

From: [Chris Lee](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Cc: [Saucedo, Portia](#); [Madrone, Steve](#)
Subject: Sept 17, 2020 Agenda Item H.1. Case Number PLN-12163-CUP
Date: Sunday, September 13, 2020 5:48:24 PM

Dear Commissioners:

I live downstream along the same tributary to Luffenholtz Creek from the proposed project referenced above, entitled "Humboldt Packaging, LLC." My comment concerns water use for the proposed project as well as a lack of clarity regarding information delivered to neighbors (these concerns are related).

The applicants for this project organized two Zoom meetings designed to deliver information about the project to the greater Westhaven community. The meeting objective was laudable, but clear information about the source and amount of water projected to be used for this project was not forthcoming in these meetings. Both the intended source and the quantity of water used have changed from meeting to meeting and between the information given by the county and that given by the project applicants. As to source, the applicants told the neighborhood that the rainwater catchment pond on the property was strictly for personal use and that all water for cannabis cultivation would be brought in by truck. The information on your agenda contradicts this. As to quantity, we have seen varying projections for annual water use between the county's supplied information and the applicants' supplied information, and given the ambiguity as to proposed water source, we remain worried that some of this water will come from the same creek that supplies our own residential water.

We do not intend to deprive anyone else of their livelihood or their personal property use. We simply don't feel that sufficient information has been given to neighbors as to either source or quantity of water proposed to be used for the project. Given the lack of solid information, we can't currently either support or oppose the project. We request that the commission require a more transparent information-sharing process with project watershed neighbors so that we can provide you with appropriate feedback on the project. We would also like assurances that once the applicants and the county settle on a proposed amount of water use, an enforcement mechanism to hold the applicants to this amount will be specified before the application is approved. Otherwise, other residents of the watershed can't be certain that this project won't irreversibly and negatively impact reasonable non-commercial, residential water use.

Best regards,

Chris Lee
1151 Westhaven Dr S
Trinidad, CA 95570
dobrowolsklee@gmail.com

September 16, 2020

Subject: Permitting of New Commercial Cannabis Cultivation/Packaging
Record number PLN-12163-CUP; APN 515-111-079-000

Dear Planning Commissioners:

We oppose the approval of this application for the following reasons:

1. Reduction of the Domestic Water Supply (Extremely Critical Concern)

Properties adjacent to this project mostly have shallow wells (6'-25') that rely on groundwater for their domestic water. Some wells dry up in summer and then water delivery is needed. Domestic water is a basic necessity and we're concerned that our water supply will be heavily impacted by the diversion of groundwater for this project.

- Use of groundwater for commercial agricultural production could cause an extensive domestic water shortage in many local wells. The diversion of groundwater via the existing 150,000 gallon catchment pond and 3-5,000 gallon storage tanks is a major concern. Was a permit required, and approval given, to build the 150,000 c.f. catchment pond?
- How will it be shown that this project will not compromise the domestic groundwater supply of neighboring properties? Has it even been determined how many wells might be impacted by the project?

2. Noise, Odors, and Light Pollution

Westhaven is primarily a residential area. Commercial agriculture projects are not a compatible use and should be located in areas specifically zoned for this purpose. It also sets an unwanted precedent. We enjoy fresh air, a quiet environment and the night sky.

- How will noise from fans and generators (when the power is out), and dust (from increased vehicular traffic) be mitigated?
- How will noxious odors be mitigated so as not to migrate to adjacent properties?
- How will light pollution be mitigated so as not to cause disruption to wildlife behavior or have aesthetic impact on neighboring parcels? .

3. Trinidad School Property Impacts

We are surprised that this type of business would be permitted near Trinidad school's nature property. Our children took educational nature trips to the property 25 years ago. We would not want children to be exposed to drug production, cannabis odors, noise, etc.

Other Questions

- Haven't the greenhouses already been built? Isn't this illegal without an approved permit?
- Were the buildings constructed at the required distance from adjacent properties? What happens if they weren't?
- Have there been any violations of environmental laws (impacts to wildlife, wetlands etc.)? If so, will the owners be required to remove the buildings if no permit was granted? Or to move the buildings if a permit is granted?
- Why is a commercial business being allowed in a residential neighborhood?
- Will there be a CEQA document prepared for the project? If not, why not?

We're not in favor of this permit being granted.

Mark and Ilene Poindexter
APN 514-061-014

From: [Paulandmichelle Hasselquist](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: Opposition to Planning Application numberPLN-12163-CUP Humboldt Packaging LLC
Date: Wednesday, September 16, 2020 8:49:21 AM

My name is Paul Hasselquist. I own two properties down stream from this proposed project. The creeks that flows through or starts on this property flows through my properties. I have witnessed the flow of this creek diminish by 1/2 since this parcel has been developed. Illegally I might add. Developing this property even more will make water flow in this creek even worse. I totally oppose this project.

Thanks, Paul Hasselquist