

June 28, 2001

To: Humboldt County Planning Commission
Humboldt County Planning Director Ford

Re: Planning Commission Meeting July 1, 2001
Agenda Item: Public Hearing #4, Record # PLN-2021-17147

Dear Director Ford & Planning Commissioners,

The work to try remedying some of the problems the RRR program has created is appreciated. I realize the program was planned to prevent further environmental destruction and possibly mitigate damage that had been done. Hopefully this change will help.

Unfortunately the proposal imbedded halfway through this item to "Update" or "modify" the definition of outdoor is not acceptable.

The proposal:

The definition for "Outdoor" has been modified to allow artificial lighting using light bulbs requiring 60 watts of electricity or less to maintain plants in a vegetative state and for the safety of those working in greenhouses after dark.

CCLUO 2.0 Commercial Cannabis Ordinance Definitions

"**Outdoor**" means outdoor cultivation using no artificial lighting. Pg. 8

"**Mixed Light,**" means cultivation using a combination of natural and supplemental artificial lighting" pg. 7

If you use lights you would apply for a Mixed Light permit.

If growers were allowed to use lights with an "outdoor" permit they would need electricity to power those lights. Which leads us to more use of generators for cannabis. This would greatly increase fire danger, noise pollution and the ever-enlarging carbon footprint of the cannabis industry.

This was absolutely not considered in your EIR and you would be in violation of CEQA if you approved this item.

This proposal would cause further environmental & social damage.

Right now if someone has a permit for “Mixed light” they are required to cover the lights at night. They are also required to have noise reduction mitigations. And hopefully some type of fire prevention and mitigation strategy in place. Your staff is not able to oversee these necessary and critical mitigations as it is now. It is up to neighbors to identify and report to the planning commission or code enforcement if there are violations. How could this change possibly be managed? Who and how would there be oversight and enforcement?

The proposal you are considering is in direct conflict with the State as shown in the Staff report.

In the report before you - Cal Cannabis comments state:

Staff frequently observe low wattage string lights in greenhouses, which are not necessarily used for supplemental lighting but rather because cultivators claim that CalOSHA requires them to provide supplemental lighting for the safety of employees working in the greenhouses at night. Of course the use of low wattage string lights to maintain plants in the vegetative state is common especially early in the season. Some cultivators remove the lights and some leave them up. Cal Cannabis view is in this situation cultivators must have a mixed-light license and a lighting diagram explaining when the lights are used and when they are removed. Of course Planning is aware that Cal Cannabis considers any supplemental lighting to be inconsistent with an outdoor license even when the licensee asserts that the lights are in place for the safety of employees. Staff has asked Cal Cannabis for an interpretation and was told they are reviewing the CalOSHA requirements, but seemed skeptical of the claim the supplemental lights are in place to comply with OSHA requirements.

Please do not approve this agenda item as is.

Thank you,
Robie Tenorio
Citizens for a Sustainable Humboldt