

From: [Gail Coonen](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: Adesa, LLC case #PLA-11923-cup
Date: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 3:50:32 PM

To whom it may concern:

I know this area, having traveled there on numerous occasions

and walked on the Wilson Ranch. Do not approve this plan-it is the wrong location.

There are multiple problems associated with the plan. Will the business repair the already

awful road and keep it repaired from all the vehicle trips? Where will they source water during

a drought? There is no reliable phone service in case of an emergency. It is a high fire area.

Many other reasons you have already been informed of. The project should have been denied

at the very start. NOW IS THE TIME TO SAY NO!

Sincerely,

Gail Coonen

From: [Peter and Sharron Childs](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Cc: [Ken Miller](#); robie707@gmail.com; [Lynn Ryan](#); [Robert Sutherland](#); [Fred Bauer](#)
Subject: Adesa, LLC. Case Number PLN-11923-CUP
Date: Sunday, August 16, 2020 8:45:10 AM

Esteemed Commissioners,

Re. Adesa, LLC. Case Number PLN-11923-CUP, I would like to register my objection to the project.

Without listing specific technical objections, i would simply say that I agree with the problems that others are raising with regard to the project; I feel that they should be carefully considered, and in the proper context, which is to say with proper attention to the health of our environment. The importance of this aspect of these industrial-level grows can hardly be exaggerated; our lack of understanding of the effects of our economic activity on the environment upon which we are entirely dependent has brought us to the point where the United Nations screamed at us two years ago that we may have as little as twelve years left to avoid “global catastrophe” from climate change alone. That is such a huge thought that we tend to simply dismiss it but it is real, it is in our face, and if we do not take it into proper consideration it is difficult to see how we can avoid consequences that can hardly be construed as being in anyone’s interest.

I object to this project not only in detail but in principle. I was one of the old Moms and Pops (HUMMAP) who, when the legalization process began, begged the Board to keep Humboldt County what had made it literally world-famous; a place where the highest quality cannabis was produced by those who knew it, loved it, and developed it.

In other words, continue to have “Genuine Original Organic Sun-Grown Humboldt County Sinsemilla” produced by many small farmers, who after all were the ones who created the whole scene and, as logging diminished, substantially supported the County’s economy (five hundred million dollars per year according to the HSU study) because they lived here and spent their money here. It was in many ways an ideal situation. Why throw that away?

That was the moment when large grows should have been removed from the remote rural lands and put where they belong. They should not have been allowed to disrupt the special neighborhoods that the “back-to-the-landers” had created, or to damage the environment, for example with diesel generators or dewatering the streams that feed our rivers. Industrial level marijuana operations should have been located in the flatlands, drawing water from municipal sources and otherwise behaving in an environmentally responsible manner.

But that’s not what happened. The County has jumped with both feet into the industrial marijuana business, for its part raking in very substantial fees. Enormous grows have, instead of being removed from remote rural lands, been institutionalized there. These special neighborhoods have been significantly impacted in several negative ways by the presence of these industrial operations, not the least of which has been the taking away of their livelihood and handing it over to the very people who are doing the damage.

And the County seems to have been oblivious to the fact that the thousands of Moms and Pops who spent their money in-county are being starved in favor of a much smaller number of growers, many of whom live out of county and who in any case, because of their much lower numbers, will

spend much less in the county businesses. How are local Mom and Pop small businesses supposed to feel about that, especially as COVID 19 impacts their operations?

I continue to feel that Humboldt County should have stuck with a good thing. We should have let others knock themselves out scrambling for the bucks with this new industry which is by no means the sure thing that its early beneficiaries assume it will be. What will happen to this industry when cannabis is fully legalized and the price collapses? The only reason the price was ever anywhere near what it achieved was because it was illegal. Anyone can grow excellent marijuana if they can grow a tomato. No, the rosy future of this enterprise is anything but certain.

The new proposed ordinance that strives to protect small grows (under 2000 square feet) is encouraging; if it allows Moms and Pops to make a living without being gouged by excessive fees it will go a long way toward preserving Humboldt County's ability to profit from the production of the highest quality cannabis into the indefinite future.

Support many small growers; not a few big ones, especially out in the hills where they do not belong! And one more thing; I'm sick and tired of hearing about the "black market". It's no more nor less than "the market", which the Moms and Pops built up over decades and of which they certainly should be not just allowed but encouraged to take advantage.

Peter Childs Miranda

From: [Gilbert Gregori](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: Adesa,LL
Date: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 8:22:47 AM

Pleas do not allow Adesa,LLC. Case number PLN-11923-CUP a permit to grow cannabis, it is in the wrong location among many other reasons.

Thank You
Gil Gregori
1901 Dutyville Rd.
Garberville

From: [Mad River](#)
To: noah@landwaterconsulting.com; woods@asis.com; [Planning Clerk](#); [Madrone, Steve](#); [Wilson, Mike](#)
Subject: Opposition to PLN-11923-CUP
Date: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 1:54:10 PM

We reiterate our opposition to this project and request that it be shelved for further review. We ask that our comments be included in the staff report. This project will be heard again by the planning commission on August 20, 2020. Failure to look at CCLUO compliance for Adesa CUPs and adjacent project Mad River Estates CUPs, is counter to CEQA. These new industrial greenhouse projects are completely out of place for this rural ranching community, where currently nothing like this heavy industrial activity takes place. Why build acres of energy intensive buildings in a remote area that is off-grid power? Solar will not run these facilities for much of the year, and instead diesel generators will be used consuming hundreds of thousands of gallons needlessly. Fire risk, among so many other impacts listed below, was specifically called out by Cal Fire and this project ignores the potential for catastrophic wildfire. Please see our previous comments below.

Friends of the Mad River

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mad River <friendsofthemadriver@gmail.com>
Date: August 6, 2020 at 3:21:49 PM PDT
To: planningclerk@co.humboldt.ca.us
Cc: smadrone@co.humboldt.ca.us
Subject: Re: Opposition to PLN-11923-CUP

The subject line of yesterdays email was incorrect and email body text was correct. These comments are on project Adesa 11923 CUP opposition

Friends of the Mad River

On Aug 5, 2020, at 3:59 PM, Mad River
<friendsofthemadriver@gmail.com> wrote:

**Record PLN-11923-CUP:
APNs (315-145-002, 315-211-003 and -004)**

Dear Planning Commissioners and Supervisor Madrone,

We, as residents and concerned citizens of the Mad River, join in the opposition to this project among others' objections included in your packet, for the following reasons,

set forth below. We are also intimidated by the large, wealthy, out-of-area interests that are discussed below. Fear of reprisal has prevented some individuals from speaking up.

The location for this project in a rural, traditional ranching community, and the permit process to allow a project of this scale are not acceptable.

This project would industrialize a very rural area typical of ranching and timberlands that many of us seek to protect from this type of development. We are disappointed and distressed that despite one of the central purposes of the Humboldt marijuana ordinances and general plan being to limit such projects to previously developed areas with available grid electric power and suitable transportation facilities, that the planning department has chosen to promote this project in our rural valley.

This location is the opposite of what the Board of Supervisors has directed for marijuana development in the county. The proposed project should be rejected based on its inappropriate location, resulting in unsupportable increases in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, VMTs, wildfire risks, and habitat degradation, as well as clear incompatibility with the current Commercial Cannabis Land Use Ordinance (CCLUO) and its EIR, and the general plan.

We understand that this project is being processed by planning staff under an MND that relies on the outdated and ineffective CMMLUO and its failed MND that was found deficient by a court and settlement with Humboldt Mendocino Marijuana Advocacy Project. When in fact, this project as proposed would not even be possible or legal under the CCLUO/EIR that is now in effect. Such an end-run would mock the County's efforts to rein in the rampant environmental and social impacts from the marijuana industry, and open the floodgates for other exceptions/exemptions for more Industrial marijuana projects in this rural ranching community.

Maple Creek Investments, LLC. (MCI) is also before the

Planning Commission tonight seeking an amendment to their project, which has been approved pursuant to the CCLUO *and* an FEIR, two critical documents that are avoided and ignored by this project and planning staff. The Staff Report for MCI acknowledges the accumulating cumulative impacts to the area: “However, the Maple creek area is an extremely rural and secluded community with limited development, with large land holdings that have historically been managed primarily for cattle grazing and timber. If approved however this would not be the first commercial cannabis operation approved in the vicinity. The property immediately south of the project site was approved for 17,000 square feet of commercial cannabis cultivation by the Planning Commission on September 19, 2019. Other properties in the immediate vicinity have applications for commercial cannabis in progress, with at least four nearby properties having been engaged in commercial cannabis cultivation since at least 2015.” (pg 5, MCI Staff Report). This is the definition of cumulative impacts that the CCLUO requires the county to avoid.

Also, it is worth noting that MCI has PG&E power already, but that this project would use approximately 180,000 gallons of diesel annually and potentially extend a PGE power line into a fire prone landscape.

Rejecting this project now in favor of a more comprehensive evaluation, under the CCLUO with an EIR, of the continuing disruption of this “extremely rural and secluded community,” may be the last chance to protect the character of this threatened hamlet.

There appear to be many aspects of this project that conflict with the CCLUO, including: the unpaved and un-striped access road, use of diesel power for the majority of electricity, growing mother plants on-site rather than an approved off-site facility with access to grid or renewable power sources, inappropriate encroachment on the site’s prime agricultural soils, the use of artificial lighting between September and February, intrusion into protected species’ habitat (yellow legged frog, red legged frog, spotted owl, grasshopper sparrow, golden eagle) and the reasonably

foreseeable development of other similarly industrial projects nearby.

Although some of these conflicts may be technically legal, at a minimum they should be considered not with an MND under the old superseded CMMLUO, but with a full EIR under the CCLUO consistent with the county's general plan. The precedent this CUP would set if approved is, well, unprecedented, and alarming.

A quick read of the biological reports reveals a region rich in biological diversity, amongst the timberlands, cattle pasture and other features of Mad River coastal mountainous riparian rural life in Humboldt.

This project is clearly within spotted owl territories that would alone disqualify the project under CCLUO. Two of three monitored sites are less than the 1.3 miles from the no cultivation zone prescribed under the CCLUO. The third is 1.8 miles away, however additional habitat and usage by owls may be occurring, but no surveys have been performed by the applicant. These sites, and the following precautions, should alert the Commissioners to the current and potential fecundity of the habitat that you are being asked to intrude upon:

“Spotted Owl habitat on neighboring Green Diamond Resource Company is monitored annually under their Habitat Conservation Plan. As mentioned in the Technical Memorandum dated August 31, 2018, there are 3 Spotted Owl sites monitored in the vicinity of the AMT project: HUM 0657 (~1.8 miles NW), HUM 1035 (~0.6miles N), and HUM 1038(~1.1mi W). I checked with the Green Diamond Resource Company Wildlife Department and all three sites' final status was unoccupied for 2018.” (PNW 12/8/18)

“The closest designated critical habitat is for the northern spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*), approximately 1 mile to the southwest and 1.5 miles to the east of the study area. Additionally, critical habitat for steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus*) is mapped 1 mile to

the southwest of the study area along the main stem of the Mad River.” (6.3.1 SHN, **6.3.1 Designated Critical Habitat**)

“Within the 9-quad search, there are many Rarefind occurrences, with the closest being 0.7 miles from the study area; the most recent observation date within the 9 quads for this taxon was 2016. The study area contains limited habitat, but high-quality habitats exists adjacent to the study area.” (3-5SHN)

“No construction work shall occur during the northern spotted owl nesting season (February 1st- July 31st) unless a wildlife biologist with experience in northern spotted owl protocol surveys completes a biological assessment of the property to determine whether the area has northern spotted owl presence and whether site specific avoidance measures are necessary to avoid any impact to the species. Any measures developed by the biologist must be adhered to during the nesting season. Regardless of northern spotted owl presence on the property, no proposed activity generating noise levels 20 or more decibels above ambient noise levels or with maximum noise levels above 90 decibels may occur during the northern spotted owl nesting season.” (Bio-1, 110-111 **BIO-1 Limits of Construction Period for Northern Spotted Owl**)

Nearby we as residents have personally watched and/or heard owls, lions, bobcat, elk herds, otter and merganser families, cormorants, berry eating ducks, pond turtles, osprey, red-tailed hawks, golden eagle, kingfisher, giant salamander, black forest scorpion, black-banded rattlesnakes, grouse, pileated woodpecker, spotted skunk, coyote, fox, mink, rainbow and steelhead trout, Chinook salmon, bear, lamprey eel, myriad varieties of bees, bald-faced and other wasps and hornets, orange larkspur, mule ear, streamside and calypso orchids, stately lilies, a great variety of trees and flowers, and many other species that are rarely visible during fleeting sporadic daytime surveys. The creeks feed critical cold water into the temperature impaired Mad River.

These increasingly precious remote areas are habitat petri dishes with tremendous rejuvenating potential that would be interrupted by this and other proposed related industrial-

scale projects.

The mid-elevation (1800-2600 feet) hilly terrain interrupted by precious valley meadows is the wrong place for such industrial operations. The project looms from 2300-2800 over valleys with an elevation of 1000 feet, disturbing wide habitat ranges. "Slopes within the proposed development areas range from near-level to 15%, with all proposed development located on slopes of less than 15%. Areas adjacent to proposed development have slopes ranging up to approximately 30%." (98-99)

Check out SHN's pictures of the areas in your packet, and it becomes immediately obvious that this is no place for these industrial operations.

A second golden eagle nest is nearby, very close to another significant proposed project industrial marijuana project known as Mad River Estates, which should be included in any legitimate cumulative analysis, for this project. PNW Biologicals were forced to reconsider their original opinion that this project would not interfere with golden eagles after becoming aware of the second nest in the area. Alternative nest sites reflect "core areas of Golden Eagle territory," and are likely to be used. ("Conservation Significance of Alternative Nest Sites of Golden Eagles" Global Ecology and Conservation, Jan., 2015). The us fish and wildlife service should be made aware that this golden eagle pair is at risk of losing their territory to industrial marijuana development.

These eagles range over 10 square miles, with a nest curtilage of over 2-3 miles, and their use of habitat is restricted neither to hunting nor nesting, as implied in the PNW letter, or they would not be here: "Further, your project area is situated in a prairie between narrow forested areas that make that section of prairie less desirable to the hunting style of Golden Eagles in general. With additional viewing of the area, I still did not observe the types of trees that Golden Eagles use in Humboldt County (very large, old growth Douglas-fir) near your project area and thus there is no concern that a Golden Eagle nest would move-in near the project site." (2/18/19

PNW Biologicals)

The applicants' consultants repeatedly infer from the existing habitat the likely absence of inhabitants or impacts. This allows for serious underestimation of both. For example, without the objective evidence that there are two local Golden Eagle nests, they would dismiss their presence and support their contention with the inadequate habitat and their failure to see one during a random field survey. In any case, the eagles' presence, like the owl sites, are potent warnings of the habitat that will be unavoidably disturbed by all the new activities associated with this project, combined with Mad River Estates and other nearby marijuana projects.

Another affected species, the grasshopper sparrow, is listed as a species of special concern by CDFW. This species makes inconspicuous ground nests in short grass prairies during the breeding season (typically April through July). Although this sparrow migrates to southern climates in the fall through winter, its habitat does not and is subject to long-lasting disturbances, notwithstanding CDFW's recommended encroachment limits during nesting season.

The record is replete with comparable apparent efforts to ignore, minimize, and dismiss destructive significant environmental and cultural impacts to an irreplaceable rural habitat whose very existence is threatened by this and other similar CUPs. Too often, as in this project, consultants miss the forest for the trees by basing their mitigations on piece-mealing the project's impacts. The Staff Report then relies on these unsupportable assertions regarding major impacts from the proposed project.

For example, this particular CUP opens the gate for others that are pending in the same region: right next to the Adesa project is a bigger proposed development called Mad River Estates, at least preliminarily with two parking areas with a total of 36 spaces for 24 full time employees, 25 part time employees and 49 employees on-site during the peak harvest and processing season, operating 24/7/365.

Perhaps this is the same or related to another project on page 10 of your agenda: Maple Creek Investments, LLC^[L]Record Number: PLN-2018-15197^[L]Assessor's Parcel Number (APN): 315-011-009, Butler Valley Road, Maple Creek area

It is disconcerting to read Planning's self-serving rationalizations regarding the obvious growth induction potential of this and other related new industries. "The proposed project will not produce significant growth inducing or cumulative impacts that will result in the conversion of farmland or forest land. Growth inducing impacts are generally caused by projects that have a direct or indirect effect on economic growth, population growth, or land development."

And "While other proposed cannabis operations are located much closer to these golden eagle individuals and may, therefore, have a greater impact, "[t]he mere existence of significant cumulative impacts cause by other projects alone shall not constitute substantial evidence that the proposed project's incremental effects are cumulatively considerable." (Et Seq, pg 17).

Please review the cumulative impacts document prepared by county staff contained in this project's file, where multiple other projects have been recently reviewed, are either under consideration, or are likely to be re-submitted for review in the near future, especially if this CUP is approved.

This obvious obeisance to the proponent does not serve the public interest, despite the lucrative income from taxes to the County coffers. This income could just as easily be generated from these projects in suitable locations.

This project will require diesel generated power despite being a new and not a "pre-existing cultivation site," as defined under the updated CCLUO, and there is no assurance, or practical reason to believe that it will be feasible to supply 80% of the power needs from the proposed future solar PV array.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions from diesel power

generation, construction activities, frequent vehicle transports, and the ominous threat of wildfire in this unprotected area should be sufficient to reject this CUP.

The current proponent's facility depends on diesel power, partially offset by a *proposed* solar PV system. According to the Staff Report, the total operational GHG emissions of approximately 6,244 metric tons of CO₂ can be dismissed because "...it is still far less than the 250,000 metric ton reporting threshold for new projects," ignoring the unmitigated additional emissions to our imperiled atmosphere that would not exist in appropriate locations. Other stationary sources of emissions from the project include the proposed cultivation, processing, and manufacturing buildings, but these are likewise minimized. (50-51)

That "The proposed facility will use forced-air gas heating instead of woodstoves or fireplaces which will significantly reduce GHG emissions generated from heating during long-term operation of the project," is an irrelevant comparison, and should be accompanied by some explanation of the impacts from the origins of the gas. (52-53)

The fact that "The NCUAQMD and Humboldt County have not adopted any thresholds of significance for measuring the impact of GHG emissions generated by a proposed project," does not translate into no impacts.

The on-site presence of propane cylinders and two 5000 gal diesel tanks not only pre-dispose to increased risks of calamitous fire, but, contrary to Staff Report, would expose workers and local residents to harmful pollutants from diesel fire other than CO₂, carbon and ozone in the event of a fire.

If this project and others in the area result in a successful attempt to bring PGE power lines to projects, this would introduce yet more ignition sources to an area without formal local fire protection.

The Kneeland Volunteer Fire Dept is many miles away, and CalFire's helicopter crew, the responsible Agency, is also miles away from this "Very High" fire hazard severity zone. (58) Support ground crews would have to come from the coast or Bridgeville.

The location of this project on a flat terrace surrounded by slopes ranging from 15-30%, with elevations from 1000 to nearly 3000 feet, creates fire hazards for the entire area, as fire and winds tend to travel upslope, pre-heating fuels as the fires advance, with fireballs descending downslope to ignite fuels below original ignition points. Post-fire fragile Franciscan soils could subject the region to increased landsliding. Neighbors are worried: "Mentioned in the plan are their own residences .9 miles to the west. WHAT ABOUT US? The property line for this project appears to be less than 200 feet from the grow houses. Our residences are nearly the same distance as theirs to the EAST of the project site." (103)

Therefore, CalFire also objects to this project for obvious reasons: "CALFIRE does not support development in areas where there is no local agency fire service for structure fires and emergency medical response. Fire services should be extended into service gap areas as a condition of development. New development can adversely impact existing fire services. Careful consideration must be given where development may overload the local fire service's ability to respond." (91)

The Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District (HBMWD) and other commenters have requested a full EIR, which should be a mandatory requirement for a signal project that promises the transformation of a region from habitat-rich rural to industrial, the opposite of the intent of the County's Cannabis Ordinance's evolution. Foreseeable projects and cumulative impacts, such as growth induction, would then be more fully considered.

HBMWD expressed serious concerns over "a potential risk to fish and wildlife, water quality of the Mad River watershed,

traffic, impacts to protected species, and impacts from the proposed ponds. Citing the cannabis land use regulations, the district expresses concerns regarding inadequate setbacks of the ponds from other hydrologic features, and safe drainage designs. The district requests confirmation that the well water source is hydrologically disconnected from surface water, in order to ensure the integrity of the Mad River and Cowan Creek water flows. They also worry about water contamination from the new septic system. The district believes “the project is not exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act,” citing particularly “the cumulative impacts of this project in conjunction with other projects in the Mad River area,” “drawing on limited water and posing a potential threat to the drinking water source and sensitive habitats.” (95-97)

The project site plans further indicate the placement of two contiguous 43,200 square foot mixed-light greenhouses for Adesa Organic, LLC partially on prime agricultural soil. (16)

While 10 vanpools daily translate into fewer VMT than would be from individual vehicles traveling the 31 miles from Eureka and Arcata is a low bar in this very rural location with very low existing VMTs. “Assuming 10 daily vanpool *and other vehicle trips*,” does little to reassure us that the “other trips” will not include many private vehicles driven by people unfamiliar and unrelated to the special nature of the surroundings, and the realities of human-caused wildland fires. “If employees prefer they can carpool and park in the parking lot at the processing buildings, which will have at least one ADA accessible spot.” (6)

These type vehicle drivers are increasingly common on Kneeland, Mt View, and Maple Creek Roads related to imported workers in the marijuana industry.

Add to all of these greenhouse and other emissions, the noise, road wear, and accident risk to pedestrians, schoolchildren, animals, and other vehicles from the accelerated vehicle use on these very rural roads, parts of which are not maintained during the wet season.

The letter from local resident Wendy Orlandi regarding dangers to schoolchildren on these roads is unsettling. (98)

Multiplied with impacts from foreseeable nearby projects, these impacts imperil this entire richly diverse rural habitat sanctuary for all residents, human and other, for no reason other than expansion of industry into an inappropriate setting (\$\$\$).

The Bear River Tribe has registered legitimate concerns around Cowan Creek and other areas, because, of course, this is original Indian Country, as it was, and is, so rich in beauty and valuable resources.

Please take note of HBMWD and Audubon's strong objections.

And please accord substantive weight to the testimony from family members whose names grace local creeks, such as the Wilsons, whose family co-owned and managed property next to the applicant's for more than a 100 years. Their property is downhill from the applicant's pond (103) that is designed to contain over 3 million gallons of water (7), and from another 30,000 gal stored in hard tanks (7)(CalFire and HBMWD state 90,000 gallons in tank storage? Pg 89 & 95). They have not the resources nor time to hire expensive consultants, like the proponents. Political pressures from the marijuana industry, politicians and even the planning department, also influence the process, and not in environmentally or culturally sensitive ways.

Thank you for your careful consideration. We appreciate the difficulties in critically reviewing projects that increase our economic potential, but in this and similar proposals, preferable feasible alternative locations are available that do not set bad precedent.

- Friends of the Mad River

From: [Daniel Chandler](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: Request to submit comment to Planning Commission regarding item on agenda August 20
Date: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 8:27:50 PM

Here is my communication to planning commission members. Thank you very much.

To Planning Commissioners
RE: Adesa, LLC. Case Number PLN-11923-CUP 8/15/20

I urge you to deny PLN11923, Adesa, LLC

The Fish and Wildlife comments on the project are more than sufficient to justify turning it down, in particular:

If the Ordinance that governs this Project requires 80% renewable power, then one-megawatt worth of diesel generators should not be allowed, and the PV array should be in place on day one. Conversely, if this Project were proposed in a warehouse in town it could be 100% renewable on day one. The scientific literature indicates that over the coming decades, it is highly likely climate change will magnify the already substantial adverse effects of land use and development on California's wetland and riparian habitats, even as their ecosystems services become more valuable (CDFW 2014). The IS/DMND states: "*The potential use of over one hundred thousand gallons of diesel represents a significant unnecessary energy consumption for cannabis cultivation.*" This level of energy consumption contributes to carbon emissions and climate change that add to natural resource impacts.

The fact that cumulative impacts of a number of other grows in the same area are not considered in the EIR and mitigated negative declaration also indicates that this project should either be denied outright, or sent back to Planning for further revisions.

Thank you,

Daniel Chandler
436 Old Wagon Road
Trinidad, Ca 95570
dwchandler@gmail.com

Northcoast Environmental Center

The voice of the environment since 1971

Humboldt County, Planning Commission

c/o Planning Clerk planningclerk@co.humboldt.ca.us

Re: Adesa Organic, LLC, Conditional Use Permit Application PLN11923

To Commissioners Bongio, Pellegrini, Levy, Newman, O'Neill, McCavour, and Mitchell, and Planning Director Ford:

The Maple Creek Area is under invasion from the industrial cannabis industry. It's up to the Commission to protect the rural ranch and TPZ nature of this beautiful area

"Oak woodlands are also extremely valuable wildlife habitat. In California, oak woodlands have the greatest wildlife species richness of any other habitat in the state with over 330 species of amphibians, birds, and mammals relying upon these habitats at some point during their lives (CalPIF 2002)."

"Other aspects of the Project appear to bifurcate oak woodlands that are functioning as riparian habitat." (CDFW)

Industrial Commercial Cannabis applications have not been approved in this particular area and concern has been raised by state agencies and members of the public regarding the potential of new cannabis applications to disrupt the incredibly high habitat values of the area. (Home of rare Golden Eagles)

This application is the proverbial camel's nose under the greenhouse. Many more of these industrial scale projects are waiting in the wings.

From the beginning drafts of the Counties Cannabis ordinances the NEC as opposed industrial Cannabis Grows and we also been on record opposed to commercial cannabis on forested (TPZ type) county lands.

This project will have at least two 500 KW diesel generators (*in the bad old days we call it diesel dope*) this is an obscene prospect and should never be allowed anywhere in the County.

There will a dramatic increase in vehicle miles traveled both with workers cars and supply trucks which will quick over burden these rural roads.

Deny this permit

Thank you for your consideration,

Larry Glass Executive Director

Northcoast Environmental Center

PO Box 4269

Arcata, Ca 95518

From: marthawalden@suddenlink.net
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: proposal from Adesa Organics
Date: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 7:11:28 PM

Adesa Organics should know there is nothing organic about their potential use of a hundred thousand gallons of diesel to cultivate their product. Their approach to business does not differ from any unsustainable extraction industry that sacrifices the environment for short-term profit. A promise to develop solar power in six years fails to mitigate the ghg emissions in the meantime, nor does it inspire trust that they understand the climate emergency.

The impacts to wildlife due to their lighting system and the disregard for the riparian zone is a page from a very old playbook--one that we can no longer afford. I ask the planning commission to require much more stringent environmental standards before granting Adesa Organics permission to move forward with their project.

Thank you.

Martha Walden

Sent from Windows Mail

Lippre, Suzanne

From: Mad River <friendsofthemadriver@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 6:25 PM
To: Planning Clerk; Wilson, Mike; Fennell, Estelle; Madrone, Steve
Subject: Corrected version: Adesa, LLC. Case Number PLN-11923-CUP, Hearing 8/20/20

Please use this version. Thank you for considering our comments.

FROM: Friends of the Mad River
TO: Humboldt County Planning Commissioners
RE: Adesa, LLC. Case Number PLN-11923-CUP, Hearing 8/20/20

We urge you to deny PLN11923, Adesa, LLC for several reasons explained below, including those highlighted by CDFW in their comment letter, pg 104 of the Staff Report.

If you do not deny the project, then an EIR must be prepared. We request that areas of confusion and gaps in details be clarified before further consideration of this project, including but not limited to issues raised herein:

- Consequences to the area from investment-backed operations and other projects
- Evaluation of potential for growth induction
- Habitat fragmentation and disruption related to the LSAA, ponds, and constant activities affecting wildlife corridors in riparian and white oak habitat
- Impacts from the photovoltaic systems
- GHG emissions and VMTs from fuel trucks all along their routes from refinery to local purveyor, water trucks, carpools, part-time employees, and individual vehicles
- Comparative analysis of propane vs wood heat in this location
- Vehicle Access to this & other projects
- The size and number of diesel generators
- Diesel Generator operations (see response to CDFW)
- Potential for, and response to, diesel spills during delivery of 135,000+gal annually
- Products of combustion from all materials on-site in the event of wildfire
- Impacts from the of-site drying facility TRANSFORMING THE MAPLE CREEK AREA Approving this opens Maple Creek to industrial Cannabis manufacturing, transforming a sensitive, habitat-rich rural area into an industrial sector:

“The location is in the Maple Creek area, in an area that has historically been very large land holdings held for cattle grazing and timber management, with very little development other than single family residences and agricultural outbuildings.” (Pg 3, SR)

“In this particular portion of the Maple Creek area, which is towards the end of Maple Creek road and north of the Mad River, approximately a dozen commercial cannabis applications were made before the January 1, 2016 deadline under the CMMLUO. Only three of these applications remain in the permit process with all others having either been denied or closed due to inactivity. All three of these applications are for multiple acres of new cultivation under the provisions of Section 314-55.4.8.2.1.1. This is the first of these cannabis applications that is being brought forward for a consideration of approval because this is the first application that has submitted enough information that demonstrates that potential significant impacts on the environment may be mitigated to a less than significant level.”

“No commercial cannabis applications have yet to be approved in this particular area and concern has been raised by referral agencies and members of the public regarding the potential of new cannabis applications to disrupt the incredibly high habitat values of the area and the overall scenic and rural quality of life....Nonetheless, the Planning Commission should consider whether this portion of Maple Creek, with its historical very low density and passive agricultural uses, is appropriate for permitting of more intensive agricultural uses such as commercial cannabis.” (pp3-4,SR) There are other CUPs in this region, potentially awaiting this approval.

<https://aca-prod.accela.com/HUMBOLDT/Cap/CapDetail.aspx?Module=Planning&TabName=Planning&capID1=16HUM&capID2=00000&capID3=0126S&agencyCode=HUMBOLDT>

- 12775 –56,235 square foot (SF) The power source will be a 100kw diesel generator and propane generators.
- 11616 – a new 5 acre (217,800 square foot (SF) Power will be provided by generators
- 12346 – Four (4) Conditional Use Permits that will operate year around, seven days a week. ...
- 10946 –9,600 square feet, Five cycles harvests occur per year. Electricity is provided by generators.

•11898 –17,780 square feet Electricity is provided from generator power.

•11899 –10,000 square feet. Electricity is sourced from generator power. •11110 –22,000 sf. Power is provided by an onsite generator.

•11982 –10,000 square feet Electricity is sourced from solar, wind, and micro- hydro power, with backup generator power.

The crowded field of projects is summarized in the IS/MND:

“There are a number of other cannabis developments in the general vicinity of the Adesa Organic, LLC project. These include two applications in the immediate vicinity of the Adesa project, and four more further afield, only one of which is approved.

There are a number of other permit applications in the vicinity of the proposed projects that were either withdrawn, denied, or canceled.

Within a three-mile radius of the project site, there are a total of 5 applications under review and one cannabis application that is approved.”

“An applicant has applied for two conditional use permits and a special permit for 56,235 square feet of commercial cannabis cultivation on a parcel to the south of the Adesa Organic LLC project. This project consists of both outdoor and mixed-light cultivation, an associated nursery, and a commercial processing facility. Project water is sourced from two existing ponds and a permitted well. Power will be sourced from a 100kW diesel generator and propane generators with appropriate noise attenuation.”

“There is a second proposed cannabis cultivation on a 417-acre parcel directly to the southwest of the Adesa project. This project permit application consists of four conditional use permits for a new mixed-light cultivation operation with the development of 37 greenhouses totaling four cultivated acres. Irrigation water will be sourced from rainwater catchment with 2.5-million-gallon pond and additional storage tanks. The project would employ approximately 24 full-time and up to 2 part-time employees. Power would initially be supplied by generators, with PG&E service being installed in the future. Up to six acres onsite will be reserved for RRR cultivation that would consist of outdoor cultivation and require separate land use approvals.”

“These two projects all require the use of Maple Creek Road for project access and are all located between 0.5 mile and 1.5 miles of the project sites.”

“There are three additional projects further afield from the Adesa Organic, LLC project. These include an application for an existing 9,600-square-foot mixed- light operation located approximately 3 miles to the northwest, an application for 17,780 square feet of existing outdoor medical cannabis cultivation located approximately 2.2 miles to the southwest, an application for 10,000 square feet of existing outdoor cannabis cultivation located approximately 2.1 miles to the southwest, an application for 22,000 square feet of existing mixed-light cultivation located approximately 2.3 miles to the southwest, and an application for a zoning clearance certificate for 10,000 square feet of new mixed-light cultivation approximately 3.2 miles to the southeast.”(IS/MND 102-103, italics added) If you approve Adesa, then your denial from your last meeting of Maple Creek Investments, LLC. will be more difficult to sustain upon appeal or challenge.

A long-time landowner near the applicant explained that big money was tempting tired old-time owners and their descendants to sell out. Adesa is financed by unknown investors from AMT, LLC, located in St. Paul, MN (pg 2, SR) No one has accounted for the transformative economic influences these financed operations have on surrounding land prices, which could be inflated if investors find these manufacturing facilities profitable, despite the unprecedented impacts. Pressure for extending PG&E may follow such development, with consequent growth induction: “If the project is ever interconnected to the local grid the electrical energy would be provided by Pacific Gas and Electric Company.” (IS/MND, Pg 42), and “Power would initially be supplied by generators, with PG&E service being installed in the future.” (IS/MND pg 102) Economic “leakage,” the non-local expenditure of large sums of money, is a well-known consequence from investor backed large operations in search of wholesale deals. Small farmers tend to engage in a local circular economy, rather than importing goods and services.

But there is no discussion of this in the Staff Report. No one has considered these foreseeable contributions to growth induction in a Cumulative Impacts Analysis with an EIR.

Criminal vulnerability

Furthermore, these grows are vulnerable to criminal activity, since weapons on-site in cannabis operations are illegal under federal law, law enforcement is far away, and security personnel are on site only during business hours ("The drying facility and greenhouses will have a security officer present during all business hours." IS/MND, pg7) HABITAT This is rare and precious habitat, with elevations ranging from 1,000 to nearly 3,000 feet, with Cowan Creek, running through the project on the way to the flow, and sediment impaired Mad River that harbors summer steelhead and Chinook among many other aquatic and riparian dependent species.

There are riparian and river habitats, and white oak and Golden Eagles, Spotted Owl, grasshopper sparrow, all rare, and all accustomed to the 100 plus years of timber and cattlegrazing, but not to the 24/7/365 activity this project threatens: "...wildlife disproportionally use riparian habitat as movement corridors. At present the Project proposes a new road with water and septic pipeline, parking, garbage and compost facility, a restroom, and sustained human presence within the riparian habitat. With the Project being partially proposed on Cowan Creek and within its riparian habitat (taking advantage of some existing facilities), the Project is likely further bifurcating riparian/stream resources where the NRA most attributes wildlife movement." (CDFW 7/31/20, pg2) Alternative Golden Eagle nest sites, like the one identified by Keith Slauson, reflect "core areas of Golden Eagle territory," and are likely to be used. ("Conservation Significance of Alternative Nest Sites of Golden Eagles" Global Ecology and Conservation, Jan., 2015) Consultants for the applicant minimize the risk to, and value of, nests. A 5.5 hr. walk/drive plus 2 hr field survey by PNW consultants failed to identify "a single Golden Eagle." SHN's 8-hr. attempt was similarly futile, and similarly insensitive. These Eagles, rare in this habitat, range over 10 square miles, with a nest curtilage of over two. There is no way to avoid threatening their lives with the planned activity proposed here. We hereby incorporate by reference all documents in the file for the Mad River Estates project, directly adjacent to both Adesa and the golden eagle nests.

See also "Oaks and Oak Woodlands" CDFW pg4 "Oak woodlands are also extremely valuable wildlife habitat. In California, oak woodlands have the greatest wildlife species richness of any other habitat in the

state with over 330 species of amphibians, birds, and mammals relying upon these habitats at some point during their lives (CalPIF 2002)."

"Other aspects of the Project appear to bifurcate oak woodlands that are functioning as riparian habitat." (ibid, CDFW pg 4 Intruding on this vital habitat with diesel generators operating day and night for 3-6 years before solar picks up 50-80% is unsupportable and unnecessary. This project means constant traffic, activity, noise, lights, and industry.

Although the Staff Report accounts for 10 vanpool trips daily ("The project proposes to minimize the usage of Maple Creek Road by having a company van or vans pick up employees in Eureka and Arcata each day to shuttle them to the project site for their shifts." (IS/MND, 7.8 Road Use, pg 6,) the Staff Report is confusing as to VMT's because the 10 daily trips do not include workers driving their own vehicles ("If employees prefer they can carpool and park in the parking lot at the processing buildings, which will have at least one ADA accessible spot." (IS/MND, Cultivation & Operations Plan, 7.8 Road Use, pg 6).

Light pollution mitigations are essentially unenforceable, since there are no nighttime inspectors, as highlighted by CDFW: "The IS/DMND should explain how this mitigation (light pollution controls) will be effectively implemented as a condition of approval in the interim or long-term and enforced." (ibid, CDFW, p2, rec2) ELECTRICAL SUPPLY Photovoltaic System "Proposed Photovoltaic System and Battery Sheds: An approximately 10,000- 12,000-square-foot photovoltaic (PV) system is proposed with an associated 500-square-foot battery shed on the hillside to the north of the greenhouses. The PV system would be located near the proposed cultivation area. The PV system is proposed to consist of an array of low, ground-mounted panels. The PV system would be constructed in sections to meet operational need." (pg 4, SR) "The proposed project also includes installation of rooftop solar on the agriculture- exempt building partially within the SMA buffer zone." (42, SR)

"The solar PV systems will have a maximum power output of 690 kW. Rooftop solar is also proposed on the agricultural storage building. (IS/MND, pg 7) The Staff Report fails to identify any impacts from either the extensive ground-mounted or the shed roof solar array installations. No specific information is provided as to the size, configuration, or installation of either. Wildlife, wildlife corridors, ground disturbances, vegetation, hydrological, trenching, and fencing impacts have all been correlated with ground-based systems, eg:

"The objectives and design of surveys and the development of ecological recommendations at ground-mounted PV parks should be considered... on a case-by-case basis, to ensure that any design restrictions or mitigation / compensation measures are justified and effective." ("10 Jan 2014 The Potential Ecological Impacts Of Ground-Mounted

Photovoltaic Solar Panels In The UK" <https://gcc01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.bsg-ecology.com%2Fpotential-ecological-impacts-ground-mounted->
&data=02%7C01%7Cplanningclerk%40co.humboldt.ca.us%7Ce379dfdcf1b141179e8108d844a7d24b%7Cc00ae2b64fe844f198637b1adf4b27cb%7C0%7C0%7C637334834862835094&sdata=wGcLxwd34HI5ZiiKlmaA%2Bei80ljgNWzikPCeJMrm1ho%3D&reserved=0 photovoltaic-solar-panels-uk/) "Putting them on the ground may require gravel underneath or something to stop vegetation growth. Birds like to sit on mine and eat (and poop out) seeds, I guess. I get all kinds of odd plant growth that occurs nowhere else on the property, including saplings growing up through the array."

(#4,
<https://gcc01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fteslamotorsclub.com%2Ftmc%2Fthreads%2Froof-mounted-vs-ground->
&data=02%7C01%7Cplanningclerk%40co.humboldt.ca.us%7Ce379dfdcf1b141179e8108d844a7d24b%7Cc00ae2b64fe844f198637b1adf4b27cb%7C0%7C0%7C637334834862835094&sdata=GvujxTLivmOifCEa6znmIUoCZds5F1t8l%2BAhKJ03aOg%3D&reserved=0 mounted-solar-array.122252/).

"Ground arrays solar array
"However, if the ground cover under the panels is gravel or bare ground, owing to design decisions or lack of maintenance, the peak discharge may increase significantly with storm-water management needed. In addition, the kinetic energy of the flow that drains from the panels was found to be greater than that of the rainfall, which could cause erosion at the base of the panels." ("Hydrologic Response of Solar Farms"
mount
are more expensive than roof mount
the necessity of installing fence posts in concrete footers and a more robust , because of
railing system, and the trenching necessary to go from the to the house, and possibly conduit to get to the main panel."
(ibid, Tesla)

Lauren M. Cook, S.M.ASCE; and Richard H. McCuen, M.ASCE,
<https://gcc01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fascelibrary.org%2Fdoi%2Fabs%2F10.1061%2F%2F528ASCE%2529&data=02%7C01%7Cplanningclerk%40co.humboldt.ca.us%7Ce379dfdcf1b141179e8108d844a7d24b%7Cc00ae2b64fe844f198637b1adf4b27cb%7C0%7C0%7C637334834862835094&sdata=5M8xMzZu10uYdoxzUbnDAtVJidVr9LK2NPqpRaGo%2FT4%3D&reserved=0 HE.1943-5584.0000530>) Electrical Service Confusion The Staff Report seems to dismiss the use and effects of the diesel generators:
"Phasing and Climate Change.

CDFW states that phasing the project with initial phase at full sun outdoor or light-dep hoop-houses and eventually transitioning to two acres of mixed-light with solar power is deferring mitigation for renewable energy. The IS/MND identifies that over one hundred thousand gallons of diesel represents a potentially significant impact and therefore deferring development of solar is deferred mitigation.

Response: CDFW misrepresents the project. The first phase would be full sun outdoor cultivation or light-deprivation. No lights would be used for the first phase and limited power would therefore be required. The reference in the IS to over one hundred thousand gallons of diesel is for the proposed project without the applicable mitigation. The mitigation measure for 80% renewable energy is intended to mitigate the amount of diesel usage. The IS/MND does not defer mitigation. The requirement for 80% of all power to be sourced from renewable energy is in place at the beginning of operation of the project, at all phases." (pg 117, SR)

However:
"The project proposes the use of a mix of solar PV systems and generators to meet the energy demands of the mixed-light cultivation. Electrical infrastructure between generation systems and project facilities requiring power will need to be developed. The solar PV systems will have a maximum power output of 690 kW. Rooftop solar is also proposed on the agricultural storage building.

Generators proposed for the Adesa Organic, LLC project include two 500-kW Type 4 diesel-powered units. The generators will be self-enclosed and will provide power in combination with the proposed PV system. The Adesa Organic, LLC project will use up to approximately 135,859 gallons of diesel annually. A total of up to 10,000 gallons of

diesel fuel storage will be installed for the Adesa Organic, LLC project, in two separate 5,000-gallon above-ground tanks." (Pg 8, SR)

One example of many of energy draws: "Fourteen stand-alone air conditioning units would be placed along the east side of the structure." (Pg 4, SR) Diesel Generator Significant Impacts "Proposed Generators and Diesel Tanks: Two 500-kilowatt (kW) diesel- powered generators are proposed." (pg 4, SR) "The project proposes to generate power through a combination of solar PV panels and five diesel generators: four 725-kw and one 150-kw." (38, SR) Generators proposed for the Adesa Organic, LLC project include two 500-kW Type 4 diesel-powered units. The Adesa Organic, LLC project will use up to approximately 135,859 gallons of diesel annually. A total of up to 10,000 gallons of diesel fuel storage will be installed for the Adesa Organic, LLC project, in two separate 5,000-gallon above-ground tanks." (IS/MND, pg 7) GHG EMISSIONS & Unnecessary VMTs The staff report fails to analyze the GHG emissions thoroughly.

Carpools plus vanpools plus water and fuel trucks Optional employee carpools, or individual transports, may increase the VMT's in excess of that disclosed in the Staff Report, which only considered vanpools, and in excess of historic traffic in this area, or on these roads, contributing further to the unevaluated GHG emissions. (IS/MND, pg 6) Water truck VMTs have not been included in any of the VMT or GHG emission analyses: "Drinking water for employees will be imported to the project site and provided in water coolers placed in all work and break areas throughout the project area." (IS/MND P93) After their transport from refineries probably in the SF Bay Area-East Bay, but no information on this is provided), both diesel and propane fuels require local truck transport near and over waterways on narrow, winding roads with all kinds of hazards like fallen limbs, narrow shoulders and steep embankments, and other vehicles with drivers (often out of town workers in the Cannabis industry) unfamiliar with the roads. ("A fuel truck will visit the site every two weeks to deliver diesel fuel." IS/MND, pg 4 "Traffic") Limited Access Roads

Regarding cumulative impacts contributed by other projects, it is unclear how employees will access other projects in the area, if not from Maple Creek Road, which is accessed by Fickle Hill or Kneeland Roads, via Butler Valley Rd., and from Korbelt, but the Staff Report suggests otherwise: "The six projects that are further from the Adesa Organic, LLC projects have effects that will not be cumulatively considerable, given their distance. The traffic impacts from these projects are not cumulative, as the access routes are different." (IS/MND, Pg 104). Mt View Road is mostly gravel and is also accessed by Kneeland Rd. or from Showers Pass Rd.

Propane vs Wood: no analysis

One can argue about the relative merits of wood heat vs propane, but there is no comprehensive analysis in the Staff Report to rely upon. Firewood is abundant on the property requiring zero transportation or production GHGs. The assertion that propane heating is better than wood heat without evidence or discussion is another example of inadequate GHG emissions evaluation: ("The proposed facility will use forced-air gas heating instead of woodstoves or fireplaces which will significantly reduce GHG emissions generated from heating during long-term operation of the project." IS/MND pg 21 Air Mgt Plan #5) Wood heat, with fuel from one's own forestland, or from the logger next door, requiring minimal transportation, bucked with electric chainsaws battery- powered with solar, and burned in a modern woodstove, may be superior to propane that is refined from fracked natural gas piped 1000s of miles away, to a refinery, liquefied and transported here by internal combustion vehicles, and stored where it can explode in a fire, endangering everyone.

What Happens if There is a Diesel spill Diesel Spill on the way to Adesa?

Diesel spills are extremely toxic to aquatic life, as documented in the spill from a truck into Hayfork Creek that killed every living creature for miles downstream.

The Staff Report is silent about this:

"If the Ordinance that governs this Project requires 80% renewable power, then one-megawatt worth of diesel generators should not be allowed, and the PV array should be in place on day one. Conversely, if this Project were proposed

in a warehouse in town it could be 100% renewable on day one. The IS/DMND states: "The potential use of over one hundred thousand gallons of diesel represents a significant unnecessary energy consumption for cannabis cultivation." (CDFW, p4, Rec6).

FIRE

This project will INCREASE the likelihood of a large wildfire because the additional activities, human presence, vehicles, lights, generators, and other sources of unnatural fire ignition will increase if the project is built and implemented. The fire hazard severity zone for the project is classified as "Very High." IS/MND, pg 97) The Staff Report is deficient with respect to the consequences of a

fire: "Finding: The project will not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. (58(g))"

And:

"Initial Study and Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration There is little surrounding the parcel that can be considered sources of pollutants in the event of a wildfire beyond the typical pollutants (carbon dioxide, carbon, and ozone precursors) resulting from wildfire." p98 ibid However, this ignores all the materials in the building, including plastics, greenhouse materials, electronics, heavy metals, glues, etc., the products of combustion from which are plenty toxic. 10,000 gal of diesel and propane tanks could fuel a raging fire with personnel response times from Kneeland over 30 minutes, and from the coast or Bridgeville, an hour.

As an LLC, Adesa's liability is limited, a fact noted by immediate neighbor Ron Wilson, who requests bonding. As an out of state LLC it is even more difficult to recover costs and damages in the event of a fire. CAL Fire comments submitted but ignored by planning staff specifically state that facilities such as Adesa should not be built far away from existing fire and emergency services.

PROPOSED DRYING FACILITY

Impacts or details about this are notably absent from the IS/MND and Staff Report: "Processing will not occur onsite. There is a proposed drying facility on APN 315-211-003." (pg 5, SR) 13.5 acres of APN 315-211-003 (pg 2, SR) EIR Without an EIR, as requested by HBMWD, the public and decision-makers are deprived of an accurate picture:

"The final IS/DMND should be revised to include an analysis of all Project impacts..." (CDFW p2, Rec 1).

OPPORTUNITY KNOCKS

Commissioners expressed two concerns in favor of the project:

1. How else can Humboldt's thriving Cannabis industry be supplied without these type facilities? The answer may be in the proposed small farmer ordinance on your agenda, especially if permitted to supply commercial Cannabis:

"Cannabis Ordinance Amendments for Small Cultivators..."

That's how the industry and market can and should be at least partly supplied- with the highest quality and variety, terroir where impacts are stable and often beneficial (eg soil), while spreading the wealth to local homestead farmers instead of investor-backed operators. This project's owner hails from Minnesota: AMT, LLC c/o Equity Holders Rep, LLC 585 Mt. Curre Blvd. St. Paul, MN 55116 (pg 2, SR) 2. The applicant has spent years and money, how can this Commission deny them now? This project, for all it's laudable attributes, is in the wrong location, and threatens to open the floodgates to many others, transforming a rural habitat-rich area into a Cannabis manufacturing zone, despite being off the grid 30 miles along country roads, away from fire protection and reliable communication. Investment-backed expectations should not supersede the Public Trust, or Cannabis 2.0. The Planning Dept. needs clear direction from the Commission, not the other way around. And as our counsel has stated, the county has complete authority to deny this project under land use law, regardless of apparent investment made by the applicant.

Additionally, your approval of this project would make sustaining your denial on 8/13 of Maple Creek Investments, LLC, PLN-2018-15197, (powered by the grid), more difficult in an appeal challenge to the Supervisors, or in a court of law.

Please deny this project and direct Planning staff to re-evaluate their interpretation of cannabis ordinances, with an emphasis on implementing the CCLUO/EIR and abandoning the outdated CMMLUO/MND.

Respectfully submitted

- Friends of the Mad River

From: [Valerie Rose](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: Pending permit for marijuana cultivation in Willow Creek
Date: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 3:30:32 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you **not approve** the Adesa Organics,LLC marijuana cultivation project proposed to encompass over 400 acres in Maple Creek. There are numerous insufficiencies associated with the mitigations proposed so far, as summarized by CA Fish and Wildlife in its review.

Furthermore, according to the IS/MND for the project, "The potential use of over one hundred thousand gallons of diesel represents a significant unnecessary energy consumption for cannabis cultivation." But CA Fish and Wildlife points out, "Conversely, if this Project were proposed in a warehouse in town it could be 100% renewable on day one," rather than awaiting solar power sometime in the future.

I am concerned about the resource impacts of the project, but no less the impact to climate change. This is the time to reduce our use of fossil fuels, not add to the greenhouse emissions that are already adversely affecting our environment. Please deny this project.

Sincerely,
Valerie Gizinski
1704 Virginia Way
Arcata, CA
707-825-7446

Aug 20, 2020
Adesa Organic LLC

There's no right way to do a wrong thing

Make no mistake . . . We are 1000% in support of approval for this project . . . for all the right reasons.

Maple Creek has been our home since Father's Day 1996. We once only dreamed of living here and the dream came true. There is a long history of pioneers who have lived in this valley. The more things change the more they stay the same. It takes a certain brand of determination to succeed here. We've seen lots of change . . . the most positive change is new families moving here and doing what we did . . . making this valley home.

Our school, long the center of the community, is seeing new life because there are children who need it. Their parents are tireless organic farmers providing jobs, they are Presidents and members of the school board, they care about water, the rivers and trees, the fish, the roads and their neighbors. I have seen it with my own eyes and I trust what I see.

We made a deliberate decision to support these families because they are making a sincere effort to do things right. And they are bringing new family centered life to Maple Creek for the right reasons.

Laura and Scott are respectful of the laws and have held to the spirit of the law. Because of pioneers like them, Danielle and Rama, Jill and Skylar, Maple Creek, which has been quietly going to sleep for decades has a breath of new life and sincere hope for the future.

We do not make a habit of public speaking. On this occasion it would be irresponsible to remain silent when we see this new life being stifled for the wrong reasons. There are some bad actors who should be publicly dismissed and denied approval. There are others who should be publicly rewarded with approval. Find someone doing it right and others will follow their example. Right projects, right place, right time, for the right reasons and down the right path. What more can you ask?

Please see this for what it is; an opportunity to do something right today. A denial of this project will send the wrong message to the wrong people.

Four different planners have been involved, four years of effort by persons respectful of our laws; the potential, substantial contribution to the financial health of Maple Creek and the county. Jobs for twenty families are on the line in a time where too many have been lost.

Listen . . . it is far less a question of moving farming out of the hills and more correctly out of the shadows and into the light. That's what I voted for . . . accountability for water and light. Ironically the two things farmers need the most.

Our laws are based on precedent. For centuries a reliable, accountable pathway. Each decision must be made on the unique merits tied together with rights and responsibilities. Laura and Scott have been reliable, respectful and persistent in choosing the light. They welcome accountability without fear. We could use some more of that.

You heard at the August 6th meeting how committed the families of this valley are to its future.

Please choose approval for all the right reasons and trust the families of Maple Creek, who wish to be part of the solution for the future, will hold each other boldly to account.

Carlene and Tony Coglaiti

A handwritten signature in purple ink, appearing to be 'Tony Coglaiti', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.