

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Safety Concerns –
August 10, 2021 – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM – Chat**

00:24:37 Sarah Stierch (she/her): ✉ Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

<https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/Cannabis/Comprehensive-Cannabis-Program-Update-and-Environmental-Impact-Report/>

00:32:32 Sarah Stierch (she/her): ✉ Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

<https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/Cannabis/Comprehensive-Cannabis-Program-Update-and-Environmental-Impact-Report/>

00:41:58 McCall Miller: From D Donovan: To resolve these issues, grows in Sonoma County should be located in areas which have a MINIMUM of two-lane, standard roads: one lane in each direction. Many rural enclaves and communities are located on substandard roads. One such example is Bloomfield, whose town streets are narrow and often dead-end, as is the case on the very street proposed as the major access point to one operation. This already requires that an oncoming car must pull into existing residents' driveways in order to permit safe passage when only two cars are on the road. When you add fire equipment passage and increased traffic from commercial trucks and non-resident temporary workers into the equation, it's evident that not just cannabis, but any large-scale commercial industry using these roads, adds wear, tear, and traffic that they were simply not made to accommodate safely. (cont)

00:42:16 McCall Miller: Continued: Who will maintain these roads as they deteriorate quicker from double or more the traffic? Cannabis operators should assume responsibility AND be held accountable...which might be difficult to quantify.

00:43:48 McCall Miller: Continued: When it comes to wildfires and evacuations, growers located adjacent to neighbors and on substandard roads will face additional issues in joining residents who are evacuating. It is recommended that grows in such situations have separate emergency fire roads that do not share the same roads as residents, so that fire equipment can be moved in and evacuees are not hampered by incoming equipment for commercial institution firefighting, or outgoing workers from the large grow, who add their vehicles and equipment to the mix. This is another reason why all processing should be done in our central corridor, and not in our rural areas. Processing plants located in commercial areas will enjoy services that ALREADY include more than adequate roads of sufficient width to permit easy ingress and egress to and from such operations, and the supportive help of fire and police agencies which are mere minutes away if the industry needs them.

00:43:51 McCall Miller: Continued: Evacuation processes in such areas would be on roads that permit added traffic.

00:46:53 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: What would safe cultivation look like when it comes to emergencies like wildfire? (1) all on site fire prevention measures and equipment should be a requirement of any permit awarded (2) any growing operation should not be located in a high risk wild fire zone, (3) exemptions for cannabis operations currently in the County Codes and specifically related

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Safety Concerns –
August 10, 2021 – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM – Chat**

to defensible space should be removed (see County Code Section 13A-4 (c) (2)) and with that removal operators should be required to comply as a permit requirement (4) do not reduce or eliminate and safety requirements for cultivation operations such as the Board of Forestry Fire Safe Regulations (e.g. width and access for roads and driveways) (5) consider exclusion zones to prohibit cannabis operations in remote rural areas, which in turn exacerbate wildfire risk

00:47:00 McCall Miller: Continued: What characteristics would make cultivation unsafe in an emergency? Lack of the items mentioned in the previous response. In addition, any volatile organic compounds and chemicals on site or other items used in cultivation that are combustible and exempting the cannabis industry from any safety regulations would be make cultivation unsafe in general and in an emergency.

00:52:14 Sarah Stierch (she/her): ✉Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

🔗Learn more about this process and get involved:

<https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/Cannabis/Comprehensive-Cannabis-Program-Update-and-Environmental-Impact-Report/>

01:00:22 McCall Miller: From N Graalman: ++++Constant monitoring with cameras and responsibility to make the footage available at all times must be required.

01:00:52 McCall Miller: From N Graalman: A safe grow operation would have to be within a defined drive for all emergency first responders (medical, fire, and law enforcement).

01:06:09 Sarah Stierch (she/her): ✉Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

🔗Learn more about this process and get involved:

<https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/Cannabis/Comprehensive-Cannabis-Program-Update-and-Environmental-Impact-Report/>

01:06:33 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: What would a safe and secure cannabis growing operation look like in a successful cannabis program?

(1) all on site fire prevention measures and equipment should be a requirement of any permit awarded (2) any growing operation should not be located in a high risk wild fire zone, (3) exemptions for cannabis operations currently in the County Codes and specifically related to defensible space should be removed (see County Code Section 13A-4 (c) (2)) and with that removal operators should be required to comply as a permit requirement (4) do not reduce or eliminate and safety requirements for cultivation operations such as the Board of Forestry Fire Safe Regulations (e.g. width and access for roads and driveways) (5) consider exclusion zones to prohibit cannabis operations in remote rural areas, which in turn exacerbate wildfire risk

01:13:41 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: What would a safe and secure retail establishment look like in a successful cannabis program? Require trained security guards on site at all times. Require security cameras be installed with signage indicating that they are installed as a deterrence. A device should be installed that can summon police immediately if activated.

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Safety Concerns –
August 10, 2021 – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM – Chat**

01:14:40 Sarah Stierch (she/her): ✉ Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

<https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/Cannabis/Comprehensive-Cannabis-Program-Update-and-Environmental-Impact-Report/>

01:24:40 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: If the state allows onsite/social consumption, what should be the most important things we prioritize when thinking about what should be allowed? I would hope that even California would not allow onsite consumption. But if the State does allow, the County should prioritize not allowing it in the County and strictly enforce the laws for driving under the influence.

01:25:09 McCall Miller: From D Donovan: Onsite consumption should be limited to areas away from residences and abutting neighbors living nearby. There are PLENTY of acres in Sonoma County which would be suitable for onsite consumption, with neighbors located far from the fence lines and the proposed commercial retail establishment.

01:30:37 Sarah Stierch (she/her): ✉ Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

<https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/Cannabis/Comprehensive-Cannabis-Program-Update-and-Environmental-Impact-Report/>

01:33:02 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: Any violations of safety requirements should be immediately and aggressively investigated (without advance notice to the operators as to on site investigations) and if substantiated should be immediately abated and fines levied. Any cannabis operator violating safety requirements should be required to pay all costs of investigation and abatement. There should be zero tolerance. If the operator is in violation of safety requirements and regulations more than twice, their permit should be revoked and operation closed down. In addition all permits should be reviewed on an annual basis and if operators are found to be out of compliance, abatement proceedings should be commenced and pursued to conclusion with operator paying all costs. If there is a continued pattern of crime related to the operation it should be required to shut down operations over time or add additional requirements suitable for the site and situation. (cont)

01:33:23 McCall Miller: continued: Operators should not be given any special exemptions from County ordinances (e.g. see County Ordinance Section 13A-4 (c) (2) regarding defensible space or Board of Forestry requirements such as road access regulations). Operators should be required to post a bond upon issuance of any permit to pay for potential abatement proceedings and fines. There should be ownership and residency requirements placed operators to limit out of county operators.

01:34:12 McCall Miller: From D Donovan: As far as accountability...we can't even get police and emergency services to physically drive out to Bloomfield in less than 15-20 minutes, as it is now. Without the vigilante-type police patrols the cannabis operations have suggested, which will heavily impact neighbors with a prison-type atmosphere, it's simply not possible for existing public services to be actively involved in policing a grow to ensure everyone's safety UNLESS it were also required that a

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Safety Concerns –
August 10, 2021 – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM – Chat**

police department be physically located and staffed 5 minutes or less away from the grow(s). The growers, not the county or taxpayers, should foot any bill for establishing, staffing, and maintaining such rural patrol departments primarily for their benefit/business pursuits.

01:36:35 Sarah Stierch (she/her): [🔗](https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/Cannabis/Comprehensive-Cannabis-Program-Update-and-Environmental-Impact-Report/) Learn more about this process and get involved:
<https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/Cannabis/Comprehensive-Cannabis-Program-Update-and-Environmental-Impact-Report/>

01:39:10 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: There should not be any combustible items on the property that are not absolutely necessary (or may be substituted) for the operation and there should be requirements as part of the permit that there be safe and appropriate storage of these items. An immediate moratorium on accepting and processing applications for cannabis operations until EIR is completed and new Ordinance adopted.

01:39:11 Sarah Stierch (she/her): [✉](mailto:cannabis@sonoma-county.org) Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

01:39:35 McCall Miller: From K Roberts-Gutzman: Don't allow cannabis farms on dead end roads. Don't allow grows on private easement roads with vehicles speeding up and down our road 24/7.

01:40:00 McCall Miller: From N Graalman: SOnoma County MUST research and publicize reports of trespassing and all cannabis-related complaints and actions.

01:45:16 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: There has been a lot of comparisons between the long established wine industry and the cannabis industry. Not all people who are wine tasting want to or do get high but can people who "taste" cannabis say the same thing? In any event why exacerbate the problem of drivers under the influence of alcohol with now allowing onsite cannabis tasting?

01:46:19 Sarah Stierch (she/her): [✉](mailto:cannabis@sonoma-county.org) Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

[🔗](https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/Cannabis/Comprehensive-Cannabis-Program-Update-and-Environmental-Impact-Report/) Learn more about this process and get involved:
<https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/Cannabis/Comprehensive-Cannabis-Program-Update-and-Environmental-Impact-Report/>