but I would like this letter, from the April 20, 2022 meeting, included in the new report. I will also be sending another one shortly. Thank you!

Sincerely, maureen catalina

Begin forwarded message:

From: Maureen Catalina <catalinaranch@aol.com>
Date: April 20, 2022 at 12:01:08 PM PDT
To: Maureen Catalina <catalinaranch@aol.com>, planningclerk@co.humboldt.ca.us
Subject: Nava ranch expansion 2

Dearest people,

I am going to resend my first letter as I still feel many of the points were not addressed in the new staff report and I still feel the same about many of the changes that are claimed to have been made. I have several concerns that were not addressed from the last meeting, and some new concerns considering new information on the report.

First of all, It took 11 days for the county to do an inspection. Eleven days.

During that time the applicant made several trips in and out of the property to clean it up before the inspection. I personally observed 20 different times of coming and going up the small road that connects to their property of the applicant. This was not normal travel activity on the small road. I find that an inspection after 11 days is not proof that the allegations made previously were unfounded, which is what is stated in the staff report. I see the lights, I hear the noise of a huge generator. That is my testimony and I will stick by it. Yes the lights seem to be covered NOW, and the generator is no longer heard at my property since the last meeting on March 17, 2022. But, I feel uncertain that this will not happen again with this applicant as there is not enough enforcement in Humboldt County. As citizens of Humboldt County our complaints seem to fall on deaf ears and it is so frustrating. Many people don't even call in anymore to the state of California, Humboldt County, and the sheriffs department. We know that nothing will be done about it. This is one of my main concerns, enforcement. No one comes out here to check on things, even when reports are filed or calls are

made about the various infractions on rural land in Humboldt county. I do understand that we do not have enough people to cover the entire county. I do understand there are financial reasons and shortages of staff. That is the reality. But with this in mind, why would Humboldt County continue to take on projects that it cannot inspect in a timely fashion and that it cannot enforce? I also feel that the applicant was well aware that these were non-compliant activities and yet continued to do so until it was stated publicly, and he was forced to comply.

1) Water. The explanation and evidence for the gathering of water is not sufficient. as the World Weather Online states, Honeydew averages 56 inches a year. This is nowhere near the amount needed. Rain catchment only works when there is sufficient rain and there is absolutely no guarantee that we will receive anywhere near the amounts that historically have come through our area. With a grow of this size, with 3 harvests, it would need closer to 1,500,000 gallons of water each year. Based on the average rain fall now, that would be impossible to gather with the rain catchment described in the staff report. What is the back up plan? Water is critical for our wildlife out here and as BLM mentioned, with the letter they submitted, there is critical habitat for the Coho, Chinook, and Steelhead salmon in Honeydew creek that could be effected by a expanded grow. BLM did not think the parcel was big enough to gather enough water from rain. And they had fears about the fish being impacted.

2) It is still being stated that a 900 square-foot building is going to handle all of the drying, processing, trimming, and storage. This is clearly physically impossible. There is still no explanation of what the “cannabis support building” is, where it will be located, and what size it will be. I have no idea how it will impact my property if I don’t know these details, therefore it is worrisome to me that this is left out of the report.

3) The report states: “One full-time employee and one family member will maintain the property.” I’m not sure why the word “family” is used in this report when addressing employee issues. An employee is an employee, and has the exact same rights and will need sufficient amenities based on California law. I still disagree that this is enough people to properly maintain the amount of cannabis they are proposing. And I am also wondering where these people will live, since it was stated in the first report that there is no housing available for employees.

3) Power. The project right now does not have enough power to do what it is doing right now. The lights that I observed and recorded, are clearly not low wattage. I completely disagree with the new staff report that said a Honda 2200 is capable of running this operation as it is right now. What I have been hearing is a diesel generator. A large diesel generator. I know the difference and have a lot of experience in this area. As for the project connecting with more PG&E power, that will take four or five years which is a well-known fact in Humboldt County. Furthermore there is no “green energy program”, and I feel these words are used to sugarcoat the reality that these huge grows are using fossil fuels for energy even when connected to PG&E. Please consider the environmental impact of this kind of electricity usage. Not just for Humboldt County but for the world and the

good of all. We live in California and there's no reason to use lights. We are known for being an agricultural state. Lights are used to increase profits. They are not necessary for anything else.

4) Please read the report sent in by the Bureau of land Management. Please consider the impact of a larger grow on the area. The king range is one of the most biologically diverse areas of California. We need to protect it by keeping the impacts small and manageable that are surrounding this delicate and valuable wilderness area. Please note that hunters will have to pass through the proposed cannabis operation in order to access the king Range Access for the public. I don't see how it is safe or viable for the general public to walk through a cannabis operation of this size without causing some kind of disturbance to the hunter and or the applicant. The public deserves free and comfortable access to the King Range.

I don't feel like the county has fully mitigated the impacts of an expansion to this Nava ranch parcel. There are many potential disasters and very few solutions are offered in the report. Please consider all concerns and deny this projects expansion.

Sincerely, maureen catalina