

June 3, 2022

RE: Appeal of Planning Commission's Approval of Nava Ranch, Inc. Special Permit (PLN-2021-17162) for Commercial Cannabis Expansion on APN 107-106-006

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We, Gary Haga and LaDonna Landergen-Haga of The Honeydew Creek Original Family Farms, are Honeydew residents and neighbors adjacent to the proposed Nava Ranch project. On May 5th, 2022, the Planning Commission adopted the Resolution and approved the Nava Ranch, Inc. Special Permit, with added conditions. While we appreciate the Commissioners' discussion and consideration of our concerns as neighbors, we do not believe all of our evidence was fully considered and do not understand why concerns from the Bureau of Land Management regarding proximity to public lands were not adequately addressed. We continue to believe that an already out-of-compliance operation should not be allowed to expand and increase intensity.

We do not see how the County can support adoption of Finding No. 7 in the Resolution, certifying that the proposed project "...will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity" (May 5th, 2022, Staff Report, pg. 16), when we have stated and documented numerous instances of existing detrimental impacts of light noise pollution.

If the existing project is currently detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare of properties in the vicinity, why would an expanded, more intensive project be any different?

Finding 7 cannot be supported as follows:

1. The existing operation emits light pollution. We have witnessed and documented light pollution at night from the existing 1.0 greenhouses dozens of times, which is out of compliance with International Dark Sky Association standards, the CMMLUO §55.4.11 v) and w), and the approved 1.0 Staff Report for Special Permit 12657.
 - a. This evidence was dismissed by County Staff after a March 17th, 2022, site visit - with 11 days notice - showed that blackout tarps were in place. However, light pollution continued *after* this site visit, and evidence of further light pollution captured on May 4th, 2022 was presented at the May 5th, 2022 Planning Commission meeting.
2. The existing operation emits noise pollution. We have frequently heard loud generator noises from the existing 1.0 operation. This generator is only supposed to be used for emergencies, yet we hear it almost nightly.
 - a. This is out of compliance with the approved 1.0 Staff Report, Development Restriction 15, and CMMLUO §55.4.11 o).
 - b. Again, concerns around generators were dismissed by County staff after they measured noise readings from a small, portable generator. This generator was not our concern; Planning Staff neglected to measure noise emissions from the 25-kW generator onsite (which we hear from our house).
3. There is still no proven source of legitimate power or energy demand calculations for this project. Despite the Conditions of Approvals #5 & #6, the reality is that PG&E is years out, and the applicants have provided no energy demand calculations for the indoor and mixed-light cultivation, which are both energy-intensive cultivation techniques. The applicants have also provided no

evidence that existing or proposed solar power could meet project energy demand. We see no reason why reliance on the “emergency” generator would not continue, continuing to negatively impact us neighboring residents and local wildlife.

Additionally, letter g) of Finding 6 has not been met and thus Finding 6 cannot be supported. Evidence supporting Finding 6 states that, *“PLN-12657-SP included a setback reduction permit allowing cultivation nearer to the Kings Range National Conservation Area, [and] while this proposed expansion will be further back from what is approved, given that it is an expansion staff believes this requires an additional setback reduction to be approved for the expanded cultivation”* (Staff Report, pg. 16).

This setback waiver was never obtained from the Bureau of Land Management, despite BLM’s request and significant concerns with the expanded scope and scale of the project. How can a project be approved when a crucial piece of evidence supporting a Finding in the Resolution is missing? The Bureau of Land Management should have been granted their request to provide an additional setback waiver given the proximity to Public Lands, prior to the approval. Thus, we believe this is a significant oversight of the County and is grounds for granting the appeal.

The concerns represented above - in addition to prior concerns submitted in previous enclosed letters regarding water, employees, Kings Range Wilderness tourism, water quality, lack of proper noise study, lack of Site Management Plan, impacts to wildlife, water usage, power, and general neighborhood incompatibility – demonstrate an operation that should not be allowed to expand.

We care deeply about the safety and welfare of this community, and its wildlife, rivers, and residents. We have lived in this area for generations, and we do support cannabis cultivation in general. However, we do not support irresponsible operators and pollution that negatively impacts life in the beautiful Honeydew Valley.

Please vote to uphold this appeal and deny the Nava Ranch, Inc. commercial cannabis expansion in its entirety. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gary Haga and LaDonna Landergen-Haga