

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Land Use –
August 9, 2021 – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM – Chat**

00:02:53 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Learn more: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/Cannabis-Program/>

00:03:45 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Please send us your ideas, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

00:10:47 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Please send us your ideas, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

00:15:43 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Just a reminder: If you have QUESTIONS please email them to cannabis@sonoma-county.org. We will not be answering policy-related questions during the Visioning Sessions. Today, we look forward to hearing your IDEAS and VISION for cannabis in Sonoma County.

00:21:21 McCall Miller: From Diana Van Ry: Limit cannabis cultivation and processing to areas that do not create noise and odor nuisances for residents, are not in public view, are not in impaired watersheds and do not impact wildfire or public safety such as high fire risk zones or areas without legal fire safe roads.

00:21:43 Sarah Stierch (she/her): cannabis@sonoma-county.org

00:26:32 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Here is the latest FAQ about taxes: Here is the current FAQ: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/Cannabis/Frequently-Asked-Questions-Taxes/>

00:26:44 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Latest FAQ about general cannabis in Sonoma County: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/Cannabis/Frequently-Asked-Questions-General/>

00:26:51 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

00:30:45 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: What are the qualities and characteristics of places that would be a good fit for growing cannabis? None. The questions should be whether the residents of the County want any commercial cannabis cultivation within the County. Although the voters of California voted to legalize cannabis for personal use, they did not vote as to where it was to be grown. The Board of Supervisors should revisit this question of whether to allow any commercial cannabis cultivation in the County after receiving public input before doing an EIR and considering amendments to the existing Ordinance. My preference is no expansion of commercial cannabis cultivation but if the County insists on allowing commercial cultivation then the only good fit would be the Industrial zoning districts. Also any commercial cannabis cultivation should be (cont)

00:31:14 McCall Miller: Cont: (a) limited to currently permitted small (less than an acre of cultivation) so called ‘mom and pop’ businesses that the Board said were those who it wanted to protect as rationale for the original ordinance so long as the properties are

(b) are not in the Rural Residential, R1, R2, or R3 Zoning District,

(c) are not visible to the general public while on public roads or to residences in Rural Residential, R1, R2, or R3 Zoning Districts

(d) are not in scenic corridors and valleys such as Bennett Valley and Sonoma Valley,

(e) do not create noise, lighting and odor impacts for neighboring residences,

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Land Use –
August 9, 2021 – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM – Chat**

- (f) are not in high risk wildfire areas
- (g) are not near waterways or water sheds,
- (h) have legal fire safe roads
- (i) prove that their water use will not limit water resources to residences

00:31:56 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org. Learn more: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/cannabis-program/>

00:37:41 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: What would an appropriately sized cannabis growing operation look like in a rural setting? It would be in an enclosed structure with appropriate odor, sound and noise mitigation measures and small enough to be thoroughly screened from being seen by residences and public roads. Property at least 20 acres and total cultivation area not more than 1 acre with a 1000 foot setback to boundaries of neighboring properties.

00:38:01 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: What would it look like in an industrial setting? It would be an enclosed structure with appropriate odor, sound and noise mitigation measures and located in an industrial zoning district and small enough to be thoroughly screened from being seen by residences and public roads. Property at least 10 acres and total cultivation structure not more than 1 acre.

00:41:34 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org. Learn more: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/cannabis-program/>

00:42:35 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: What would too many cannabis operations look like? Again, any commercial cultivation in my view is too many. But if the County insists I suggest limiting to a very small number (i.e. a cap) and only to currently permitted so called “mom and pop” operations (cultivation area no greater than 1 acre) that the Board said it wanted to protect and sold as the reason to the public for adopting the original ordinance. There should be an immediate moratorium on accepting and processing any more permit applications until at least the EIR is complete. How does it make sense to continue to process applications without the necessary environmental analysis (i.e. EIR) which should have been done when the original ordinance was considered?

00:45:04 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org. Learn more: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/cannabis-program/>

00:49:38 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: What would a successful growing operation do to control odor? Any allowed cultivation (be it commercial or personal) should be inside a structure with all necessary mitigation measures (i.e. ventilation and filtration systems that contain all odor and volatile organic compounds (such as terpenes) and other pollutants within the building). If the County allows outside growing, it should be located in an industrial zoning and never in a location where odor can reach residential neighbors or residences. Permits should only be issued to outside grows for 2 years to determine if odor is properly being controlled from neighboring residences and if not immediate abatement proceeding should be commenced and concluded at operators expense and if no compliance permit should be revoked.

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Land Use –
August 9, 2021 – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM – Chat**

00:56:45 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org. Learn more: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/cannabis-program/>

00:58:17 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Here is the County General Plan about Noise: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Long-Range-Plans/General-Plan/Noise/>

00:58:56 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: What would a successful ordinance contain to address any noise produced throughout the cannabis supply chain? Ordinance should require any cannabis operation (including cultivation) to be inside a structure with all mitigation measures for noise that would not be heard by residential areas. As to distribution it should be limited to certain times of the day, not be allowed on residential streets as to not disturb residences and neighborhoods.

01:04:33 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

01:06:45 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: What would it mean to hold cannabis growers accountable? If they violate regulations, immediate abatement proceeding be commenced and pursued to conclusion with violators paying County fines and all enforcement costs including staff time, court costs and attorney fees. There should be zero tolerance. If the operator is in violation of regulations more than twice without good cause, their permit should be revoked and operation closed down. County should do away with its Penalty Relief Program and should not allow an operator to piece meal or segment its applications to avoid CEQA or conditional use permit process. Operators should not be given any special exemptions from County ordinances (e.g. see County Ordinance Section 13A-4 (c) (2)). Operators should be required to post a bond upon issuance of any permit to pay for potential abatement proceedings and fines.

01:15:08 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Keep your ideas coming to us! Please send an email to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

01:17:05 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

(1) Siting in General:

The questions should be whether the residents of Sonoma County want any commercial cannabis cultivation in the County. While the voters of California voted to legalize cannabis for personal use they did not vote as to where it was to be grown. My preferences in order are:

- Ban all commercial cultivation in Sonoma County.

OR

(CONTINUED)

01:17:31 McCall Miller: Continued: (b) However if the Board of Supervisors continues to allow commercial cultivation, I suggest that such commercial cultivation be a limited number of small so called “mom and pop” businesses that the Board said were those who it wanted to protect as a rationale for the original ordinance as long as the properties are (1) not in the Rural Residential, R1, R2, and R3 Zoning Districts, (2) do not border Rural Residential, R1, R2, and R3 Zoning Districts, (3) are not visible to the general public while on public roads or to residences in Residential Zoning Districts or from scenic corridors and valleys such as Bennett Valley and Sonoma Valley

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Land Use –
August 9, 2021 – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM – Chat**

(2) Require all commercial cultivation applications go through the conditional use process and comply with CEQA. In other words do away with any ministerial processes and allow rights of appeal to the Board of Supervisors.

01:17:50 McCall Miller: Continued: (3) Eliminate the Penalty Relief Program. No commercial operations should be allowed unless and until an appropriate permit is obtained AFTER going through the permit and CEQA process. NO SPECIAL FAVORS FOR CANNABIS

(4) Require all commercial operations to comply with the County's defensible space ordinance. Currently such operations are deemed exempt. (See Sonoma County Code Section 13A-4 (c) (2)) These operations should not get preferential treatment. NO SPECIAL FAVORS FOR CANNABIS.

(5) Do not allow commercial operations to piece meal (segment) their applications such as apparently was apparently allowed at least one grow operation in order to avoid the conditional use process and environmental review. Why was this allowed to happen? Who made the decision to allow such segmentation? NO SPECIAL FAVORS FOR CANNABIS.

01:18:05 McCall Miller: Continued: (6) Increase set back requirements of commercial operations to 1000 feet from adjacent property lines and require any necessary vegetation screening to help mitigate the visual and odor impacts of such operations.

(7) Immediately impose a moratorium on receiving and processing any future applications for commercial operations until the forthcoming EIR is completed. To continue to allow such applications before the EIR is completed to determine cumulative effects could be a potential violation of CEQA.

01:18:19 McCall Miller: Continued: (8) Do not reduce or eliminate any safety requirements for commercial operations such as Board of Forestry Fire Safe Regulations (i.e. defensible space, road width and access, etc.) and County Fire Safety and Defensible Space Regulation to which other types of commercial operations must comply. In particular, delete Sonoma County Code Section 13A-4 (c) (2) which exempts commercial cannabis cultivation, structures and roads from defensible space requirements. NO SPECIAL FAVORS FOR CANNABIS.

(9) No commercial cultivation located in in or visible from scenic corridors and valleys such as Sonoma Valley and Bennett Valley.

(10) No "tasting rooms" anywhere in the County as was suggested in the last suggested amendments to the ordinance.

(11) Include a "no commercial cannabis cultivation alternative" (i.e.no project alternative) to be analyzed in the upcoming EIR.

01:18:32 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Land Use –
August 9, 2021 – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM – Chat**

01:23:17 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

01:23:26 McCall Miller: From A Storms: In responding to your comment re: The County BOS ordered an EIR for the Commercial Cannabis Ordinance, this ONLY happened because the community came together, organized, and demanded it.

01:23:54 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org. Learn more: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/cannabis-program/>

01:24:09 McCall Miller: From J Masters: Community engagement and citizen input are good, but you are not starting over at zero. Everything is not on the table and you do not have to reinvent the wheel. The big four are:

1. State rules on agriculture
2. County rules on agriculture. The baseline should be the existing rules on cattle, pig farms, and any other crop.
3. Voters approved.
4. Other counties or even countries have worked through these issues. How do they do it? So a simple ordinance with a few add-ons for unique characteristics of cannabis (and what are those?) would seem like the right approach.
5. Why do you have to include everything in a vertical industry (growing, processing, distribution, retailing) in the same ordinance?
6. Is the assumption that illegal grows will no longer exist?

01:25:40 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org. Learn more: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/cannabis-program/>