

From: Kent Sawatzky
Sent: Wednesday, November 22, 2023 6:49 AM
To: kentsawatzky@homail.com <kentsawatzky@homail.com>
Subject: A chance.

Good morning, John.

This would be your chance to convince us how the Cannabis 1.0 and 2.0 are consistent with the Humboldt County General Plan. Is there a consistency matrix in the GP regarding Cannabis? are there definitions, goals or implementation of goals relating to Cannabis. Has there been an amendment to the GP that reflects the ordinances passed. Were they determined to be consistent (erroneously) with the GP. I am not aware of any goals in the current GP which state the purpose is converting illegal large-scale commercial business in our forest lands to legal large-scale commercial business in our forest lands. are there any such goals or implementation measures?

My understanding that any secondary use in TPZ or other forest lands should be an ancillary use. Not the primary one. Is that correct or not? When more \$ is derived from Cannabis than the \$ from timber production it clearly is the primary use, and not ancillary.

It is our opinion that any attempt to put a competing measure to measure "A" which requires that the County comply with the legal requirements for a General plan, is legally actionable. Your fear of the County being tied up in years of legal battles is justified. There is a public perception that you would be the cause for that to happen. In our opinion you are. And that shall be your legacy. Your choice.

I await your response. failure to do so in our opinion will be an admission that the above is correct in its totality.

Kent Sawatzky (A concerned citizen)