

## SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION #1

For Planning Commission Agenda of: January 11, 2018

- Consent Agenda Item
- Continued Hearing Item #3
- Public Hearing Item
- Department Report
- Old Business

Re: **Zoning Ordinance Amendments**  
Commercial Cannabis Land Use Ordinance  
Case Number OR 17-02

Attached for the Planning Commission's record and review are the comment letters from the following:

- Willow Creek Community Services District comment letter
- Robert Mays comment letter
- Kevin Caldwell comment letter
- Donald Fregeau regarding pot grows
- Donald Fregeau regarding cannabis operations setbacks



November 1, 2017

Planning Commission Clerk  
County of Humboldt Planning and Building Department  
3015 H Street  
Eureka, CA 95501

**RE: WCCSD comments on updates to the Humboldt County Commercial Cannabis Ordinance**

Planning Clerk,

The Willow Creek Community Services District (WCCSD) Board met on October 26th, 2017 at their regular board meeting and discussed the current proposed draft changes to the Humboldt County Commercial Cannabis ordinance. Specifically, we discussed how the ordinance will impact our downtown.

The WCCSD has always had a vested interest in our community. Please see the attached vision and mission statements of our three departments. Additionally, I would like to direct your attention to the Willow Creek Community Action Plan (CAP) from 1996 and 2003. The vision statements in the CAP include the following which are particularly relevant to the topic of this letter.

- Willow Creek will be an attractive rural community with a healthy downtown business district.
- The town will be comprised of a number of thriving small businesses (rather than one or two large ones).
- The town will retain the positive aspects of a rural community, including low crime, trust, safety, and a relaxed feel.

The community of Willow Creek is quite spread out with the exception of our small downtown. This downtown area, or business district, is critical to the viability of our community. Please see attached map which was developed for our current wastewater project which we are currently in the final stages of design. For the purposes of this letter, the "downtown" area also includes the properties on each side of the highway north on highway 96, which includes the elementary school, forest service, and medical services.

We would like this downtown area to be used for commercial businesses which serve the public by providing goods or services. Our downtown area currently has gas stations, restaurants, coffee shops, markets, accountants, realty office, vet and pet grooming and other similar businesses.

We would like the county to help the community of Willow Creek maintain our vision for our small downtown. Specifically, the following are items we hope to maintain:


1. Retail – Our downtown area is quite small. For this reason, we would like to maintain the small amount of space for retail and service businesses. A small amount of manufacturing associated with a retail store may be welcomed.
2. 2 Stories – We understand the local volunteer fire department does not have the ability to fight fires over 2 stories in height. For this reason, the building height in downtown (and in all of the greater Willow Creek area) should be restricted to not more than 2 stories in height.
3. Smell – We would like to have our town be welcoming to all walks of life. To do this, we would like to avoid the smell of cannabis in our downtown area.
4. Safety – We would like our downtown to be as safe as possible. We would like to restrict the types of businesses in downtown that require the security of armed guards. If a business requires an armed security guard, this generally means they have significantly valuable goods in the building that could entice armed robberies.
5. Welcoming – We would like all buildings and properties in downtown to be welcoming. Tourism is a significant element in our community and a welcoming downtown is key to maintaining tourism. For example, security fences, or boarded up windows which impart exclusivity are not desired effect.
6. Hazards – We would like to restrict the use of volatile chemicals and other hazardous elements in our downtown district.

While this letter is meant to address the cannabis ordinance, we don't necessarily expect the items above to be incorporated into the ordinance itself. We will leave the determination of how to best apply the land use goals of the downtown area of Willow Creek to the Planning Department and Planning Commission. Additionally, with this new business market and associated regulations, the WCCSD plans to meet and discuss this topic at future meetings. Additional comments or concerns may be developed at these meetings that will be sent to the county at that time.

Sincerely,



Susan O'Gorman  
General Manager



## **DISTRICT MISSION**

**The MISSION of the Willow Creek Community Services District is to deliver efficient, environmentally sound, economical, and compliant services to the residents of Willow Creek. We are committed to providing reliable, high quality water, street lighting, wastewater services and well maintained parks and recreation facilities.**

# **Recreation Vision & Mission Statement**

## **Vision:**

We see a prosperous, beautiful village, growing in an agrarian setting. Its inhabitants take care of and use the wilderness and nature that surrounds it. A diversity of people lives in and passes through this village. This village, Willow Creek, is a unique, integrated part of our state, our nation and our world.

## **Mission:**

The Recreation Department of the WCCSD will be part of creating this vision by husbanding, in a fiscally responsible manner, its various holdings for the health and safety benefits they provide those living near and passing through Willow Creek. The department will offer a variety of options for all ages, from leisurely walks through our landscaped village to vigorous exercise in our summer sports programs. Our Recreation Department will cooperate with the public and private sectors to avoid unnecessary duplication of services.

## **Waste Water Mission and Vision Statement**





### **Vision**

We see a prosperous, beautiful village, growing in an agrarian setting. Its inhabitants take care of and use the wilderness and nature that surrounds it. A diversity of people lives in and passes through this village. This village, Willow Creek, is a unique, integrated part of our state, our nation and our world.

### **Mission**

In order to help fulfill this vision, the WCCSD Board of Directors hopes to begin an environmentally progressive wastewater system for the heart of our community. This wastewater system will help us protect the health of our people and our river. It will help each property owner to prosper by bringing added flexibility to our land usage. It will stimulate a more vibrant, local economy by helping to create a walkable and diversified commercial center for our residents and visitors alike.





Willow Creek Community Services District	Job Number	1205711001
Project Name	Revision	A
	Date	07 Nov 2013

Potential Service Boundaries **Figure 1**

G:\12057 WillowCreekCSD\8410746 WCCSD-WWTP Planning\08-GIS\Maps\Working\Potential\_Service\_Bndry.mxd  
 © 2013. Whilst every care has been taken to prepare this map, GHD and the Willow Creek Community Services District make no representations or warranties about its accuracy, reliability, completeness or suitability for any particular purpose and cannot accept liability and responsibility of any kind (whether in contract, tort or otherwise) for any expenses, losses, damages and/or costs (including indirect or consequential damage) which are or may be incurred by any party as a result of the map being inaccurate, incomplete or unsuitable in any way and for any reason.  
 Data source: Data Custodian, Data Set Name/Title, Version/Date. Created by: emgutierrez

January 4, 2018

To:  
Humboldt County Board of Supervisors  
County Courthouse  
Eureka, CA

From:  
EcoMeds LLC  
Robert May  
1271 Evergreen Dr. Suite 2  
Redway, CA 95560

Dear Commissioners,

This letter is to suggest clarifications to the Draft Ordinance that will strengthen Humboldt County's competitiveness in the California cannabis industry, create rural jobs, and generate significant new tax revenues with no changes to current tax mechanisms.

Per EcoMeds' testimony at the November 22<sup>nd</sup> commission meeting, CA BCC believes that the Type 9 Non-Storefront Retail is the correct license for direct sales to consumers. BCC will require a valid local permit to issue the corresponding state license.

Sec. 55.4.10.2 (Farm-Based Retail Sales) of the current Planning Staff Report can be construed to permit direct internet sales from farms but its language is general and its requirements are onerous for rural farms.

**There are significant differences between “on-location” sales to consumers driving up to a farmstand versus “off-location” sales to urban buyers who order from the Internet and receive their product at their city residence from a licensed transportation/delivery service.**

Requiring an applicant to hire an engineering firm to evaluate private or county roads that are not owned and controlled by the applicant may be reasonable for on-location sales, where traffic control, fire safety, and road “wear-and-tear” from frequent buyer visits may be an issue. But we believe requiring an engineering report for an “off location” license is an unnecessary overreach.

Costs to operate urban-to-rural transportation are high. Humboldt farmers are not Amazon. Their range of products for sale are not large, therefore profits are low on a per trip basis. Therefore, “Off-Location” farms selling over the Internet will send their products to urban distribution depots from which deliveries will be made.



Due to high transportation costs, distributors (and their farmer customers) will be strongly incented to schedule these inventory pickups infrequently, on a weekly or even bi-monthly basis. These periodic pickups from the farm will be made by licensed transporters with professional drivers in vehicles no larger than a typical UPS or FedEx van. Thus, the environmental impact of “Off-Location” sales will be significantly less than “On-Location” FBS.

The Commission is rightfully concerned about preventing increased traffic, environmental impacts, and fire safety from Farm Sales. But over-regulation hurts Humboldt County. Expensive and intrusive engineering studies, for example, (especially on roads that are not owned or controlled by the applicant) for “Off-Location” sales are wasteful and unnecessary.

UPS and FedEx trucks deliver to rural residents every day. Should Humboldt County’s rural residents be required to hire an engineering firm in order to permit UPS or FedEx to supply their ranch?

We therefore respectfully urge the Commission to adopt two types of permits for Farm Based Retail Sales under Sec. 55.4.10.2.

- I. “On-Location” Farm Based Sales permits that can be more highly regulated to address local concerns. This permit could tie to a CA BCC Type 10. Retail Dispensary License.
- II. “Off-Location” Farm Based Sales permits with less onerous regulatory requirements. County approval of an “Off-Location” permit should make the permit-holder eligible for the CA BCC’s Type 9 “Non-Storefront Retail” license.

Either permit should be deemed valid for an applicant seeking a CA BCC Type 12 Microbusiness license.

If Humboldt County is going to survive the onslaught of massive over-capacity in this new market, we’re going to do so by playing to our strengths.

Let’s help our rural entrepreneurs focus on inventing new, high-value, small-sized cannabis products delivered to their customers’ doorsteps.

Let's help Humboldt County entrepreneurs bypass the stranglehold of urban dispensaries and their "Big Ag" grows.

Internet sales are taxed in the location the product is ordered. Let's harvest the millions of dollars in sales taxes currently being collected by urban dispensaries and put them to work here, fixing Humboldt County's roads, schools, and other infrastructure needs.

Thank you for your consideration. We hope the Commission will specifically delineate these two permit types, adjust the regulations pertaining to them, and make both eligible for County and State Microbusiness licenses.

Robert May  
Owner  
EcoMeds LLC

cc: Director John Ford, Senior Planner LRU Steve Lazar, Senior Planner Michael Richardson, Supervisor Estelle Fennell, Supervisor Ryan Sundberg

## Real Property Solutions

---

P.O. Box 614 ♦ Miranda ♦ CA. ♦ 95553 ♦ (707) 498-0391 ♦ Email: realpropertysolutions4u@gmail.com

November 2, 2017

Humboldt County Planning Commission  
County of Humboldt  
3015 "H" Street  
Eureka, CA. 95501

Subject: Commercial Cannabis Land Use Ordinance Amendments

I am writing in response to the proposed amendments to the County's Commercial Medical Marijuana Land Use Ordinance (CMMLUO). Staff has done an excellent job in redressing the regulations in light of the passage of the Adult Use of Marijuana Act (AUMA) and Senate Bill 94. I fully support and actually encouraged the Department during the preparation of the original regulations to eliminate the requirement of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for any cannabis related activities. In any event, I do offer the following comments, recommendations and questions.

### **55.4.6 COMMERCIAL CANNABIS CULTIVATION, PROPAGATION, AND PROCESSING – OPEN AIR ACTIVITIES**

Outdoor and Mixed-light Cultivation Activities, On-Site Processing, and Nurseries shall be principally permitted with a Zoning Clearance Certificate when meeting the following Eligibility and Siting Criteria and all applicable Performance Standards, except when otherwise specified.

#### 55.4.6.1 Eligibility Criteria - Resource Production and Residential Areas

##### **55.4.6.1.1 Zoning**

AE, AG, FR, and U when accompanied by a Resource Production General Plan land use designation (not including Timberland) or Residential land use designation requiring parcel sizes of **more than 5 acres (emphasis added)**.

**Comment:** I believe the intent is to reference parcels five (5) acres or more, not just parcels more than five (5) acres. If not I would suggest that the provisions refer to parcels **five (5) acres or more**. Both the Design Floodway (DF) and the Flood Plain (FP) zones allow general agriculture as a principally permitted use. The current CMMLUO allows cultivation on these parcels.

**Recommendation:** Allow cultivation on parcels zoned Design Floodway (DF) and the Flood Plain (FP).

#### 55.4.6.3 Eligibility Criteria – All Areas

##### 55.4.6.3.1 **Energy Source**

Electricity must be exclusively provided by a Renewable Energy Source, meeting the Performance Standard for Energy Use.

**Comment:** The recommended Performance Standard for Energy Use (Section 55.4.12.5) requires grid power be supplied from a 100% renewable source or an on-site renewable energy system with zero net energy use or grid power supplied by partial or wholly non-renewable source with purchase of carbon offset credits. Although I applaud the intent, the proposed regulations will put Humboldt County at a competitive disadvantage.

**Recommendation:** That the County adopt the same regulations that the State is proposing. They are:

- On-grid power with 42 percent renewable source.
- Onsite zero net energy renewable source providing 42 percent of power.
- Purchase of carbon offsets for any portion of power above 58 percent not from renewable sources.
- Demonstration that the equipment to be used would be 42 percent more energy efficient than standard equipment, using 2014 as the baseline year for such standard equipment.

#### 55.4.6.4 Siting Criteria – All Areas

##### 55.4.6.4.3 **Limitation on Use of Prime Soils**

The cumulative area of any Cannabis Cultivation Site(s) located on Prime Agricultural Soil shall not exceed 20 percent of the area of Prime Agricultural Soil on the Parcel.

**Comment:** At first look it's somewhat puzzling that the County would limit agricultural horticultural activities on prime agricultural soils to no more than 20% of the prime agricultural soils on the parcel. I understand that many farmers use imported or "bagged" soils. However, I think imported and bagged soils should be discouraged and the use of prime soils or amended



prime soils be encouraged. Many times “bagged” soils are not reused and improperly disposed of, not to mention the bags themselves are not properly disposed as well.

**Recommendation:** Incentivize the use of prime agricultural soils for cannabis cultivation by allowing larger cultivation areas where prime agricultural soils are utilized for cannabis cultivation.

#### 55.4.6.4.4 Setbacks

Cultivation Site(s) must observe all of the following setbacks:

b) Residences – Three hundred feet (300’) from any residence;

**Comment:** I assume the recommended setback is from residences on adjoining parcels and not the residence on the parcel where the cultivation activity is occurring. If so, this should be clarified. I also assume the setback is in response to odor concerns. I personally believe the only reason folks have objections to the odor is because it’s produced by cannabis. If the same odor were produced by roses, gardenias, jasmine, etc., there would be very few if any complaints. If the odor is truly a nuisance the recommended setback should also apply to other local industries including the dairy, goat, cattle and fishing (Pacific Choice Seafood) industries that produce offensive odors. I just returned from Modesto and Turlock where the odor of manure is overwhelming as soon as you open the car door. It reminded me of Ferndale on a warm summer day. In Gilroy it’s garlic. Back in the day in Vacaville it was green onions.

**Recommendation:** Setbacks be reduced to one hundred (100’) to any residences on adjoining parcels.

#### 55.4.6.5.7 Provisional Permitting

**Comment:** There is a typo in the second paragraph: *“As part of application submittal, Pre-Existin1q cultivation sites...”*

#### 55.4.6.5.8 Myers Flat Community Area

In the Myers Flat Community Area, on any sized parcel, the cultivation area of a Pre-Existing Site may be permitted with a Special Permit, up to a maximum of 3,000 square feet. Expansion is prohibited on parcels less than 1 acre in size. The cultivation area setback requirement specified in Section 55.4.6.4.4(a) shall be reduced to the setbacks applicable to the underlying principal zoning district. The cultivation area setback from residence requirement specified in Section 55.4.6.4.4 (b) shall only apply to permanent residences constructed with approved building permits. Temporary use of an RV for up to 6 months may be permitted in conjunction with cannabis cultivation if permitted pursuant to 314-81.1.1.5.1.

**Comment/Question:** I'm curious why Myers Flat is singled out? The communities of Weott, Redcrest, Miranda, Phillipsville and Benbow should be afforded the same opportunity. Also curious why the setback requirement from a residence only applies to permitted residences?

**Recommendation:** Allow the same provisions in the communities of Weott, Redcrest, Miranda, Phillipsville and Benbow.

#### 55.4.6.5.9 Retirement, Remediation, and Relocation of Pre-Existing Cultivation Sites

In order to incentivize, promote, and encourage the retirement, remediation and relocation of pre-existing cannabis cultivation operations occurring in inappropriate, marginal, or environmentally sensitive sites to relocate to environmentally superior sites, the following provisions shall apply:

**Comment/Question:** Pursuant to Section 55.4.6.5.9(d) the cultivation area of the receiving site is limited to 20% of the area of the parcel. In addition, if the Relocation Site has Prime Agricultural Soils on the parcel, the area utilized for cannabis cultivation on Prime Agricultural Soils shall not exceed twenty percent (20%) of the area of Prime Agricultural Soils on that parcel. I truly believe there are hundreds, maybe thousands of sites that should be relocated for one reason or another. However, there are limited receiving sites that have desirable site characteristics, including proximity to labor sources, adequate direct access from a County maintained, available adequate water supply, available grid power, farmable/tillable soils, etc.

**Recommendation:** Allow those sites that exhibit the aforementioned qualities be allowed to have cumulative cultivation areas up to 35% of the area of the parcel and up to 35% of prime agricultural soils, up to a maximum of 10 acres.

#### 55.4.7.2 Cannabis Testing and Research Laboratories

Where meeting all applicable Performance Standards, as well as the Eligibility and Siting Criteria specified in Sections 55.4.6.3 and 55.4.6.4, except for 55.4.6.4.4 (c) and (d), Cannabis Testing and Research Laboratories shall be principally permitted with a Zoning Clearance Certificate in C-2, C-3, MB, ML, MH zones, or U (when accompanied by a Commercial or Industrial General Plan land use designation) or where previously developed for a lawful industrial or commercial use.

**Comment:** Although staff is recommending that Manufacturing be allowed in the Highway Service Commercial or CH zone, cannabis testing and research facilities are excluded. Cannabis testing and research facilities can be considered an Office and Professional Services use type according to Section 314-172.5 and a Research/Light Industrial use type according to Section 314-175.3 of the County's Zoning Regulations. There are very few if any available vacant

parcels or available developed parcels in Southern Humboldt that are zoned to accommodate cannabis testing and research facilities. I have a client that has been contacted by not one, but two cannabis testing companies looking to locate in Southern Humboldt. Office and Professional Services use types are principally permitted in the Highway Service Commercial or CH zone.

**Recommendation:** Allow cannabis testing facilities in the CH zone.

#### 55.4.12.5 Performance Standards for Energy Use

All electricity sources utilized by Commercial Cannabis Cultivation, Manufacturing, or Processing activities shall conform to one or more of the following standards:

- 55.4.12.5.1 grid power supplied from 100% renewable source
- 55.4.12.5.2 on-site renewable energy system with zero net energy use
- 55.4.12.5.3 grid power supplied by partial or wholly non-renewable source with purchase of carbon offset credits

Purchase of carbon offset credits (for grid power procured from non-renewable producers) may only be made from reputable sources, including those found on Offset Project Registries managed the California Air Resources Board, or similar sources and programs determined to provide bona fide offsets recognized by relevant state regulatory agencies.

**Comment:** The recommended Performance Standard for Energy Use (Section 55.4.12.5) requires grid power be supplied from a 100% renewable source or an on-site renewable energy system with zero net energy use or grid power supplied by partial or wholly non-renewable source with purchase of carbon offset credits. Although I applaud the intent, the proposed regulations will put Humboldt County at a competitive disadvantage.

**Recommendation:** That the County adopt the same regulations that the State is proposing. They are:

- On-grid power with 42 percent renewable source.
- Onsite zero net energy renewable source providing 42 percent of power.
- Purchase of carbon offsets for any portion of power above 58 percent not from renewable sources.
- Demonstration that the equipment to be used would be 42 percent more energy efficient than standard equipment, using 2014 as the baseline year for such standard equipment.

**Conclusion:**

Once again, I commend staff for crafting a comprehensive CCLUO, including streamlining the process. The new cannabis industry is very competitive and many jurisdictions throughout the State are also streamlining their process.

The one complaint I have heard (second hand) regarding the current application process is that some applicants have spent thousands of dollars to get their application deemed “complete” to only have a referral agency either recommend denial or additional costly studies that some folks just cannot afford. I would suggest that once minimum information including a project description, plan of operation and site plan has been submitted that the application be referred for a “fatal flaw analysis”. This would save staff time, costs and frustration to the applicants.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and provide some recommendations. I look forward to the Department’s responses to my comments and recommendations. If you have any questions or need additional information please feel free to contact me.

Regards,

*Kevin Caldwell*

Kevin Caldwell  
P.O. Box 614  
Miranda, CA. 95553  
Email: [realpropertysolutions4u@gmail.com](mailto:realpropertysolutions4u@gmail.com)

Copy:

Bob Morris  
Chairman Humboldt County Planning Commission

Steve Lazar  
Humboldt County Planning Department

John Ford  
Humboldt County Planning Director

Estelle Fennell  
Humboldt County Supervisor

Ryan Sundberg  
Humboldt County Supervisor



**From:** [Dr. Donald Fregeau](#)  
**To:** [Planning Clerk](#); [Planning Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** Letter regarding Planning commissiod decisions regarding pot grows  
**Date:** Thursday, December 14, 2017 11:32:16 AM

---

Dear Planning Commission:

I am writing to voice my opinion regarding commercial cannabis operations situated so close to heretofore generally accepted residential areas. It is the height of stupidity to allow commercial to exist so close to residential areas. The rural nature of Humboldt County allows for the segregation of grows which could protect residential areas from the effects of increased traffic, marijuana smell, outrageous night time security lighting and the unique problems associated with marijuana grows. There are so many areas grows could exist and not impact residential areas. The 600 foot offset is a joke. I have photos of my growing neighbor walking down my road with a pistol in his hand and peering into my security camera with a tactical vest.

Marijuana activity brings different problems with it. It is not legally recognized in the same way a farming operation or flower growing or commercial vegetable garden and so should be treated as such. There are lots of places grows could exist and not impact local residential areas. A grow should never be allowed to exist next to and abutting any city limit.

My property is next to a current grow. My children and grandchildren play in the pasture and tell me they can smell the marijuana. I am appalled that the supervisors and planning department have allowed the grows to negatively impact long time residents who have worked hard to create a home that now is not what it used to be. We are the people who have helped build Humboldt County. The growers are interlopers and have been outlaws for years.

The current regulation does not allow for grows to exist on roads which fail to meet a category 4 standard. Loop Road does not meet that standard yet we have grows along Loop Road.

Why is it that the treatment of the growers seems favorable for them but no concern is shown to the long time resident? My growing neighbor is not from Humboldt County yet he has no problem dropping his grow into an area which by law should have been excluded from a commercial operation.

I have no faith that either the planning department or board has any concern for the long time residents negatively impacted by the current lenient treatment of growers. If they did we would not see grows next to residential areas and abutting the city limit. I am hoping against hope to have my once beautiful property restored by pushing the grows away from Fortuna and other cities.

Sincere regards,

Donald Fregeau Jr.  
3653 Loop Road  
Fortuna, CA 95540  
707-725-4419  
donaldvf@yahoo.com

From: Dr. Donald Fregeau [mailto:donaldivf@yahoo.com]

Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2017 3:29 PM

To: Ford, John

Subject: Letter regarding concern over cannabis operations set backs

Dear Mr. Ford:

Regarding the meeting to consider issues about setbacks or cannabis operations from cities and residential areas:

I am writing to voice my opinion regarding commercial cannabis operations situated so close to heretofore generally accepted residential areas. It is the height of stupidity to allow commercial to exist so close to residential areas. The rural nature of Humboldt County allows for the segregation of grows which could protect residential areas from the effects of increased traffic, marijuana smell, outrageous night time security lighting and the unique problems associated with marijuana grows. There are so many areas grows could exist and not impact residential areas. The 600 foot offset is a joke. I have photos of my growing neighbor walking down my road with a pistol in his hand and peering into my security camera while wearing a tactical vest.

Marijuana activity brings different problems with it. It is not legally recognized in the same way a farming operation or flower growing or commercial vegetable garden and so should be treated as such. There are lots of places grows could exist and not impact local residential areas. A grow should never be allowed to exist next to and abutting any city limit.

My property is next to a current grow. My children and grandchildren play in the pasture and tell me they can smell the marijuana. I am appalled that the supervisors and planning department have allowed the grows to negatively impact long time residents who have worked hard to create a home that now is not what it used to be. We are the people who have helped build Humboldt County. The growers are interlopers and have been outlaws for years.

The current regulation does not allow for grows to exist on roads which fail to meet a category 4 standard. Loop Road does not meet that standard yet we have grows along Loop Road. Why is it that the treatment of the growers seems favorable for them but no concern is shown to the long time resident? My growing neighbor is not from Humboldt County yet he has no problem dropping his grow into an area which by law should have been excluded from a commercial operation.

I have no faith that either the planning department or board has any concern for the long time residents negatively impacted by the current lenient treatment of growers. If they did we would not see grows next to residential areas and abutting the city limit. I am hoping against hope to have my once beautiful property restored by pushing the grows away from Fortuna and other cities.

I have heard it said that to apply new regulations to already permitted operations would be like "nuking" them. What do you call it when residents who have been law-abiding all their lives, working hard to build a legacy for their family, find their holdings forever altered by unreasonable pot grows on their doorsteps. I feel we are the ones who have been nuked. It is just plain unfair and we find ourselves at your mercy. You alone have the power to reinstate fairness and equity to the hard-working residents who have played by the rules and legally paid for what they have acquired. Making setbacks retroactive will inconvenience a few growers but benefit many more of these taxpaying residents.

Sincere regards,

Donald Fregeau Jr.

3653 Loop Road

Fortuna, CA 95540

707-725-4419

donalddf@yahoo.com