



COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT
PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT
LONG RANGE PLANNING

3015 H Street Eureka CA 95501
Phone: (707) 445-7541 Fax: (707) 268-3792

Hearing Date: Meeting of October 17, 2019

To: Humboldt County Planning Commission

From: John H. Ford, Director of Planning and Building Department

Subject: Public Hearing on the Industrial Hemp Land Use Ordinance
Case # PLN-2019-15590

Table of Contents

Page

Agenda Item Transmittal	2
Recommended Action and Executive Summary	3
Attachments	
Attachment 1: Draft Resolution	7
Attachment 2: Draft Ordinance	14
Attachment 3: Addendum to the Program Environmental Impact Report for the 2017 Commercial Cannabis Land Use Ordinance (CCLUO)	22
Attachment 4: Link to the Program Environmental Impact Report for the CCLUO	35
Attachment 5: Public Comment	36

Please contact Elanah Adler, Planner, at 445-7541, or by email at eadler@co.humboldt.ca.us, if you have any questions about the scheduled public hearing item.

AGENDA ITEM TRANSMITTAL

Hearing Date	Subject	Contact
October 17, 2019	Zoning Ordinance Amendments – Industrial Hemp Ordinance	Elanah Adler

Project Description: Amendment to Chapters 3 and 4 of the Zoning Regulations (Title III of Humboldt County Code) Division 1 of Title III of Humboldt County (Zoning Code) to allow Industrial Hemp activities in Humboldt County. The proposed zoning ordinance amendments would establish the types, location and performance standards for all Industrial Hemp activities in the unincorporated areas of Humboldt County, including the Coastal Zone.

Project Location: The new regulations would apply throughout the unincorporated areas of Humboldt County, including the Coastal Zone.

Present Plan Designations: Various.

Present Zoning: Various.

Environmental Review: An Addendum to the certified Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the 2017 Commercial Cannabis Land Use Ordinance (CCLUO) (SCH # 2017042022) has been prepared and is included herein as Attachment 3.

State Appeal Status: The portion of the ordinance that affects land use within the coastal zone must be certified by the Coastal Commission prior to taking effect.

**ORDINANCE AMENDING HUMBOLDT COUNTY CODE
CONCERNING THE REGULATION OF INDUSTRIAL HEMP ACTIVITIES**

Record Number: PLN-2019-15590

Recommended Commission Action

1. Open the public hearing.
2. Request that staff present the staff report.
3. Receive public testimony.
4. Deliberate on the draft ordinance, public input, and alternatives presented.
5. Take the following action:

"Move to make all of the required findings, based on evidence in the staff report and public testimony, and recommend the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors consider the Addendum to the Commercial Cannabis EIR, find that no new information has been presented that changes the findings of the PEIR pursuant to Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines and approve the Industrial Hemp Zoning Ordinance Amendments by adopting the attached Resolution of Approval."

Executive Summary: Based on the public testimony presented at the October 3, 2019 Planning Commission public workshop on the draft Industrial Hemp Ordinance, staff is recommending the Planning Commission take a precautionary approach to allowing Industrial Hemp activities in the County. To minimize the risks of Industrial Hemp inadvertently pollinating permitted cannabis cultivation sites, the draft ordinance in Attachment 2 prohibits cultivation of Industrial Hemp, but allows distribution, retail sale, manufacturing and testing of Industrial Hemp at sites permitted through the CCLUO for commercial cannabis products.

Staff believes the necessary findings can be made for the Commission to approve the Resolution in Attachment 1 recommending that the Board of Supervisors adopt the proposed Ordinance amendments as recommended by staff and certify their compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). If the Commission selects one or more of the alternatives, appropriate language should be added to the Ordinance/Resolution.

Background

As discussed in the staff report for the Planning Commission Workshop on October 3, 2019, for Industrial Hemp recent legislative changes at the federal and state level have created a legal framework for the cultivation of Industrial Hemp. Hemp and Cannabis are the same plant, the legal distinction between the two is the amount of Tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) which is a regulated substance at the federal level. This creates a situation where cannabis plants grown for Cannabidiol (CBD) which is associated with its medical properties and without THC can qualify as hemp. Without a testing device it is not possible to distinguish between a cannabis plant grown for CBD and one grown for THC.

There is a growing Industrial hemp industry in the United States and there are those within Humboldt County who would like to participate in this. The primary interest in Humboldt County is to grow hemp for CBD oil and not as a source of food or fiber. There is also a burgeoning and to date unregulated market for CBD products. This complicates factors in

regulating medical marijuana. A cannabis plant grown with low THC and high CBD grown in a permitted and licensed farm needs to pay local and state permit and license fees and taxes, while a similar grower operating as a hemp cultivator would not have the same taxes or state regulations to comply with.

One of the concerns with hemp production is the potential for pollen drift. This concern is more related to hemp grown for food and fiber than flower for CBD extraction, but the experiences of Oregon and Colorado reveal that where hemp has moved in the outdoor cannabis industry has relocated. There is definite concern on the part of existing licensed cannabis growers in Humboldt County that the cannabis industry not be damaged by hemp.

It was with this tension between the desire of some to grow hemp and the concern with what that might mean for the cannabis industry that the Board of Supervisors adopted a temporary moratorium to allow preparation of an ordinance regulating the cultivation of industrial hemp. The Board of Supervisors in adopting a work program to complete the ordinance by the end of 2019, expressed that they would like to see industrial hemp cultivation allowed with minimum regulatory constraints.

Staff began work on the ordinance with three workshops conducted in Redway (2) and Eureka during the month of June. The comments received in the Redway workshop supported allowing cultivation for small hemp farmers living on the parcel being cultivated, and anything larger would follow regulations of the Commercial Cannabis Land Use Ordinance (CCLUO). Concern was expressed about the need for tight controls to prevent pollen drift from affecting Humboldt County's high-quality cannabis crop. Commenters also noted the value of hemp will decline over time as more producers enter the market.

At the workshop in Eureka comments generally fell into three groups: not regulating Industrial Hemp cultivation beyond State requirements; regulate with a light touch, with only minor regulations beyond State requirements; and regulate to ensure it's not determinantal to the environment and the existing cannabis industry. There were comments that CCLUO permit holders should be able to cultivate hemp, and a perception that Humboldt County isn't the place to be a big industrial producer of Industrial Hemp but has the history and ability to create intellectual property with a CBD focus.

With these concerns and the direction from the Board of Supervisors staff developed a draft ordinance to accomplish the following:

1. Mapped Industrial Hemp Management Zone would allow Industrial Hemp cultivation in areas that are currently in agricultural production subject to only a Registration with the Agricultural Commissioner's office. The IHMZ areas are all zoned AE - Agriculture Exclusive and would occur in the lower parts of watersheds where there is an abundance of water for irrigation. These are also not located in community plan areas or within the spheres of influence of cities. This concept was proposed as a way to allow industrial hemp cultivation without any permit requirement.
2. An allowance for cannabis cultivators to convert to Industrial Hemp through a Zoning Clearance Certificate between January 1st and April 1st of each year. The cultivation area for new cultivation sites could be expanded to the maximum allowed by the permit type or up to 3,500 feet, whichever is less.

3. An Accessory Use provision to allow an applicant that lives on the property to grow up to 5,000 square feet of Industrial Hemp in the AE, AG – Agriculture General, FR – Forest Recreation, and RA – Residential Agriculture Zones, and parcels zoned U – Unclassified with an RA General Plan designation. The cultivation would need to be exclusively outdoors, use non-diversionary water for irrigation, and occur in native soils on slopes of less than 10%. Conversion of timberland would not be allowed. The State requires industrial hemp cultivation to be at least 4,370 square feet, which is the rationale for the 5,000 square feet. This was proposed as a way of allowing the small cultivator to have a path forward, with minimal regulatory requirements.
4. Larger cultivation areas and other Industrial Hemp activities including indoor, retail sales and manufacturing would be permitted as Commercial Cannabis Activities through the CCLUO.

Between September 24 and 25 public workshops were conducted to review the draft ordinance in Redway and Eureka. Comments expressed concern regarding large-scale Industrial Hemp farms which could be allowed in the Industrial Hemp Management Zone and the potential to have widespread impacts on cannabis farms from uncontrolled pollen drift. Concern was also expressed about “mono-cropping” of Industrial Hemp creating the potential to bring in new pests and pathogens. Other commenters felt that 5,000 square foot hemp cultivation plots are not going to be economically viable when Industrial Hemp is being produced throughout the United States and the price has dropped significantly for CBD produced from Industrial Hemp.

There was also a concern expressed that attempting to create a pathway for the small farmer that may be struggling with cannabis permitting to pursue industrial hemp as an alternative is a false promise because hemp will not produce the same return as cannabis. Hemp is a commodity currently being grown in other areas on a massive scale. To attempt to create a pathway for this niche may simply not be viable.

At the October 3 Planning Commission workshop, written and verbal comments expressed some of the same concerns raised at the September workshops. A June 25th comment letter supporting the Sun Valley Group's use of greenhouses for Industrial Hemp was also received. Other written comments expressed preference for allowing Industrial Hemp cultivation.

Discussion:

While hemp and cannabis are essentially the same plant, the federal and state regulations affecting each are very different, which makes it very difficult in Humboldt County to design a regulatory structure that adequately addresses both fairly. Lessons learned from other communities are that outdoor cannabis cultivation and industrial hemp cultivation do not co-exist due to pollen drift. While staff has attempted to develop an ordinance with addresses the ideals expressed early in the process, the ordinance presented at the Planning Commission workshop does not adequately address the divergent concerns surrounding this issue.

The idea of the Industrial Hemp Management Zone addresses the desire to allow Hemp in an unregulated manner but exposes the existing cannabis industry to the potential of pollen drift and pest and pathogen infestations associated with monocropping practices of hemp cultivation. The risk here to the existing cannabis industry may be too great to incorporate this provision into an ordinance.

The 5,000 square foot industrial hemp cultivation as an accessory use is a good concept initially introduced in the Commercial Cannabis Land Use Ordinance, but this too raises several problems. First is parity with cannabis farmers. Many of the hemp cultivators would be in locations similar to cannabis farmers, and the hemp farmers would have less regulatory requirements to cultivate the same plant. The plant will require the same amount of water, have the same potential water quality, access, and wildlife as cannabis cultivation, but yet have an abbreviated regulatory process. Second is whether the scale of a 5,000 square foot hemp cultivation site can compete in a market place where hemp is grown in large quantities. For instance, in Oregon 60,000 acres are being used to cultivate hemp. It is expected that in California the Central Valley will be used to cultivate large tracts of hemp, which is currently happening in places like Kern County which coincidentally does not allow cannabis cultivation.

There is concern that hemp cultivation has the potential to adversely affect cannabis crops. As noted above this has been experienced in other locations. This is too important of a subject to rush something through that would not adequately promote an industrial hemp industry which can be successful on the national and international scene while also protecting the cannabis industry. It has not been shown that outdoor cannabis can co-exist in proximity to large tracts of hemp cultivation.

The end of the temporary moratorium is fast approaching. One of two options should be taken: either to extend the temporary moratorium to continue to work on a program that could allow industrial hemp in a successful way, or establish an ordinance not allowing hemp cultivation in Humboldt county.

If the decision is made not to pursue a permanent prohibition of industrial hemp cultivation, there are several ideas that are worth added consideration:

1. develop an ordinance for a pilot program allowing cultivation of Industrial Hemp. The program could be specific about the parameters, describing the types and locations of Industrial Hemp activities and an appropriate sunset date for the program.
2. Determine that there is no difference between hemp and cannabis and regulate them in the same manner.
3. Option 2 with the recommendation that the CCLUO be examined to determine if there are regulatory barriers which preclude small farmers from entry into the legal market place.

The ordinance that is being presented to you today is different from the workshop draft in that it prohibits industrial hemp unless a permit is obtained under the provisions of the CCLUO. This essentially allows hemp cultivation as a similar use to cannabis.

Additional Public Comment and Staff Recommendation

Since the previous meeting, four additional public comments were received on the proposed amendments which are included in Attachment 5 for the Commission's consideration.

ATTACHMENT 1

Draft Resolution

**RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT
Resolution Number 19-**

Case Number PLN-2019-15590

RECOMMENDS THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CERTIFY COMPLIANCE WITH THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND ADOPT THE AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III, CHAPTER 3 AND CHAPTER 4 OF THE HUMBOLDT COUNTY CODE - REGULATIONS INSIDE THE COASTAL ZONE AND REGULATIONS OUTSIDE THE COASTAL ZONE, GOVERNING RETAIL SALE, TESTING, MANUFACTURING, AND DISTRIBUTION OF INDUSTRIAL HEMP.

WHEREAS, California Government Code Section 65850, et seq. authorizes counties to regulate land use, and to adopt and amend zoning ordinances for such purposes, and sets forth procedures governing the adoption and amendment of such ordinances; and

WHEREAS, in June 2019 the Planning and Building Department held three public workshops to get public input on what should be included in the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments; and

WHEREAS, comments received supported a tiered approach to allowing cultivation; and

WHEREAS, on September 23 a workshop draft Industrial Hemp Ordinance was published which includes 1) Industrial Hemp cultivation areas with no local regulation ("Industrial Hemp Management Zones"), 2) cultivation allowances for CCLUO permit holders, 3) "Accessory Use" cultivation which would allow small grows on parcels with existing residences, and 4) a path for cultivation in other areas just like cannabis cultivation under the CCLUO; and

WHEREAS, in September 2019 the Planning and Building Department held two public workshops on the proposed ordinance amendments; and

WHEREAS, comments received expressed concern that large-scale Industrial Hemp farms grown in the Management Zone could potentially have widespread impacts on cannabis farms from uncontrolled pollen drift; "mono-cropping" of Industrial Hemp and the potential to bring in new pests and pathogens could destroy the economic viability of the local cannabis industry; and Accessory Use grows are not going to be economically viable when Industrial Hemp is being produced throughout the United States and the price has dropped significantly for CBD produced from Industrial Hemp; and

WHEREAS, on October 3, 2019 the Planning Commission held a public workshop on the proposed ordinance amendments; and

WHEREAS, written and verbal comments at the meeting expressed some of the same concerns raised at the September workshops; and

WHEREAS, staff introduced a revised draft ordinance for consideration by the Planning Commission at the October 17 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the draft ordinance was revised to take a more cautionary approach and not allow Industrial Hemp cultivation because of the potential adverse impacts on the local cannabis industry; and

WHEREAS, the staff report describes alternatives for the Planning Commission's consideration that include amendments that would allow cultivation of Industrial Hemp on a limited basis, and an alternative that could allow broader cultivation; and

WHEREAS, the Humboldt County Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed ordinance amendments on October 17, 2019 to receive a report on the draft ordinance amendments, as well as evidence and testimony; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the staff report, the alternatives, the Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report prepared for the project, evidence, and other testimony presented to the Commission; and

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved and determined that the Planning Commission:

1. Makes the findings in Exhibit A of this resolution based on the information contained in the public record; and
2. Recommends that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Humboldt:
 - Hold a public hearing in the manner prescribed by law.
 - Consider the Addendum to the Program Environmental Impact Report for the CCLUO;
 - Adopt the findings that the proposed ordinance is consistent with the applicable provisions of the Humboldt County Code and General Plan.
 - By ordinance, approve the zoning ordinance amendments as recommended by the Planning Commission.
 - Direct the Planning and Building Department to prepare and file a Notice of Determination pursuant to CEQA for the project.
 - Direct the Clerk of the Board to publish a post approval summary in a newspaper of general circulation, and give notice of the decision to interested parties; and
 - Adopt a Resolution transmitting the Amendment package, 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.

Adopted after review and consideration of all the evidence on _____, 2019.

The motion was made by Commissioner . and seconded by Commissioner .

AYES: Commissioners:

NOES: Commissioners:

ABSTAIN: Commissioners:

ABSENT: Commissioners:

DECISION:

I, John Ford, Secretary to the Planning Commission of the County of Humboldt, do hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and correct record of the action taken on the above entitled matter by said Commission at a meeting held on the date noted above.

John Ford
Director, Planning and Building Department

Exhibit A - Findings

Required Findings: To approve the proposed zoning ordinance amendments, the Hearing Officer shall determine that there is evidence in support of making **all** of the following required findings.

A. Section 312-50 of the Zoning Ordinance states the following findings must be made to approve changes in the Zoning Ordinance

1. The proposed zoning change is consistent with the General Plan.
2. The proposed change is in the public interest

B. Required Finding for Consistency With Housing Element Densities

1. Government Code Section 65302.81 requires specific findings supported by substantial evidence where a general plan amendment or zone reclassification is adopted that reduces the residential density for any parcel below that utilized by the Department of Housing and Community Development in determining compliance with housing element law (the mid point of the density range specified in the plan designation).
2. In addition, the same Government Code sections also requires any proposed development to maintain the residential density for any parcel at or above that utilized by the Department of Housing and Community Development in determining compliance with housing element law (the mid point of the density range specified in the plan designation), unless the following written findings are made supported by substantial evidence: 1) the reduction is consistent with the adopted general plan including the housing element; and 2) the remaining sites identified in the housing element are adequate to accommodate the County share of the regional housing need; and 3) the property contains insurmountable physical or environmental limitations and clustering of residential units on the developable portions of the site has been maximized.

C. Required Finding for Consistency With the California Environmental Quality Act

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) states that one of the following findings must be made prior to approval of any development which is subject to the regulations of CEQA:

1.
 - a) The project either is categorically or statutorily exempt; or
 - b) There is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment or any potential impacts have been mitigated to a level of insignificance and a negative declaration has been prepared pursuant to Section 15070 of the CEQA Guidelines; or
 - c) An environmental impact report (EIR) has been prepared and all significant environmental effects have been eliminated or mitigated to a level of insignificance, or the required findings in Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines are made.

Finding A: Section 312-50 of the Zoning Ordinance states the following findings must be made to approve changes to the Zoning Ordinance

Section(s)	Applicable Requirements
§312-50 of the Zoning Ordinance	Finding A1. That the proposed zoning change is consistent with the General Plan.
Evidence Supporting Finding A1 <p>The purpose of the ordinance amendments is to establish land use regulations concerning the commercial cultivation, processing, manufacturing, distribution, testing, and sale of Industrial Hemp within the County of Humboldt.</p> <p>Policy UL-P21 of the 2017 Humboldt County General Plan states: Cultivation of medical cannabis shall be regulated by ordinance to provide for the health, safety, and welfare of the community, but shall not interfere with the patient's right to medical cannabis. The General Plan policy was finalized prior to California State approval of Industrial Hemp which also has medicinal qualities similar to medical cannabis, and thus this policy should be understood to apply to both medical cannabis and medicinal Industrial Hemp regulations. This policy states the clear intent of the county that cannabis and Industrial Hemp activities shall be regulated in order to protect the public, health safety and welfare. This ordinance accomplishes that objective.</p>	
§312-50 of the Zoning Ordinance	Finding A2. That the proposed zoning change is in the public interest
Evidence Supporting Finding A2 <p>These regulations are in the public interest because they are designed to protect the public health, safety and welfare of residents of the County of Humboldt, visitors to the County, persons engaged in regulated Industrial Hemp activities including their employees, neighboring property owners, end users of Industrial Hemp; the environment from harm resulting from Industrial Hemp activities, including but not limited to streams, fish, and wildlife, residential neighborhoods, schools, community institutions and Tribal Cultural Resources; to ensure the security of state-regulated medicinal Industrial Hemp.</p>	

Finding B: Section 312-50 of the Zoning Ordinance states the following findings must be made to approve changes to the Zoning Ordinance

Section(s)	Applicable Requirements
Government Code Section 65302.81	Finding B. That the proposed zoning change will not reduce the residential density for any parcel below that utilized by the Department of Housing and Community Development in determining compliance with housing element law (the mid point of the density range specified in the plan designation)

Evidence Supporting Finding B

The proposed ordinance amendments do not allow any Industrial Hemp activities on parcels zoned Residential Single Family or Residential Multifamily, so the properties affected by the ordinance are not included in the residential land inventory used by the by the Department of Housing and Community Development in determining compliance with housing element law.

Finding C: Required Finding for Consistency With CEQA

Section(s)	Applicable Requirements
Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines	Finding C. That the proposed zoning ordinance amendments comply with the requirements of CEQA

Evidence Supporting Finding C

An Addendum to the CCLUO PEIR has been prepared for the project, which is included in Attachment 3 of the staff report presented to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission has considered the Addendum. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed Industrial Hemp Ordinance amendments would not change any previous conclusions associated with effects disclosed in the CCLUO PEIR. Impacts previously found to be less than significant would not be elevated to significant as a result of the proposed Industrial Hemp Ordinance amendments. No new significant impacts or more severe impacts resulting from the proposed Industrial Hemp Ordinance amendments were identified, and no changes would occur in the CCLUO PEIR analysis of significant impacts. Therefore, based on the information above, none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines have occurred and there is no substantial evidence to warrant the preparation of a subsequent EIR. The decision-making body shall consider this addendum to the CCLUO Program EIR prior to making a decision on the project.

ATTACHMENT 2A

DRAFT ORDINANCE

(AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 3 OF ZONING REGULATIONS - COASTAL)

313-55.5 INDUSTRIAL HEMP LAND USE REGULATION FOR THE COASTAL AREA OF THE COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT

55.5.1 AUTHORITY AND TITLE

This Section regulates the cultivation of industrial hemp within the Coastal Area of the County of Humboldt.

55.5.2 PURPOSE AND INTENT

The purpose of this Section is to establish land use regulations for the purposes of Industrial Hemp activities within the County of Humboldt in order to encourage safe, reasonable and responsible growth that reduces negative impacts on our community and environment, increases public awareness, and community health and safety while creating a clear and attainable path for applicants to follow.

These regulations are intended to ensure the public health, safety and welfare of residents of the County of Humboldt, visitors to the County, persons engaged in Industrial Hemp activities to protect the environment from harm resulting from Industrial Hemp activities, including but not limited to streams, fish, and wildlife, residential neighborhoods, schools, community institutions and Tribal Cultural Resources; and to ensure the security of state-regulated hemp cultivation. To this end, these regulations identify where in the County Industrial Hemp activities can occur and specify the application process, what type of permit is required, and the approval criteria that will apply.

55.5.3 APPLICABILITY AND INTERPRETATION

55.5.3.1 All facilities and activities involved in Industrial Hemp activities within the jurisdiction of the County of Humboldt within the Coastal Zone shall be controlled by the provisions of this Section.

55.5.3.2 Nothing in this Section is intended, nor shall it be construed, to exempt Industrial Hemp activities from compliance with all other applicable Humboldt County zoning, land use, grading, and streamside management area regulations as well as other applicable provisions of the County Code.

55.5.3.3 Nothing in this Section is intended, nor shall it be construed, to exempt Industrial Hemp activities from any and all applicable local and state construction, electrical, plumbing, water rights, waste water discharge, water quality, streamside management area, Coastal Development Permit regulations, endangered species, or any other environmental, building or land use standards or permitting requirements.

55.5.3.4 Other than as enumerated in this Section, Industrial Hemp activities are prohibited in any zoning district other than those zoning districts where it is expressly permitted.

55.5.3.5 Severability. If any provision of this Section, or the application thereof, is held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect any other provision or application of this Section that can be given effect without the invalid provisions or application; and to this end, the provisions or application of this Section are severable.

55.5.4 DEFINITIONS

“Industrial Hemp” A crop agricultural product, whether growing or not, that is limited to types of the plant *Cannabis sativa Linnaeus* and any part of that plant, including the seeds of the plant and all derivatives, extracts, the resin extracted from any part of the plant, cannabinoids, isomers, acids, salts, and salts of isomers, with a delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) concentration of no more than 0.3 percent on a dry weight basis.

55.5.5 GENERAL PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO INDUSTRIAL HEMP ACTIVITY LAND USE PERMITS

55.5.5.1 Cultivation of Industrial Hemp for the purposes of fiber or seed production intended to produce seed cake or seed oil, is prohibited.

55.5.5.2 Industrial Hemp activities for the purposes of cannabinoid derivatives production is permitted subject to the requirements in this Section.

55.5.6 INDUSTRIAL HEMP MANUFACTURING, RETAIL SALES, AND CULTIVATION SUPPORT FACILITIES

Existing Cannabis Manufacturing sites permitted through Section 313-55.4.8.2, Cannabis Retail Sales sites permitted through Section 313-55.4.10.1 and Section 31-55.3, and Cannabis Support Facilities permitted through Section 313-55.4.7 may substitute Industrial Hemp for Commercial Cannabis without additional permit or Registration requirements except those required by state and federal law. The conditions of approval and performance standards of the permitted Commercial Cannabis activities also apply to Industrial Hemp activities.

Applications may be accepted for new Industrial Hemp Manufacturing sites through Section 313-55.4.8.2, Retail Sales sites through Section 313-55.4.10.1 and Section 313-55.3, and Support Facilities through Section 313-55.4.7 where Industrial Hemp is substituted for Commercial Cannabis. All the Eligibility Criteria and Performance Standards that apply to Commercial Cannabis activities shall equally apply to Industrial Hemp activities.

55.5.7 RELEASE OF LIABILITY, INDEMNIFICATION, AND HOLD HARMLESS

As part of the application for any Coastal Development Permit, Zoning Clearance Certificate, Special Permit, or Use Permit for Industrial Hemp activity, the property owner and permittee shall indemnify and hold harmless the County of Humboldt and its agents, officers, elected officials, and employees for any claims, damages, or injuries brought by affected property owners or other third parties due to the Industrial Hemp activity and for any claims brought by any person for problems, injuries, damages, or liabilities of any kind that may arise out of these uses.

Alternative to allow cultivation of Industrial Hemp at sites already permitted for cultivation of commercial cannabis where the cultivation area for Industrial Hemp would replace the cultivation area for commercial cannabis

55.5.8 CULTIVATION OF INDUSTRIAL HEMP ON SITES APPROVED FOR COMMERCIAL CANNABIS CULTIVATION THROUGH THE COMMERCIAL CANNABIS LAND USE ORDINANCE (CCLUO).

55.5.7.1 Cultivation of Industrial Hemp instead of Commercial Cannabis within the approved cannabis cultivation area under a permit or permits approved through the Coastal CCLUO may be allowed with a Zoning Clearance Certificate if an application is received between January 1 and April 1 of each year. All of the permit requirements for the approved Commercial Cannabis cultivation shall apply to the Industrial Hemp cultivation in addition to the Registration requirements administered by the Agricultural Commissioner.

ATTACHMENT 2B
DRAFT ORDINANCE
(AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 4 OF ZONING REGULATIONS - INLAND)

314-55.5 INDUSTRIAL HEMP LAND USE REGULATION FOR THE INLAND AREA OF THE COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT

55.5.1 AUTHORITY AND TITLE

This Section regulates the cultivation of industrial hemp within the Non-Coastal Area of the County of Humboldt.

55.5.2 PURPOSE AND INTENT

The purpose of this Section is to establish land use regulations for the purposes of Industrial Hemp activities within the County of Humboldt in order to encourage safe, reasonable and responsible growth that reduces negative impacts on our community and environment, increases public awareness, and community health and safety while creating a clear and attainable path for applicants to follow.

These regulations are intended to ensure the public health, safety and welfare of residents of the County of Humboldt, visitors to the County, persons engaged in Industrial Hemp activities to protect the environment from harm resulting from Industrial Hemp activities, including but not limited to streams, fish, and wildlife, residential neighborhoods, schools, community institutions and Tribal Cultural Resources; and to ensure the security of state-regulated hemp cultivation. To this end, these regulations identify where in the County Industrial Hemp activities can occur and specify the application process, what type of permit is required, and the approval criteria that will apply.

55.5.3 APPLICABILITY AND INTERPRETATION

55.5.3.1 All facilities and activities involved in Industrial Hemp activities within the jurisdiction of the County of Humboldt outside of the Coastal Zone shall be controlled by the provisions of this Section.

55.5.3.2 Nothing in this Section is intended, nor shall it be construed, to exempt Industrial Hemp activities from compliance with all other applicable Humboldt County zoning, land use, grading, and streamside management area regulations as well as other applicable provisions of the County Code.

55.5.3.3 Nothing in this Section is intended, nor shall it be construed, to exempt Industrial Hemp activities from any and all applicable local and state construction, electrical, plumbing, water rights, waste water discharge, water quality, streamside management area regulations, endangered species, or any other environmental, building or land use standards or permitting requirements.

55.5.3.4 Other than as enumerated in this Section, Industrial Hemp activities are prohibited in any zoning district other than those zoning districts where it is expressly permitted.

55.5.3.5 Severability. If any provision of this Section, or the application thereof, is held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect any other provision or application of this Section that can be given effect without the invalid provisions or application; and to this end, the provisions or application of this Section are severable.

55.5.4 DEFINITIONS

“Industrial Hemp” A crop agricultural product, whether growing or not, that is limited to types of the plant *Cannabis sativa Linnaeus* and any part of that plant, including the seeds of the plant and all derivatives, extracts, the resin extracted from any part of the plant, cannabinoids, isomers, acids, salts, and salts of isomers, with a delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) concentration of no more than 0.3 percent on a dry weight basis.

55.5.5 GENERAL PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO INDUSTRIAL HEMP ACTIVITY LAND USE PERMITS

55.5.5.1 Cultivation of Industrial Hemp for the purposes of fiber or seed production intended to produce seed cake or seed oil, is prohibited.

55.5.5.2 Industrial Hemp activities for the purposes of cannabinoid derivatives production is permitted subject to the requirements in this Section.

55.5.6 INDUSTRIAL HEMP MANUFACTURING, RETAIL SALES, AND CULTIVATION SUPPORT FACILITIES

Existing Cannabis Manufacturing sites permitted through Section 313-55.4.8.2, Cannabis Retail Sales sites permitted through Section 313-55.4.10.1 and Section 31-55.3, and Cannabis Support Facilities permitted through Section 313-55.4.7 may substitute Industrial Hemp for Commercial Cannabis without additional permit or Registration requirements except those required by state and federal law. The conditions of approval and performance standards of the permitted Commercial Cannabis activities also apply to Industrial Hemp activities.

Applications may be accepted for new Industrial Hemp Manufacturing sites through Section 313-55.4.8.2, Retail Sales sites through Section 313-55.4.10.1 and Section 313-55.3, and Support Facilities through Section 313-55.4.7 where Industrial Hemp is substituted for Commercial Cannabis. All the Eligibility Criteria and Performance Standards that apply to Commercial Cannabis activities shall equally apply to Industrial Hemp activities.

55.5.13 RELEASE OF LIABILITY, INDEMNIFICATION, AND HOLD HARMLESS

As part of the application for any Zoning Clearance Certificate, Special Permit, or Use Permit for Industrial Hemp activity, the property owner and permittee shall indemnify and hold harmless the County of Humboldt and its agents, officers, elected officials, and employees for any claims, damages, or injuries brought by affected property owners or other third parties due to the Industrial Hemp activity and for any claims brought by any person for problems, injuries, damages, or liabilities of any kind that may arise out of these uses.

Alternative to allow cultivation of Industrial Hemp at sites already permitted for cultivation of commercial cannabis where the cultivation area for Industrial Hemp would replace the cultivation area for commercial cannabis

55.5.7 CULTIVATION OF INDUSTRIAL HEMP ON SITES APPROVED FOR COMMERCIAL CANNABIS CULTIVATION THROUGH THE COMMERCIAL CANNABIS LAND USE ORDINANCE (CCLUO).

55.5.7.1 Cultivation of Industrial Hemp instead of Commercial Cannabis within the approved cannabis cultivation area under a permit or permits approved through the CCLUO may be allowed with a Zoning Clearance Certificate if an application is received between January 1 and April 1 of each year. All of the permit requirements for the approved Commercial Cannabis cultivation shall apply to the Industrial Hemp cultivation in addition to the Registration requirements administered by the Agricultural Commissioner.

ATTACHMENT 3

Addendum to the Program Environmental Impact Report for the CCLUO

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (CEQA) ADDENDUM TO THE
AMENDMENTS TO THE HUMBOLDT COUNTY CODE REGULATING COMMERCIAL CANNABIS
ACTIVITIES ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

(State Clearinghouse # 2017042022) September 1, 2017

**For the
HUMBOLDT COUNTY INDUSTRIAL HEMP ORDINANCE**

1.0 Introduction

This Addendum to the Certified Amendments to the Humboldt County Code Regulating Commercial Cannabis Activities Environmental Impact Report (Commercial Cannabis) (PEIR) (State Clearinghouse No. 2017042022) has been prepared by the Humboldt County Planning Department in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code § 21000 et seq.), and the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, Chapter 3 § 15000 et seq.). The Addendum evaluates the potential environmental impacts of implementing changes to the Humboldt County Code, as a result of the Industrial Hemp Ordinance.

1.0 Background and Tiering

The Final Environmental Impact Report for the Commercial Cannabis PEIR was published September 2017. This PEIR is a first-tier environmental document that evaluated amendments to Humboldt County Code regulating Commercial Cannabis Activities. The PEIR evaluated an ordinance which established land use regulations concerning the commercial cultivation, processing, manufacturing, and distribution of cannabis within Humboldt County.

As a part of Commercial Cannabis ordinance amendments, the Industrial Hemp ordinance is appropriately tiered from the PEIR because it (1) is geographically coincident with the Commercial Cannabis ordinance; (2) is a logical and foreseeable part of its contemplated action; (3) deals with regulations, plans, and other criteria to implement a continuing program; and (4) falls under the same authorizing statutory and regulatory authority and has generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways (see CEQA Guidelines § 15168(a)).

The Industrial Hemp Ordinance (the Project) will allow for distribution, testing, manufacturing and sale of industrial hemp that is anticipated to occur within the scope of the Commercial Cannabis PEIR, and is a minor addition that has occurred subsequent to that document. When determining whether later activities under a Program EIR require an additional environmental document, § 15168(c) states, in relevant part:

- (c) Use with Later Activities. Later activities in the program must be examined in the light of the program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared.

This Addendum evaluates the Project's environmental effects in the light of the program EIR.

Further, § 15168(c)(5) states that when a PEIR provides a description of later activities that would implement the program, and deals with the effects of the program as specifically and comprehensively as possible, "the later activities could be found to be within the scope of the project described in the program EIR, and no further environmental documents would be required". Section 3.3 evaluates whether the Project results in new or substantially more severe significant effects not discussed in this PEIR. Section 4.0 examines whether new information of substantial could affect the adequacy of the PEIR.

1.2 Prior EIRs Incorporated by Reference

This Addendum addresses updates and minor changes to the 2017 Amendments to Humboldt County Code Regulating Commercial Cannabis Activities, which was evaluated in a Programmatic Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) SCH 2017042022. Additionally, along with the Commercial Cannabis PEIR, the General Plan Update Final and Revised Draft Program EIR was used as background information and analysis to prepare this Addendum to the PEIR. They are a matter of public record and are hereby incorporated by reference.

- [2017 Amendments to Humboldt County Code Regulating Commercial Cannabis Activities \(SCH 2017042022\):](#)
- [2017 General Plan Update Final and Revised Draft Program EIR \(SCH 2007012089\).](#)

The documents are available for review during regular business hours at the Humboldt County Planning and Building Department at 3015 H Street, Eureka; or online at <https://humboldt.gov.org/2308/Cannabis-EIR> and <https://humboldt.gov.org/547/General-Plan-Documents>.

The provisions, eligibility and siting criteria, and performance standards that make up the Project, and the subject of this Addendum, are contained in the Industrial Hemp Land Use Ordinance, attached here as Attachment 1 to the Staff Report.

1.3 Statutory Authority and Requirements

CEQA Guidelines § 15164(a) states the following with respect to an Addendum to an EIR:

The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.

CEQA Guidelines § 15162, *Subsequent EIRs and Negative Declarations*, states the following with respect to Subsequent EIRs:

- (a) When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:
- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
 - (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
 - (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
 - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR

or negative declaration;

- (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
- (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
- (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

The County of Humboldt is the Lead Agency. The Humboldt County Planning Commission and Humboldt County Board of Supervisors have approval authority over the General Plan Program and the Industrial Hemp Ordinance.

1.4 Summary of Analysis and Findings for an Addendum

The Industrial Hemp Ordinance (the Project) is analyzed based on the Commercial Cannabis PEIR and the General Plan's Agricultural Resources Land Use goals and policies to support these regulations. New allowances for the distribution, testing, manufacturing and sale of industrial hemp, as described in the ordinance, confirms the assumptions of the Commercial Cannabis PEIR. The Project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe physical impacts, change land use designation, or rezoning with potential to increase development capacities. In re-examining the mitigation measures of the PEIR, no newly feasible or different measures or alternatives were found that would substantially reduce potential significant effects of the project. Section 3.3 of this Addendum presents evidence supporting the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to §15162.

Based on the new data, and the evaluation of the potential environmental impacts resulting from the Project, none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines § 15162 have occurred, and this Addendum was prepared.

2.0 Project Description

The Industrial Hemp Ordinance (the Project) is a new ordinance to address changes to State Law and prohibit cultivation of Industrial Hemp but allow distribution, retail sale, manufacturing and testing of industrial hemp at sites permitted through the CCLUO for commercial cannabis products in Humboldt County. Industrial Hemp is a crop that is limited to types of the plant *Cannabis sativa* Linnaeus having no more than three-tenths of 1 percent tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) contained in the dried flowering tops, whether growing or not; the seeds of the plant; the resin extracted from any part of the plant; and every compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of the plant, its seeds or resin produced therefrom.

The passage of the County's Commercial Medical Marijuana Land Use Ordinance in 2016 was the first proactive step in the County's process of establishing regulations for commercial cultivation, processing, manufacturing, and distribution of cannabis in a manner consistent with California's recently enacted Medical Marijuana Regulation and Safety Act (MMRSA). In September 2017, a draft environmental impact report (Draft EIR) was prepared to evaluate the proposed Amendments to Humboldt County Code regulating Commercial Cannabis Activities, as part of a new ordinance to establish land use regulations concerning the commercial cannabis activities within Humboldt County.

With the passage of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (2018 Farm Bill) that was signed into law by the President and effective on January 1, 2019, hemp was removed from Schedule I of the Federal Controlled Substances Act and no longer federally regulated as a controlled substance. In California, Senate Bill 1409 was approved by the Governor and effective on January 1, 2019. Both of these pieces of legislation allowed for the ability for California cultivation of hemp.

2.1 Project Location and Setting

A complete description of the project location, setting, and existing conditions can be found in [Section 2.3 of the Amendments to Humboldt County Code Regulating Commercial Cannabis Activities Project Draft Environmental Impact Report](#). Humboldt County consists of approximately 2.3 million acres, 75 percent of which is forested. Approximately 30 percent of the county is under federal, state, and tribal ownership. Incorporated cities consist of 24,000 acres and agricultural operations make-up 460,000 acres of the County.

2.2 Project Characteristics

Previous environmental review analyzed the potential effects of commercial cannabis cultivation, including establishment of land use regulations for the commercial cultivation, processing, manufacturing, distribution, testing, and sale of cannabis within the County.

The Project would add land use regulations for Industrial Hemp allowance for distribution, retail sale, manufacturing and testing. No existing measures that are intended to lessen environmental impacts resulting from the Commercial Cannabis PEIR are proposed to be deleted. The full text of the Amendments to Humboldt County Code Regulating Commercial Cannabis Activities, available for review on the County's website ([Cannabis Environmental Impact Report](#)) and incorporated into this Addendum by reference.

3.0 Evidence Supporting the Addendum

This section compares actions in the proposed Industrial Hemp Ordinance Amendments to those incorporated in the Humboldt County Code Regulating Commercial Cannabis Activities PEIR to determine whether any of the conditions in § 15162 have occurred. The decision-making body shall consider this addendum to the final certified Amendments to the Humboldt County Code Regulating Commercial Cannabis Activities PEIR prior to making a decision on the project.

3.1 Environmental Impact Analysis

CEQA Guidelines § 15162(a)(3) prescribe an additional EIR when a project results in new or substantially more severe significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR.

The Industrial Hemp ordinance will have the same impacts on the environment described as significant and unavoidable in the previous EIRs. The Commercial Cannabis PEIR recognized significant and unavoidable impacts related to Commercial Cannabis Activities. Those include Air Quality and Utilities and Service Systems and Cumulative Impacts. In certifying this PEIR, the Board of Supervisors made findings based on substantial evidence that the benefits of implementing the Commercial Cannabis Land Use Ordinance outweighed the unavoidable environmental effects, and adopted a Statement of Overriding Conditions.

However, this Addendum examines the potential, indirect environmental impacts of the new policies, standards, and implementation measures in light of the Program EIR to determine

whether there are effects not previously examined, or substantially more severe.

3.3.1 Aesthetics

Section 3.1 of the Commercial Cannabis PEIR evaluates environmental effects related to Aesthetics. The PEIR found that cannabis operations are aesthetically not substantially different in appearance from other agricultural operations, having less than significant aesthetic impacts.

Relevant Project Components. No Project components would impact aesthetics.

Impact Analysis. The minor changes proposed by the Project will not result in aesthetic impacts attributable to a change in activities held within existing commercial buildings, or future commercial buildings within commercially zoned areas, that would allow for the distribution, retail sale, manufacturing and testing of industrial hemp. In light of the PEIR, the project would have no potential significant impacts.

3.3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Section 3.2 of the Commercial Cannabis PEIR evaluates environmental effects related to Agriculture and Forest Resources. The PEIR found that cannabis operations have no impact on agricultural resources or land use. Potential impacts of cannabis on conversion of forest land were found to be less than significant, as only existing cultivation sites may have had timberland conversion and on-site remediation would be subject to performance standards.

Relevant Project Components. No Project components would impact agriculture and forestry resources.

Impact Analysis. The Project would not have any additional impacts to agricultural or forestry resources, as no new cultivation for industrial hemp would be allowed. In light of the PEIR, the project would have no potential significant impacts.

3.3.3 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Section 3.3 of the Commercial Cannabis PEIR evaluates environmental effects related to Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Humboldt County is in attainment of all federal and state criteria air pollutant standards, except for State PM₁₀ levels, for which the entire North Coast Air Basin, including Humboldt County, is currently designated as a non-attainment area. For this reason, increases in PM₁₀ emissions that could increase exceedances are significant, and although harvest season lasts approximately four to six weeks and daily PM₁₀ emissions only exceed the NCUAQMD-recommended threshold during that time, the impacts remain significant and unavoidable. Additionally, exposure of people to objectionable odors was determined to be a significant impact. In certifying the Commercial Cannabis PEIR and CCLUO, the Board of Supervisors made findings that the benefits of implementing the CCLUO outweighed the unavoidable environmental effects.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions and impacts related to Climate Change were also evaluated in Section 3.3 of the PEIR, and impacts were found to be less than significant.

Mitigation. While a NCUAQMD PM₁₀ Attainment Plan is in effect, no feasible mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce PM₁₀ to a level less than significant. Mitigation related to odors, specifically Mitigation Measure 3.3-4, prohibits the burning of cannabis and other vegetative material will reduce odors. However, the PEIR determined that it does not reduce the

impact of the odors related to outdoor cultivation and processing of cannabis, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact.

Relevant Project Components. The Project components would have similar impacts to air quality, in regard to odors. These impacts have been evaluated and determined to be significant and unavoidable.

Impact Analysis. The above measure would not be applicable to the Project, as no cultivation of industrial hemp would be allowed. Thus, no odors as a result of processing of industrial hemp would occur. The Industrial Hemp ordinance intends to provide new allowances for the distribution, retail sale, manufacturing and testing of industrial hemp cultivation in the same locations as Commercial Cannabis is allowed. In light of the PEIR, the project's potential impacts on air quality do not exceed those previously considered.

3.3.4 Biological Resources

Section 3.4 of the Commercial Cannabis PEIR evaluates environmental effects related to Biological Resources, and finds the impacts of the PEIR to be less than significant as mitigated.

Mitigation. Species protection is assured by assessing development impacts on species diversity in wetlands, mapped sensitive habitats, threatened/endangered species ranges and in SMA's as part of the review process for discretionary permits. The PEIR includes mitigation measures that restricts development and adds buffers around wildlife corridors and nursery sites; and maps biological resources to reduce potential conflicts.

Relevant Project Components. The Project components would not result in impacts to biological resources beyond than as studied by the PEIR, as the ordinance does not allow for industrial hemp cultivation, and thus no generators or surface water diversions will be used.

Impact Analysis. As the Project has a narrow scope of providing new allowances for the distribution, retail sale, manufacturing and testing of industrial hemp within existing Commercial Cannabis facilities, all mitigation measures and performance standards outlined in the Commercial Cannabis PEIR reduced impacts to less than significant levels, and those would be imposed on any subsequent development of the permitted areas. The Project does not allow for the use of generators or surface water diversions as evaluated in the PEIR. Therefore, mitigation already in place would reduce any impacts of the Project to a less than significant level.

3.3.5 Cultural Resources

Section 3.5 of the Commercial Cannabis PEIR evaluates environmental effects related to Cultural Resources. The Commercial Cannabis ordinance contains performance standards which protect historical and archaeological resources or mitigate impacts to them.

Mitigation. Mitigation measures in the Commercial Cannabis PEIR identify potentially significant historical and archaeological resources; however, potential impacts have been reduced to a less than significant level through mitigation measures for protection of historic resources (Mitigation Measure 3.5-1) and unique archaeological resources (Mitigation 3.5-2).

Relevant Project Components. The Project would not result in any ground disturbance activities, as no industrial hemp cultivation would be allowed.

Impact Analysis. The Project focuses on new allowances for distribution, retail sale, manufacturing and testing of industrial hemp in commercial areas. In light of the PEIR, the project's impacts on historic and archaeological resources are less than significant.

3.3.6 Geology and Soils

Section 3.6 of the Commercial Cannabis PEIR evaluates environmental effects related to Geology and Soils. The Commercial Cannabis ordinance contains performance standards which protect damage as a result of geologic hazards or destruction of soil and undiscovered paleontological resources or mitigate impacts to them.

Mitigation. Mitigation measures in the Commercial Cannabis PEIR identify potentially significant damage to or destruction of undiscovered paleontological resources and potential impacts have been reduced to a less than significant level through mitigation measure to require the contractor to cease all work activities if paleontological discoveries are made (Mitigation Measure 3.6-5).

Relevant Project Components. The Project components would not result in impacts from geological hazards nor soil losses beyond than as studied by the PEIR, as the ordinance does not allow for industrial hemp cultivation, and thus not result in impacts to paleontological resources.

Impact Analysis. The Project focuses on new allowances for the distribution, retail sale, manufacturing and testing of industrial hemp in commercial areas. In light of the PEIR, the project's impacts on geology and soils are less than significant.

3.3.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Section 3.7 of the Commercial Cannabis PEIR evaluates environmental effects related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and finds that the Commercial Cannabis ordinance contains performance standards which protect damage as a result of hazards and hazardous materials or mitigate impacts to them.

Mitigation. Mitigation measures in the Commercial Cannabis PEIR identify potentially significant impacts as a result of potential human hazards from exposure to existing on-site hazardous materials through requiring preparation of environmental site assessments would reduce the risks to less than significant (Mitigation Measure 3.7-2).

Relevant Project Components. The Project focuses on new allowances for the distribution, retail sale, manufacturing and testing of industrial hemp in commercial areas, and thus may occur within areas where construction of commercial buildings may disturb subsurface materials.

Impact Analysis. The Project focuses on new allowances for the distribution, retail sale, manufacturing and testing of industrial hemp in commercial areas. In light of the PEIR, mitigation already in place would reduce any impacts of the Project to a less than significant level.

3.3.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

Section 3.8 of the Commercial Cannabis PEIR evaluates environmental effects related to Hydrology and Water Quality, and finds the impacts of the PEIR to be less than significant as mitigated.

Mitigation. Mitigation measures listed in Section 3.8 were found to reduce significant and potentially impacts to operational water quality, groundwater supply, surface drainage and on-

site flooding, and diversion of surface water and through performance standards and mitigation measures, were reduced to levels less than significant. These Mitigation Measures include require minimum size of commercial cultivation activities, annual groundwater and adaptive management, design features to attenuate increase in drainage, water diversion and monitoring and reporting requirements (Mitigation Measures 3.8-2, 3.8-3, 3.8-4, and 3.8-5)

Relevant Project Components. No Project components would impact hydrology and water quality, as not cultivation of industrial hemp would be allowed.

Impact Analysis. The Project focuses on new allowances for distribution, retail sale, manufacturing and testing of industrial hemp in commercial areas. In light of the PEIR, the project's impacts on hydrology and water quality resources are less than significant.

3.3.9 Land Use and Planning

Section 3.9 of the Commercial Cannabis PEIR evaluates environmental effects related to Land Use and Planning, finding that the impacts of implementing the CCLUO would be less than significant.

Relevant Project Components. No Project components would impact land use and planning.

Impact Analysis. The Project focuses on new allowances for the distribution, retail sale, manufacturing and testing of industrial hemp in commercial areas, consistent with zoning and general plan land use designations. In light of the PEIR, the project's impacts on land use and planning are less than significant.

3.3.10 Noise

Section 3.10 of the Commercial Cannabis PEIR evaluates environmental effects related to Noise, finding that the impacts of implementing the regulations would be less than significant as mitigated.

Mitigation. Mitigation measures in the Commercial Cannabis PEIR identify potentially significant impacts as short-term, construction-related noise and that through requiring reducing new construction activity for new cannabis operations impacts would be reduced to less than significant (Mitigation Measure 3.10.1).

Relevant Project Components. Any new construction that may result as part of the Project must adhere to the noise mitigation measure.

Impact Analysis. The Project focuses on new allowances for the distribution, retail sale, manufacturing and testing of industrial hemp in commercial areas. In light of the PEIR, the project's noise impacts are less than significant.

3.3.11 Public Services

Section 3.11 of the Commercial Cannabis PEIR evaluates environmental effects related to Public Services, finding that the impacts of implementing the CCLUO would be less than significant.

Relevant Project Components. No Project components would impact public services.

Impact Analysis. The Project would not have any additional impacts to public services, as the

Project allows for distribution, retail sale, manufacturing and testing of industrial hemp in commercial areas where public services are provided. In light of the PIER, the project would have no potential significant impacts.

3.3.12 Transportation

Section 3.12 of the Commercial Cannabis PEIR environmental effects related to Transportation and Circulation, finding that the impacts of implementing the CCLUO would be less than significant.

Relevant Project Components. The Project, by allowing for distribution of industrial hemp, could result in an increases to transportation, if hemp products exceed the existing transportation capacity of commercial cannabis.

Impact Analysis. It is anticipated that the Project would not have any additional impacts to transportation and circulation. Although an increase in transportation may occur as a result of distribution of industrial hemp products, along with commercial cannabis projects, it is anticipated that these increases, if any, would result in a significant impact beyond what was considered as part of the PEIR. In light of the PIER, the project would have no potential significant impacts.

3.3.13 Utilities and Service Systems

Section 3.13 of the Commercial Cannabis PEIR evaluates environmental effects related to Utilities and Service Systems, finding that the impacts of implementing the regulations would be less than significant as mitigated.

Mitigation. Mitigation measures and performance standards listed in Section 3.13 were found to reduce significant and potentially impacts to exceeding wastewater service demand, increases in water demand from public water systems, and contribution to solid waste generation. These Mitigation Measures include prepare treatment programs and verify wastewater services, require verification of adequate water supply and service, and preparation of a treatment program for all new indoor and non-cultivation activities (Mitigation Measures 3.13-1a, 3.13-1b, 3.13-2, and 313-3).

Relevant Project Components. The Project, by allowing for manufacturing of industrial hemp could have potential indirect impacts to Utilities and Service Systems in potentially requiring additional resources for manufacturing processes.

Impact Analysis. It is anticipated that the project may allow for additional manufacturing of industrial hemp as a result of the Project, the existing facilities for commercial cannabis have meet the performance standards as required in the CCLUO, and would not result in a significant impact beyond what was considered as part of the PEIR. In light of the PIER, the project would have no potential significant impacts.

3.3.14 Energy

Section 3.3.14 of the Commercial Cannabis PEIR evaluates environmental effects related to Energy, finding that the impacts of implementing the CCLUO would be less than significant.

Relevant Project Components. No Project components would impact energy.

Impact Analysis. As the Project allows for distribution, retail sale, manufacturing and testing of

industrial hemp in commercial areas where public services are provided, it would not have any additional impacts to energy beyond what was considered in the PEIR. In light of the PEIR, the project would have no potential significant impacts.

3.3.15 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

The Industrial Hemp Ordinance (Project) would not change the conclusions reached by the certified 2017 Commercial Cannabis PEIR regarding the environmental effects addressed in the Significant Unavoidable Impact Section of the PEIR.

The Project, like the CCLUO it modifies, is an ordinance that is intended to guide new development allowing for distribution, retail sale, manufacturing and testing of industrial hemp at sites permitted through the CCLUO for commercial cannabis products. Likewise, the Project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

Approval of the Project would not increase the number of allowable industrial hemp facilities in the County beyond what has already been analyzed in the Commercial Cannabis PEIR. The environmental setting conditions for the Project are the same as those previously reviewed by the Commercial Cannabis PEIR.

The contribution of the Project to cumulative impacts has already been reviewed in the Commercial Cannabis PEIR. Approval of the Project would not, for the reasons noted above, have a substantial adverse impact on human beings either directly or indirectly in excess of those already identified in the Commercial Cannabis PEIR.

Project Environmental Impact Conclusions. The proposed CEQA Project would have no significant impact on any of the topical issues reviewed above. Although the Commercial Cannabis PEIR identified significant unmitigated impacts associated with a particular area of assessment, the proposed Project would not result in an increase in the severity of any of those potential impacts. Accordingly, for purposes of this Addendum, the proposed Project would only result in less than significant changes in the level of impact identified or the mitigation measures proposed by the Commercial Cannabis PEIR.

4.0 STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

An addendum to a previous EIR is appropriate when all of the required findings described below can be made.

1. No substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects [§ 15162(a)(1)].

Adoption of the Industrial Hemp Ordinance will not require revisions to the Commercial Cannabis PEIR because no new significant environmental effects or substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects will occur. The adoption of the Industrial Hemp Ordinance involves updates to the allowance under the CCLUO that do not involve new development or physical changes to the environment that would increase previously identified cumulative impacts. Statements of overriding considerations were made in conjunction with the Commercial Cannabis PEIR, in the areas of: Air Quality, Utilities and Service Systems, and Cumulative Impacts.

The Industrial Hemp Ordinance will not cause a substantial increase in the severity of the identified countywide cumulative impacts. No physical changes to the environment will occur with adoption of this Ordinance, beyond those that were previously considered. Therefore, the Industrial Hemp Ordinance will not have new significant environmental effects or substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects.

2. No substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects [§ 15162(a)(2)].

Adoption of the Industrial Hemp Ordinance will not require major revisions to the Commercial Cannabis PEIR because no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project was undertaken. The adoption of the Industrial Hemp Ordinance involves allowance under the CCLUO and does not include new development or direct physical changes to the environment. Substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project was undertaken have not occurred since Commercial Cannabis PEIR was adopted. As discussed under number "1" previously, no substantial increases in the severity of the cumulative impacts will occur. No direct physical changes to the environment, or indirect significant effects will occur with adoption of the Industrial Hemp Ordinance. Therefore, adoption of the Industrial Hemp Ordinance will not have new significant environmental effects or substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects due to changes in circumstances.

3. No new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the Board of Supervisors certified the previous EIR, shows any of the following:

a. The project will not have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR [§ 15162(a)(3)(A)];

No new information of substantial importance has been introduced that would lead to new or different impacts compared with those discussed in the Commercial Cannabis PEIR. Therefore, there is no evidence that the Industrial Hemp Ordinance will result in one or more significant new effects not discussed in the Commercial Cannabis PEIR.

b. Significant effects previously examined will not be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR [§ 15162(a)(3)(B)];

No new information of substantial importance has been introduced that would increase the severity of the identified cumulative impacts or cause new significant effects not discussed in the Commercial Cannabis PEIR. The adoption of the Industrial Hemp Ordinance involves allowance under the CCLUO. There is no evidence that these conditions evaluated by the Commercial Cannabis PEIR are likely to substantially change in the Project planning period. Based on projected development, adopting the Industrial Hemp Ordinance will not have significant effects substantially more severe than shown in the Commercial Cannabis PEIR.

c. No mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative [§ 15162(a)(3)(C)];

No new information of substantial importance has been introduced that would make mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible that were discussed in the Commercial Cannabis PEIR to now be feasible. Statements of overriding consideration

were adopted for the previously identified significant and cumulative impacts. Additional mitigation measures and alternatives that were previously considered would not reduce the identified impacts for the same reasons stated in the Commercial Cannabis PEIR. Therefore, no mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible that would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project.

d. No mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative [§ 15162(a)(3)(D)].

No new information of substantial importance has been introduced that would require mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those that were discussed in the Commercial Cannabis PEIR and/or that would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment. Statements of overriding consideration were adopted for the previously identified impacts. No new or previously rejected mitigation measures or alternatives would reduce potential impacts.

5.0 Conclusion Regarding Preparation of an Addendum

The proposed Industrial Hemp Ordinance would not change any previous conclusions associated with effects disclosed in the Commercial Cannabis PEIR. Impacts previously found to be less than significant would not be elevated to significant as a result of the proposed Industrial Hemp Ordinance. No new significant impacts or more severe impacts resulting from the proposed modifications were identified, and no changes would occur in the Commercial Cannabis PEIR analysis of significant impacts. Therefore, based on the information above, none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines have occurred and there is no substantial evidence to warrant the preparation of a subsequent EIR. The decision-making body shall consider this addendum to the final certified 2017 Amendments to Humboldt County Code Regulating Commercial Cannabis Activities Program EIR prior to making a decision on the project.

ATTACHMENT 4

Link to the Program Environmental Impact Report for the CCLUO

<https://humboldt.gov/DocumentCenter/View/62689/Humboldt-County-Cannabis-Program-Final-EIR-60mb-PDF>

ATTACHMENT 5

Public Comments

From: [Merritt Perry](#)
To: [Adler, Elanah](#)
Subject: RE: Questions regarding Hemp Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, October 01, 2019 1:41:37 PM

Thank you Lana.

From: Adler, Elanah <EAdler@co.humboldt.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 1:06 PM
To: Merritt Perry <mperry@ci.fortuna.ca.us>
Subject: RE: Questions regarding Hemp Ordinance

Hi Merritt:

I've copied your questions and will address the responses below each question:

1. Q: Why was the West End Road area identified as an ideal location for a hemp management zone? Was it due to the lack of cultivation of other types of cannabis in that area?
A: The Industrial Hemp Management Zone (IHMZ) was identified at a landscape level, including lands zoned Agriculture Exclusive (AE), have existing agricultural uses, are outside community plan areas and are low in the watershed.
-
2. Q: Did any specific land owners request this designation for the West End Road area?
A: The IHMZ areas were selected based on existing agricultural use, zoning, watershed and community plan characteristics, not based any land owner requests.
3. Q: What is purpose of outlawing seed production in hemp management zones when this may be a viable product of hemp cultivation?
A: The prohibition of seed and fiber production in the IHMZ was based on the feedback we received during our public workshop outreach. From what we heard, the overwhelming interest in the use of Industrial Hemp in the community is for medicinal purposes, i.e. CBD production, not for seed and fiber production. Additionally, there is concern that hemp pollen from new large scale fiber and seed production operations could negatively impact existing commercial cannabis cultivation.
4. Q: Are there other examples of county ordinances that require the indemnification of the county by an agriculture producer? Why was this added to the ordinance? Will the indemnification be required for those in the hemp management zones?
A: The Commercial Cannabis Land Use Ordinance is another example of a County ordinance that requires indemnification of the County by an agricultural producer. This was added to the ordinance because this is a new agricultural industry, with some unknowns and concerns about the potentials that are unforeseen at the present time. This indemnification would be required for all those who conduct any activities as authorized under this ordinance.

I hope that my answers have addressed your questions. Please feel free to contact me if you have any additional questions.

Thank you, Lana

Elanah Adler

Planner II

Humboldt County

[Long Range Planning Division](#)

3015 H Street | Eureka, CA 95501

707-445-7541

From: Merritt Perry <mperry@ci.fortuna.ca.us>

Sent: Monday, September 30, 2019 12:35 PM

To: Adler, Elanah <EAdler@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Subject: Questions regarding Hemp Ordinance

Elanah,

I had a couple of questions for you. My property is within the proposed industrial hemp management zone on west end road.

Here are my questions:

1. Why was the West End Road area identified as an ideal location for a hemp management zone? Was it due to the lack of cultivation of other types of cannabis in that area?
2. Did any specific land owners request this designation for the West End Road area?
3. What is purpose of outlawing seed production in hemp management zones when this may be a viable product of hemp cultivation?
4. Are there other examples of county ordinances that require the indemnification of the county by an agriculture producer? Why was this added to the ordinance? Will the indemnification be required for those in the hemp management zones?

Thank you in advance for your timely response.

Merritt Perry

499-4416

From: [Whitewolf Switzer](#)
To: [Adler, Elanah](#)
Subject: Draft Hemp Ordinance
Date: Wednesday, October 02, 2019 9:18:51 PM

**Elanah Adler, Planner
Humboldt County Planning Department**

This is Whitewolf Switzer of Palo Verde Farms, LLC in Garberville

We testified in both hearings on the Industrial Hemp Ordinance and we also were amongst the original applicants for the Hemp permits with the Humboldt Dept. of Agriculture.

We only learned of these workshops today and are interested in growing Hemp Flowers for CBD.

We are currently licensed under the County Cannabis Ordinance.

The calendar indicates the dates of the Planning Commission Hearings. We also need the times in order to attend and comment.

The following family members would also like to attend: my son, Mark Switzer owner of the land for Palo Verde Farms, Harmony Switzer-Tryon, a Hemp Patient and my granddaughter, and Lorraine Tryon, Harmony's mom and an applicant for a Hemp Permit thru the Dept. of Agriculture.

Respectfully

**Whitewolf R. Switzer, CEO
Palo Verde Farms, LLC
355 Road A
Garberville, Ca 95542
707-354-1985**

From: [Nate Madsen](#)
To: [Adler, Elanah](#)
Subject: Draft Hemp Ordinance
Date: Thursday, October 03, 2019 2:51:32 PM

Hi Lana,

Thank you for fielding comments on this draft hemp ordinance. I apologize for the delay in getting these comments to you; I know the meeting is tonight. It has been a busy week for me.

I am working from the print out from the meeting at the ag commissioners office the other night and will reference sections per that print out. I mention that in case a new draft has been produced since.

1. 55.5.2 first paragraph I question the need to say, “reduces negative impacts on our community and environment,” So far I don’t know of any negative impacts and think we are not likely so see any negative impacts beyond what an agrarian culture generally produces. I would strike that clause and the paragraph still reads fine.
2. Same section second paragraph same comment as relates to, “from harm resulting from industrial hemp activities,”
3. 55.5.3.4 This reads a little rough. It seems to indicate that this is to limit the activity of growing industrial hemp to just the areas depicted on the map, but I may be reading this too narrowly. I would craft this paragraph a little different and as I will discuss related to section 55.5.6.1 I would open this up significantly. I think limiting hemp production to the areas depicted on the Industrial Hemp Management Zone **and** areas primarily zoned for agricultural production on prime ag soils is appropriate.
4. 55.5.6.1 I would add areas primarily zoned for agricultural production on prime ag soils to the application of this section.
5. 55.5.7.1.2 I would encourage (as an austerity measure for all the struggle permitted cannabis farmers have sustained) allowing those permitted farmers to add square footage, not replace square footage. I would not limit it by any amount of area (i.e. the 3,500 or less as is the language) but rather by existing potential infill to already developed areas. I.e. if they have a timber conversion they can use any of that area that is not in use for cannabis production. I would add language to this section precluding any cutting of trees or further conversion or grading. I will discuss this further in section 55.5.8.1.6 but I think a preclusion of grading all together would be appropriate and would preclude any conversion be it timber or other native meadow not previously impacted by human activity. Feel free to call me to discuss this detail if I am not being clear here or missing a detail. The idea is no further development of otherwise unimproved native conditions, but allow use of any and all already impacted lands such that a more profitable operation can be achieved without any further impacts.
6. 55.5.8.1.2 change 5,000 sf to 1 acre subject to the limitation of section 55.5.7.1.2 as discussed in #5 above.
7. 55.5.8.1.3 Though I personally prefer the idea of exclusive full sun outdoor, I don’t see why hemp should be subjected to additional limitations other crops are not subjected to. You can use a greenhouse for tomatoes and receive a substantial advantage as to early to market as protection from rain. I think hemp should also have that as an option; strike,

“greenhouses, protective covers, or” from the last sentence of this section. As discussed at the meeting this might also be a good means to contain pollen drift and I don’t think this option should be off the table.

8. 55.5.8.1.6 Strike, “of more than 50 cubic yards of soil” and replace that wording with “for purpose of creating a cultivation area”.
9. 55.5.8.1.8 (d) Leave this as is and add to the end another sentence, “Unless clear and compelling evidence can be provided that no impacts to water quality or quantity including but not limited to potential sedimentation, agricultural runoff, pesticide contamination will result from the industrial hemp cultivation project.” Then add language to establish a permitting process to determine that finding. I.e. ZCC goes to SUP or CUP as is appropriate.
10. 55.5.11 unless compliance with CEQA requires the first paragraph of this section, I would strike it. I don’t see how limiting agricultural production serves the better needs of Humboldt County and I don’t see how CEQA will limit this so long as cultivation is limited as discussed here, to already impacted areas. This is a great opportunity to apply local knowledge, the “Humboldt Brand”, and reap substantial benefits. I would like to see growing encouraged not discouraged provided impacts are managed and limited appropriately. I feel strongly that can be done and open this up quite a bit more than this section allows. We don’t limit raspberry production this way and it represents nearly identical impacts.

That is it for my input as to the current draft.

As to the alternatives:

1. 1(a) and (b) yes and yes to these two ideas.
2. 2(a) not sure how I feel about this...
3. 2(b) yes
4. 3(a) No to modifying the Hemp ordinance to match the CCLUO and yes to modifying the CCLUO to more directly parallel the hemp ordinance (and ideally incorporate the ideas listed above).
5. 3(b) I am not sure much of this is needed. The ordinance as drafted limits hemp production to native soils (an idea I support) so not sure why we need to remove “bags, pots, or other containers[.]” The other Junk can go, except the pond liners... not sure how that serves a need, but I guess it is handled with the last sentence in this paragraph... so maybe this is just precautionary and well be subjected to review, but some how I would like there to be some limit on the discretion here. Maybe add a sentence to the end that says, “if the operator provides such a plan then the county shall allow said infrastructure to remain for its continued use.” Or something to that affect.
6. 3(c) yes but it doesn’t need to be regulations. It should just be a mandate. “Operator shall contain pollen drift such that it does not impact any neighbors. Operators shall be liable for any harm caused by a violation of this section.”
7. 3(d & e) not strong feelings but would give input if draft language becomes available. There is certainly an opportunity here, but I might leave it up to the producer, but maybe there is a real advantage and I would support that if it comes to fruition.

Thank you again for all your work on this project and for maintaining such a wonderfully open and engaging process!

Please do not hesitate to reach out if I can be of any assistance or you would like to discuss any of these or other ideas further.

I hope to see you at the meeting tonight.

Best,

Nate Madsen

From: [Gillian Levy](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: Draft Hemp Ordinance
Date: Thursday, October 03, 2019 6:03:00 PM

To Whom It May Concern,

I am the co-founder and co-owner of Humboldt Apothecary, a women owned craft cannabis manufacturing company in Arcata. Our products are made from the biomass of small farms in Humboldt County, and we are very proud supporters of our local Humboldt County cannabis farmers.

Many of our products are made with cannabis that is high in CBD, in fact our CBD tinctures are a staple of our business. Out in the larger cannabis community, we have a devout following of people that love our products and whose lives have sometimes been significantly and profoundly altered in a beneficial way by using our products. In fact, we have gathered so many anecdotal stories of how well these tinctures work for people that we are pretty convinced that the particular CBD cultivars that local farmers have bred and cultivated for years here in Humboldt County are quite special. Something to note about many of the CBD cultivars in this community is that while they are high in CBD, the percentage of THC exceeds the federal allowable limit of under .3%

I write all of this to make a point that I truly believe that the small cannabis farms in Humboldt County have real value in the future of California cannabis, and perhaps someday soon, a global cannabis economy. This is partly because of the particular appellation of the region and the multitude of cannabis strains that have been bred and stabilized in these mountains and watersheds.

I think it is imperative that we protect and support the small cannabis farms in Humboldt County. Because of this, I would encourage the planning commission to enforce a moratorium on hemp in Humboldt County. I have particular concerns about the ability of hemp pollen to travel on the wind to neighboring farms and compromising both the value of the cannabis crop as well as the integrity of future seed stock, a Humboldt County treasure that farmers have spent generations stabilizing and perfecting.

Additionally, I am concerned about the issue of space for hemp farms. While craft cannabis farms can be small and still profitable, hemp farms yield significantly smaller profits per pound, thus requiring large tracts of agricultural land, which this county just does not have. Let's continue to support our small farms and wild lands, and leave hemp farming in more open, traditionally agricultural inland valleys where it belongs. There are too many risks and unknowns at this point if we are to lift the moratorium on hemp.

Thank you for your time,

Gillian

Gillian Levy
President, Humboldt Apothecary

(707)407-7693
humboldt-apothecary.com