



AGENDA ITEM NO.

BI

COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT

Hearing Date: March 19, 2018

To: Board of Supervisors

From: John Ford, Director of Planning and Building

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Board of Supervisors:

1. Introduce by title and waive further reading of Ordinance No. ____ [Attachment 4], amending sections 313-55.4, 313-55.3.11.7, 313-55.3.7 and 313-55.3.15 of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title III of the County Code; and
2. Introduce by title and waive further reading of Ordinance No. ____ [Attachment 5], amending sections 314-55.4, 314-55.3.11.7, 314-55.3.7 and 314-55.3.15 of Chapter 4 of Division 1 of Title III of the County Code; and
3. Receive and consider the staff report, the Planning Commission's recommendation to certify the FEIR and adopt the ordinances [Attachment 6], the Final Environmental Impact Report [Attachment 10], and written comments received [Attachment 11], open the public hearing, and accept public comment; and

Prepared by Michael Richardson
Michael Richardson, Supervising Planner

CAO Approval [Signature]

REVIEW:

Auditor _____ County Counsel TLFR Personnel _____ Risk Manager _____ Other _____

TYPE OF ITEM:

____ Consent
____ Departmental
☒ Public Hearing
____ Other _____

PREVIOUS ACTION/REFERRAL:

Agenda Order No. F-2
Meeting of: June 13, 2017
Agenda Order No. I-1
Meeting of: April 11, 2017

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT

Upon motion of Supervisor
Seconded by Supervisor

Ayes
Nays
Abstain
Absent

SEE ACTION SUMMARY

and carried by those members present, the Board hereby approves the recommended action contained in this Board report.

Dated: _____

By: _____
Kathy Hayes, Clerk of the Board

Recommendations (continued)

4. Close the public hearing; and
5. Deliberate on the proposed ordinances; and
6. Adopt the proposed ordinances by taking the following actions:
 - a. Adopt the attached Resolution No. ____ [Attachment 1] certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and adopting the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; and
 - b. Adopt Resolution No. ____ [Attachment 2] A Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Humboldt making findings pursuant to Humboldt County Code Section 312-50 concerning adoption of zoning ordinance amendments and consistency with the Coastal Act, and transmitting the coastal zoning ordinance, including all necessary supporting documentation, to the California Coastal Commission as an amendment to the certified Local Coastal Program for their review and certification in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 30514; and
 - c. Adopt Resolution No. ____ [Attachment 3] A Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Humboldt making findings pursuant to Humboldt County Code Section 312-50 concerning adoption of zoning ordinance amendments not in the coastal zone.
 - d. Adopt Ordinance No. ____ [Attachment 4] approving the proposed Coastal Zoning Ordinance changes; and
 - e. Adopt Ordinance No. ____ [Attachment 5] approving the proposed Inland Zoning Ordinance changes; and
 - f. Adopt Resolution No. ____ [Attachment 7] establishing a limit on the number and acres of Cultivation Permits; and
 - g. Direct the Clerk of the Board to publish Summaries of the Ordinances within 15 days after adoption by the Board, along with the names of those Supervisors voting for and against each ordinance [Attachments 8 and 9] and to post in the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors a certified copy of the full text of each adopted ordinance along with the names of those Supervisors voting for and against the ordinance; and
 - h. Direct Planning Staff to prepare and file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk and Office of Planning and Research.

SOURCE OF FUNDING:

The contractual and salary funding for this work is included is in the General Fund contribution to the Long Range Planning unit, 1100-282.

SUMMARY:

These proposed ordinances are a comprehensive update of the Commercial Cannabis regulations within Humboldt County applying to both the Coastal and Inland areas. The draft ordinances reflect the work and recommendation of the Planning Commission. A notable component of the ordinances is that they include a cap on the number of cultivation sites which is to be adopted by

separate resolution. A resolution establishing the cap is included for the Board's consideration. Prior to adopting the ordinances the Board of Supervisors must review and consider the Final Environmental Impact Report which analyzed the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the ordinances. The Planning Commission recommended adoption of the ordinances with a vote of 5-2 and certification of the FEIR with a vote of 4-3.

DISCUSSION:

A. Background

The proposed ordinances are titled the Commercial Cannabis Land Use Ordinance (CCLUO) and will regulate all phases of commercial cannabis activities for both medical and adult use of cannabis. Adoption of these ordinances will repeal the existing Commercial Medical Marijuana Land Use Ordinance (Section 313-55.4 and 314-55.4 of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title III of the County Code and the Medical Cannabis Testing and Research Laboratories and on-site consumption prohibitions in Sections 313-55.3.15, 314- 55.3.15, 313-55.3.11.7 and 314-55.3.11.7 of Division 1 of Title III of the County Code) to be replaced by the proposed ordinances. The proposed ordinances would apply throughout the unincorporated areas of Humboldt County, including the Coastal Zone.

The process of getting to this point has been very deliberate. It began with establishing agreed upon objectives adopted by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors between April and June, 2017. The more significant objectives include:

- Allowing new applicants to enter the permit process
- Removing the limitation on cultivation being located on Prime Soils
- Addressing the residential interface with cannabis cultivation
- Expanding the regulations to include Adult Use of Cannabis
- Providing permit types consistent with state license types
- Encouraging reuse of industrial sites
- Analyzing the implementation of the Ordinance with an Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

B. Planning Commission Review

Beginning in September, 2017 the Planning Commission conducted a workshop over a period of 5 meetings, which was expanded to include workshops in Garberville and Willow Creek. The workshop discussion transitioned into a public hearing which was held over a period of 5 additional meetings, deliberating on the following topic areas.

- Cannabis activity interface with more populated areas
- Concerns with cost of road improvements
- Protecting viability of success for small growers
- Maintaining a separation between cannabis cultivation and existing residential development
- Odor impacts on communities

- Generators (both restricting and allowing their use)
- Applicability of the new ordinance to existing permits, and whether some provisions should apply retroactively
- More appropriate standards for the variety of manufacturing uses
- Appropriate limits on the number of permits or number of acres of cultivation
- Method of calculating cultivation area
- Size of cultivation area which should require discretionary permit
- Desire to protect tribal ceremonial sites

During this time, the Planning Commission considered and straw voted on 14 different alternatives and changed other portions of the draft ordinances.

There were four areas where the Planning Commission struggled to reach consensus:

- 1) ***Applications Filed Under Prior Ordinance:*** The majority of the Commission voted to not apply the new ordinance requirements to existing applicants (Section 314-55.4.3.1, page 112 of this staff report). The Commission received testimony from applicants and others that conforming to the new ordinance requirements may trigger different performance standards, application requirements and may even trigger different permit requirements which would make navigating the permit process more difficult in some cases.

The majority of the Commission expressed that it would not be fair to applicants to change the standards of review during the permit process. In attempting to encourage existing cultivators to participate in the permitted environment it would be viewed negatively to change standards mid-stream. While this sentiment is generally true, the primary changes that would affect applicants have to do with project sites located on the fringe of cities and in community areas.

- 2) ***Neighborhood Compatibility at Permitted Sites Near Cities and Other Sensitive Areas:*** the Planning Commission consensus was to apply specific standards retroactively to Zoning Clearance Certificates issued near cities and other sensitive areas (Section 314-55.4.6.7, page 131 of this staff report). This alternative is an attempt to balance the desire to exempt existing applications from the new ordinance and to address concerns with issuing Zoning Clearance Certificates in proximity to existing residential areas without public review or departmental discretion. The language recommended by the Planning Commission would either require retroactive odor control, approval of a discretionary permit or relocation of the site.
- 3) ***Bus Stop Setbacks:*** The Planning Commission reviewed the issue of the 600 foot bus stop setback twice. The decision was to remove the 600 foot setback for bus stops from the ordinance except for cannabis manufacturing activities involving flammable extraction.
- 4) ***Limit on the Number of Permits and Acres of Open Air Cultivation:*** Staff presented to the Commission a recommendation to set a cap at 5,000 on the number of cultivation applications approved under the existing and proposed new ordinance, and a table showing a suggested distribution of the applications among watersheds in the County. The

Commissioners discussed the permit limit and distribution, and eventually recommended that the requirement for a cap be included in the ordinance, but that the actual cap itself be established by a separate resolution. The following language is contained in the proposed ordinance:

“The total number of permits issued for open air cultivation activities, (including Outdoor and Mixed-Light cultivation and Nurseries) shall be equally distributed among each of the twelve (12) discrete planning watersheds of Humboldt County as directed by the Board of Supervisors by Resolution.” (Section 55.4.6.8 - Cap on Permits, page 131 of this staff report).

This cap is not intended to be an absolute cap but rather a check point requiring the Board of Supervisors to review the information available on water quality and quantity to make sure that the combination of the permitting and enforcement processes are adequately protecting the Humboldt County watersheds.

Attachment 7 includes a range of three different alternatives for establishing caps on acreage and permitting. All three alternatives are consistent with the EIR, and were derived from permit application data collected from all applications submitted under the County’s current commercial cannabis land use regulations.

a) Alternative 1 Cap Approach Presented to Planning Commission at November 14th meeting (Attachment 7A)

The Department presented this resolution to the Planning Commission at the November 14th meeting. It established a cap of 5,000 permits based on the methodology described later in this section of the staff report.

b) Alternatives 2 and 3– Permitting Restrictions within Specified Subwatersheds (Attachment 7B and 7C)

As part of ongoing consultation with local California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) staff and other stakeholders, the Department developed two additional cap alternatives for the Board’s consideration. Both would establish immediate prohibitions on the permitting of new cultivation sites and the expansion of existing sites within eleven (11) subwatersheds that contain creeks and tributaries identified as “Impacted” or “Strongholds” for key populations of California Coho Salmon by CDFW in a March 1st, 2018 letter (Attachment 12). Under the language of these resolutions, lifting of the permitting restrictions within these subwatersheds could only occur when all known pre-existing cultivation sites have been suspended, permitted, or remediated.

c) Comparison of Cap Alternatives

Alternative 1 provides for the largest number of permits and acreage of cultivation (5,000 permits / 1,250 acres). Alternative 2 implements a moderate reduction in permits and acreage by deducting the acreage in Impacted and Stronghold subwatersheds (4,792 permits / 1,198 acres). Alternative 3 deducts the acreage in Impacted and Stronghold subwatersheds and caps total permits at 3,000 permits and total acreage at 750 acres.

All three alternatives include provisions for the Board of Supervisors to perform review of the established limitations on permits and acreage on an annual basis, beginning in April of 2019. Review would occur at a noticed public hearing. Prior to the meeting, the Board would receive an annual report providing an update on the status of local permitting and enforcement efforts. After holding a hearing and considering all information provided, the Board may choose to establish new caps on acreage or permits or change their distribution countywide.

i. Permit and acreage allocation methodology in the Inland Areas

All three alternatives reserve space for the cultivation permit applications filed on or before December 31, 2016 ("Ordinance 1.0"). The permit/acreage allocations found on the left side of the cap distribution tables under columns labeled "Ordinance 1.0" are therefore identical under all three alternatives. Allocations for these permits have been distributed within each of the twelve Planning Watersheds, through an investigation and analysis of parcel locations where applications for cultivation permits were filed. Trends in permit cultivation area sizes were used for acreage allocations.

All three alternatives also provide for future applications received following adoption of the proposed regulatory amendments ("Ordinance 2.0") and the reopening of the application window upon the ordinance becoming effective. To determine the allocation and distribution of these future permits by Planning Watershed, staff performed a countywide analysis of all private parcels with potential for permitting, based on meeting core ordinance eligibility criteria (parcel size & zoning), without regard to other site-specific criteria such as slope, watercourse setbacks, or road access. Large tracts of industrial timberland were excluded. So for example, the South Fork of the Eel River planning watershed contains 15% of the total acreage of potentially eligible parcels countywide, so that watershed was allocated 15% of the new cultivation permits and acres.

ii. Permit and acreage allocation methodology in the Coastal Zone

The Coastal Zone is divided into six (6) Coastal Planning Areas, four of which encompass more than one planning watershed. Approximately 4.88% are associated with land(s) situated within the Coastal Zone, so these areas received 4.88% of the total countywide permits and acres in the coastal version of the CCLUO. Rather than distributing the permits on a watershed basis, the coastal ordinance distributes the cultivation permits and acres in the six coastal planning areas proportional to their percentage of eligible parcels (page 88 of this staff report).

d) Staff Recommendation on the Cap

The initial number of 5,000 cultivation permits presented to the Planning Commission was based upon a rough doubling of the original 2,400 applications received prior to December 31, 2016. This is far less than the estimated 15,000 grows that exist in Humboldt County. The concept presented by CDFW of protecting certain priority watersheds has merit. Staff would recommend that Option 2, subtracting out the units from the priority watersheds is an appropriate refinement.

In further conversations with other interested organizations desire was expressed to see a far lower number of cultivation sites. The alternative of 3,000 cultivation sites may seem low, but if one considers there are currently in the neighborhood of 1,800 applications active for cultivation and non-cultivation cannabis activities, and if of these 1,500 cultivation sites are approved, then the 3,000 number would represent a doubling of the number of cultivation sites. Staff recommends this alternative as appropriate to balance concerns expressed about watershed protection and to allow a sufficient number of permits to begin accepting applications under the updated ordinance.

Since this is a watershed protection effort, locations which have sufficient water based upon infrastructure and water supplies established to support prior industrial uses should be exempted from the cap. This primarily applies on the Samoa Peninsula, and this exemption has been included in the ordinance language.

C. California Coastal Commission

Comments from the Coastal Commission staff were received on February 2, 2018. The proposed CCLUO for the coastal zone in Attachment 4 was modified to address that agency's concerns by:

- clarifying that coastal development permits would be required for cannabis activities,
- including language for protection of ESHA and public access,
- increasing the minimum parcel size where Open Air Cultivation can occur from ten to 20 acres,
- limiting cannabis activities in areas designated Agriculture Exclusive Grazing and in the TC - Coastal Commercial Timberland and TPZ - Timber Production Zones, and
- Placing within the ordinance the language establishing a cap on the number of Open Air Cultivation permits allowed for each of the six Local Coastal Plans.

The proposed revisions are shown in underline and strikeout. The changes do not significantly change what was considered by the Planning Commission but are considered refinements. The language for the cap on Open Air Cultivation in the ordinance will need to be modified depending on the Board's deliberations. The Resolution of Approval (Attachment 2) finds the proposed coastal zoning ordinance amendments are consistent with and carry out the policies of the Coastal Act (Title 14, § 13551 of the Administrative Code and Public Resources Code, §30200), and authorizes its submission to the Coastal Commission for certification.

D. Environmental Impact Report

A Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) was prepared for the ordinances and circulated for public review prior to the Planning Commission review of the ordinance in September, 2017. A Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) was prepared in January, 2018 (Attachment 10), which includes responses to comments on the DEIR and changes made to the DEIR in response to public comments. The FEIR has been provided to those agencies providing comments and the only response has been a letter provided by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

While most of the impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation, the FEIR concludes there are three areas where implementation of the proposed ordinance has the potential to have significant adverse environmental impacts that are unavoidable:

- Impact 3.3-2: Long-term operational emissions of criteria pollutants and ozone precursors: Because the North Coast Air Basin exceeds the maximum thresholds for particulate matter (PM10), operation of new cannabis cultivation would incrementally contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation.
- Impact 3.3-4: Exposure of people to objectionable odors: The cultivation and processing of cannabis generates odors associated with the plant itself, which during maturation can produce substantial odors. Alternative measures are presented in the ordinance to address the odor issue including setbacks and use of greenhouses with filtered emissions equipment; however, these measures will not preclude the generation of odorous emissions in such quantities as to cause detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to some people.
- Impact 3.13-2: Provision of sufficient municipal water supplies and infrastructure needs: New commercial cannabis facilities that would be allowed under the proposed ordinance would result in increased water demand from public water systems that could exceed supply and related infrastructure capacity.

All the other environmental impacts from the ordinance are considered to be less than significant. Some of the impacts are considered less than significant due to mitigation measures which have been proposed as part of the DEIR. There are 24 mitigation measures that propose changes to the ordinance to reduce the adverse environmental impacts to less than significant levels. Most of the mitigation involves adding performance standards to the ordinance. For example, Mitigation Measure 3.10-1 "Implement construction-noise reduction measures" requires the County include in the ordinance the following construction noise standard for new commercial cannabis operations and modifications to existing commercial cannabis operations:

"All outdoor construction activity and use of heavy equipment outdoors shall take place between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday." (See Section 314-55.4.12.2.8 on page 145 of this staff report.)

These performance standards, including the above noise reduction mitigation, are added to Section 55.4.12 of the ordinance, "Performance Standards". Other mitigation involves adding application submittal requirements to the ordinance in Section 55.4.11, "Application Requirements". All the mitigation measures that involve changes to the ordinance are listed in the FEIR in Attachment 10 of this staff report and have been incorporated into the ordinance.

The Planning Commission voted 4-3 to recommend the Board certify the FEIR. The Commissioners not satisfied with the FEIR expressed concerns the FEIR was inadequate because it did not fully discuss the impacts associated with on-going illegal cultivation. In their opinion, the FEIR should be significantly expanded to describe all the impacts of the illegal cannabis industry, not only environmental impacts but also economic and social impacts. They expressed frustration about the impacts of the illegal cannabis operators on the County, and wanted the EIR go further toward addressing them.

The FEIR was written to meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Under CEQA the existing condition is considered “Baseline” and that is the starting point for the analysis. The analysis then evaluates the impacts from the Baseline condition. The EIR acknowledges there are a substantial number of illegal cultivation sites within the county. There were comments received and perhaps influencing some Commissioners that this should be analyzed under the Cumulative scenario.

However, the cumulative impacts discussion in the EIR looks at other similar and related foreseeable projects which are to be undertaken, which is very different from the existing setting. Discussion of cumulative impacts assesses whether the incremental effects of a project are significant when viewed in connection with the effect of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects, so the cumulative impacts of regulatory projects in the cannabis context are very different from the existing environmental setting of illegal cannabis activity. Impacts from illegal cannabis cultivation operations that remain in the black market must still be addressed through a separate ongoing and enhanced program of civil and criminal enforcement that is exempt from CEQA review. (14 C.C.R. § 15321)

While the dissenting Commissioners seemed to understand that their requests extended beyond the scope of the EIR, and beyond state requirements contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the commissioners also expressed their opinion that this is the best time to comprehensively address all the impacts of the illegal cannabis industry on the County.

1. Agency Comments on the FEIR

a. California Department of Fish and Wildlife

In response to the release of the FEIR, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife submitted a comment letter dated March 1, 2018. The letter identifies 24 recommendations which the department would like to see implemented. Some of the recommendations are relevant to the FEIR, some are relevant to the ordinances, and others are related to code enforcement and code enforcement procedure, which is not applicable to the FEIR or ordinances. The specific recommendations and responses relevant to the FEIR have been addressed in the resolution certifying the FEIR. The responses to the full letter is included as Attachment 12.

Staff recommends changes to the FEIR in response to CDFW’s comments that the mitigation currently in the FEIR protecting the Northern Spotted Owl is inadequate to protect that species, which is on both the state and federally list of endangered species. To protect applicants for existing cultivation sites from inadvertently resulting in a “take” of an endangered species, a survey for the Northern Spotted Owl is proposed to be added to the application submittal requirements for existing cultivation sites as follows:

“For pre-existing cultivation sites that submitted for permitting prior to December 31, 2019 within 0.7 miles of a known northern spotted owl activity center, a qualified biologist, familiar with the life history of the northern spotted owl, shall conduct a disturbance and habitat modification assessment to determine the presence of the species and whether the cultivation site can operate or have its operation modified to avoid take of the species. If it is determined that take of the species could occur, the

cultivation site will be required to participate in the Retirement, Remediation, and Relocation provisions of the proposed ordinance to relocate the cannabis cultivation to outside of the northern spotted owl activity area. Pre-existing cultivation sites that submit for permitting after December 31, 2019 will be subject the new development provisions of this mitigation (Attachment 12, Mitigation Measure 3.4-1e).

Staff also recommends changes to Mitigation Measure 3.4-1h to address their comments on noise generation at cannabis activity sites as shown below:

“Mitigation Measure 3.4-1h: Generator ~~n~~Noise reduction.

The ordinance requires generators and other cannabis operations not to increase existing ambient noise levels at the property line of the site beyond 3 dB. In addition, the noise standards shall include the following standards to protect wildlife (USFWS 2006).

- Project-generated sound must not exceed ambient nesting conditions by 20-25 decibels.
- Project-generated sound, when added to existing ambient conditions, must not exceed 90 decibels.
- Time of day adjustment: Marbled murrelet and northern spotted owl are most active during dawn and dusk. Within approximately 2 hours of sunrise and sunset, ambient sound levels are lower than during the middle of the day (by approximately 5-10 decibels). This will be accounted for when determining impacts of project-generated sound.”

The resolution in Attachment 1 and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan in the Final EIR (Attachment 10) reflect the above changes to the mitigation measures.

E. Consultation with Native American Tribes

As reflected in the FEIR, offers to consult on the ordinance and as part of AB 52-Consultation on Tribal Cultural Resources were undertaken with all known tribes within Humboldt County. This consultation resulted in the 1,000 foot setback from ceremonial sites that is included within the proposed ordinance. The Yurok Tribe did not reply timely to the offer for AB-52 consultation, but County staff has undertaken a dialogue with Yurok Tribe staff to address the Tribe’s concern with being able to meaningfully participate in the review process. These discussions are ongoing.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The cost of preparing the FEIR was \$231,927.00. Staff costs for preparation and review of the ordinance total \$210,838.10 at the time this report was drafted. These costs are supported by the General Fund contribution to the Planning and Building Department, Long Range Planning Unit's FY 2017-18 budget.

The proposed ordinance is consistent with the Board’s 2017 Strategic Framework as it will help enforce laws and regulations to protect residents, create opportunities for improved safety and

health, encourage new local enterprise, and support business, workforce development and creation of private-sector jobs.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

The following agencies have been involved in the review of the ordinance:

- Humboldt County Agricultural Commissioner
- Humboldt County Department of Health and Human Services
- Humboldt County Office of Education
- Humboldt County Public Works Department
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,
- California Coastal Commission,
- California Department of Consumer Affairs, Bureau of Cannabis Regulation,
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 1,
- California Department of Food and Agriculture,
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection,
- California Department of Parks and Recreation,
- California Department of Pesticide Regulation,
- California Department of Public Health,
- California Department of Transportation, District 1,
- California Department of Water Resources,
- North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (Region 1),
- North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District, and
- State Water Resource Control Board.

ALTERNATIVES TO PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS:

The ordinance recommended by the Planning Commission has been thoroughly evaluated. During their deliberations, the Planning Commission considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative recommended in the EIR which would not allow new cultivation. The Planning Commission did not feel this alternative was feasible because of the need to allow new cultivation because RRR sites and existing cultivation sites are proposed to be phased out in a two year period.

As noted above, there is an alternative based on comments from the Coastal Commission Staff. Staff recommends that the Board of Supervisors give consideration to this alternative. The comments from the California Department of Fish and Game primarily affect the resolution which established the cultivation cap and does not affect the ordinance.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Attachment 1: Resolution No. _____, certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR)
- Attachment 2: Resolution No. _____, making findings pursuant to Humboldt County Code Section 312-50 – concerning adoption of zoning ordinance amendments for the coastal zone and Title 14 §13551 of the Administrative Code and Public Resources Code, §30200 (Coastal Act)
- Attachment 3: Resolution No. _____ A Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Humboldt making findings pursuant to Humboldt County Code Section 312-50 concerning adoption of zoning ordinance amendments not in the coastal zone.
- Attachment 4: Ordinance No. _____, amending sections 313-55.4, 313-55.3.11.7, 313-55.3.7 and 313-55.3.15 of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title III of the County Code
- Attachment 5: Ordinance No. _____, amending sections 314-55.4, 314-55.3.11.7, 314-55.3.7 and 314-55.3.15 of Chapter 4 of Division 1 of Title III of the County Code
- Attachment 6: Planning Commission Resolution and findings, recommending adoption of the Ordinances and Certification of the EIR for the CCLUO.
- Attachment 7: Resolution Establishing a Cap on the Number Permits and Acres Which May Be Approved For Open Air Cannabis Cultivation
- Attachment 8: Post-Adoption Summary of Ordinance, amending Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title III of the County Code For Areas Within the Coastal Zone
- Attachment 9: Post-Adoption Summary of Ordinance, amending Chapter 4 of Division 1 of Title III of the County Code For Areas Outside the Coastal Zone
- Attachment 10: Final Environmental Impact Report
- Attachment 11: Written Public Comments Received after close of the comment period on the Draft EIR
- Attachment 12: Responses to March 1, 2018 Letter from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife