

Attachment G

Public Comment – Cannabis Workshops

March 8, 2021

2:00 PM – 3:30 PM

5:00 PM – 6:30 PM

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
13	West County neighborhoods are intermingled with both residential (RR) and agricultural (DA) parcels. In our neighborhood we have 16 lots. Four of those are above 10 acres. If all four of these lots farm cannabis, our neighborhood would become unlivable. Would you consider raising the lot size to 15 or 20acres?	Viviane Farre	viviane@foodandstyle.com
14	Will there be an administrative tool to allow existing operators with projects in the penalty relief program to apply for additional acreage up to 10% of the parcel through the Dept. of Ag.?	Shivawn Brady	shivawn@justicecannabisco.com
15	Young native trees, specifically oak species need to be protected. There is very little regeneration currently and we need to see more to protect watersheds, native habitat, biodiversity and ecosystem health.	Natasha Granoff	njgranoff@comcast.net
16	Please clarify, did you just say growers will be required to control smell off the parcel site.	Nancy Citro	Citro@sonic.net
17	Clarify odor topic. Does this mean if I can detect odor from a cannabis operation on an adjacent property that they will be required to mitigate the odor? Said another way, to get a permit will require that odor mitigation be present before a permit will be granted?	Mark Farmer	markafarmer@msn.com
18	I am a member of SOSN and the Gold Ridge Neighborhood Group and submitting the following question: Why does the draft provide less protection to my family at home than in public? The BOS understood the problems and specifically amendment the setback requirements to 1000 feet for Schools, Parks, and Bikeways. Yet your draft retains the 100 foot setback from personal residences. So your proposal provides my children and spouse more protection at places where they will only be for a few hours' than their home where they spend the majority of their time and are more subjected to the impacts? This difference makes no sense. The BOS saw the wisdom to increase the setbacks to 1,000ft, the same setbacks are appropriate for the home. Should be 1,000 ft. everywhere.	Bill Krawetz	billkrawetz@comcast.net

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
19	Can someone clarify how growers mitigate odor on outdoor grows? Does it require equipment that might impose additional nuisance...like fans, filtration systems, light/power?	Stacey Carlo	Stacey.Elisabeth.Carlo@gmail.com
20	Just LIA, LEA,DA,RRD zones, what about light industrial?	Nancy Citro	Citro@sonic.net
21	Ridge top protection clause should be eliminated and manage it using the same language as other agriculture for consistency.	Cynthia Murray	cmurray@northbayleadership.org
22	Do you plan on covering any changes that were made to Chapter 26?	Amber Morris	amber.morris@norcalcann.com
23	Does air quality requirements address diesel generators? Are the generators allowed?	Nancy Citro	Citro@sonic.net
24	Why is there a change to the locations of wells within Zone 3 & Zone 4 areas (increased from 100 ft to 300 ft)? Isn't the point of this ordinance to align it with other agriculture within Sonoma county. This item does not make sense and should not be changed. A professional Hydrogeological survey should provide the data for this decision process as it does for other agriculture, not simply increase this well location setback to make the ministerial process easier.	Lori Pascarella	lori@bangodistribution.com
25	Eliminate the tree language in the cannabis ordinance and reference the larger tree policy that is currently being created	Cynthia Murray	cmurray@northbayleadership.org
26	What is the process for amending the dysfunctional parts of Chapter 26?	Joanna Cedar	jhcedar@gmail.com
27	Please treat Cannabis like any other Agricultural Crop	Justin Arowcavage	arowcavage@gmail.com
28	This is going to be agricultural why are other agricultural crops not being put to this task	Vincent Scholten	Norcalgrowers@hotmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
29	<p>The public has discovered countless issues in the draft documents. These flaws are shockingly numerous. Moreover, because the current draft is so challenging to interpret, there may be many more undetected flaws.</p> <p>QUESTION: Has the county considered the solution of stopping this process and doing a re-write rather than addressing every mistake the public has discovered in the draft documents? Will the County actually bring this flawed, poorly written and cobbled together document to the Planning Commissioners?</p> <p>-James Bracco Save our Sonoma Neighborhoods (SOSN)</p>	james bracco	jim@braccos.com
30	<p>Is there any discussion of developing a Cannabis Equity program in Sonoma county? The state is issuing grants to counties and cities that are participating.</p>	Sarah Shrader	sarah@safeaccessnow.org
31	<p>Why are we not regulating these cultivation sites like any other Agricultural Crop. Double standards based on antiquated reefer madness rhetoric is unfounded and restricts our economic growth.</p>	Sam De La Paz	sam@greenwaveconsult.us
32	<p>Comment re: Setbacks: State law mandates only 600 ft from sensitive uses, my request is for the BOS to align County setback requirements with state law rather than implementing a different standard of 1000 ft.</p>	Joe Rogoway	joerogoway@rogowaylaw.com
33	<p>The Ad Hoc recommended that cannabis cultivation be treated like other Ag in sonoma conuty. This proposed ordinance doesnt' do that. If cannasbi shoud be treated like other Ag, all these new restrictions shoud be eliminated. No other Ag has these restrictions.</p>	Joe Rogoway	joerogoway@rogowaylaw.com
34	<p>We live 1000ft from an illegal cannbis operation. They grow outdoor. PRMD just fined them for their illegal activities. We suffered from terrible, noxious odors from July through October 2020. We are down-wind from them and the odor was severe. How would you deal with this problem and the strong odors carried by the wind from outdoor operations?</p>	Viviane Farre	viviane@foodandstyle.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
47	Sonoma County General Plan states that all residents in agricultural areas shall recognize that the primary use of the land may create agricultural "Nuisance" situations such as flies, noise, odors, and spraying chemicals.	Yoel Chetrit	yoel@elyoncannabis.com
48	The already setbacks established address odor mitigation. Additionally, the County's environmental consultants seem to address odor in the Mitigated Negative Declaration that they prepared in association with cannabis cultivation and this draft ordinance.	Lori Pascarella	lori@bangodistribution.com
49	Why are there restriction on cannabis (THC odor), but not hemp. They smell the same, do they not?	Joe Rogoway	joerogoway@rogowaylaw.com
50	Hemp and cannabis smell the same- why the different set of odor control standards?	Sica Roman	sica@sonic.net
51	What are you doing to more closely assess water use and the draw down of neighboring wells? These existing wells are critical for our homes and our livestock. Some penalty relief operators are already drawing down our water. Shouldn't an EIR address this?	Colleen Mahoney	colleenanmahoney@gmail.com
52	Treat cannabis as agriculture and follow the new hemp ordinance that does not have so many inequality barriers	Kila Peterson	Kilapeterson@gmail.com
53	i think it is wrong that the land size was raised from 5 to 10. it hurt a lot of good family farms. its really obnoxious that these cannabis hater groups want to dominate cannabis operators and raise the lot size so that only the richest people could cultivate. NOTHING will satisfy these people so please DO NOT try.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
54	Why does cannabis (THC) need to be screened by not hemp?	Joe Rogoway	joerogoway@rogowaylaw.com
55	We lost our BOF certification. the General plan was amended but the zoning code was not. so cannabis will not be recognized as true ag to the Board of Forestry. Will cannabis farms be required to have 20 ft wide roads?	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
56	Treat cannabis like any other industry Prioritize tax paying farmers who have been stuck in the penalty relief permitting process for YEARS. Adopt pro-cannabis policies that allow our ESSENTIAL industry to thrive. Support the creation of more local green jobs Support the preservation of our rural ag lands and pesticide free acreage	Shivawn Brady	shivawn@justicecannabisco.com
57	what website will host the responses to these questions?	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
58	Are there plans to discuss Chapter 26 cannabis changes?	AnnaRae Grabstein	annarae.grabstein@norcalcann.com
59	Safety and fire prevention. our streets are narrow in Bloomfield.	Marta May	champagnetaste2002@yahoo.com
60	Has the county defined a process for permittees who are on less than 10 acres but were grandfathered in as existing operators?	Shannon Hattan	Info@fiddlers-greens.com
61	What are you doing to screen huge hoop houses on ridge lines? Why are operators seeming to ignore requirements plant and maintain screening? These should never be allowed on ridge lines and they destroy scenic corridors - what is the County policy?	Colleen Mahoney	colleenannmahoney@gmail.com
62	Establish policy to allow hoop houses to be permanent on propto reduce unnecessary material and labor waste, as well as improved sustainability because of reduced water use	Cynthia Murray	cmurray@northbayleadership.org
63	Setbacks should mirror state law	Joel S	joel.freston@421.group
64	Increased minimum parcel sizes raises the barriers to entry into the regulated market, making land acquisition near impossible for low income farmers.	Shivawn Brady	shivawn@justicecannabisco.com
65	Why should hoop houses be allowed to be permanent? Under what controls? Limits?	Colleen Mahoney	colleenannmahoney@gmail.com
66	I do not mind people growing whatever, but not in the center of a residential neighborhood like Bloomfield.	Marta May	champagnetaste2002@yahoo.com
67	I live in an unincorporated community of about 400 people. All of us rely on our wells for water. There is not adequate protection regarding the amount of water usage by cannabis growers.	Virginia Hair	hairklein@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
68	<p>We strongly encourage the County to strive toward mirroring state law, which provides the best and most clear path for Sonoma County cultivators to remain competitive. Many of the setback requirements provided in the draft ordinance are overly restrictive and put a burden on operators, especially those who seek to expand or alter their operations with respect to sensitive uses.</p> <p>We believe that if a sensitive use chooses to locate within the setbacks of an existing cannabis operation, the cannabis operation ought to reserve the right to expand regardless of the proximity of the sensitive use. In other words, the cultivator was there first and ought to be able to have a degree of confidence in their ability to grow and expand their business without risk of losing that ability at no fault of their own.</p>	Joel S	joel.freston@421.group
69	How do we create a neighborhood exclusion process? How can we start now? Our neighborhood would like to have protection. Please advise.	Colleen Mahoney	colleenanmahoney@gmail.com
70	Why is cannabis been signaled out for these environmental restrictions, and not other crops?	Joe Rogoway	joerogoway@rogowaylaw.com
71	How are you inspecting for herbicides and pesticide use relative to sensitive neighboring habitats?	Colleen Mahoney	colleenanmahoney@gmail.com
72	We request that Industrial zoned cultivation, which remains in Chapter 26, be better aligned with cultivation allowances in Chapter 38 (specifically square footage and ownership limits).	Amber Morris	amber.morris@norcalcann.com
73	I do not want my town to have increasing traffic. I am concerned about the danger of crime. They want to use drowns...how about our privacy?	Marta May	champagnetaste2002@yahoo.com
74	I am not only concerned about odor, but our water table. What protection do the rural residents have if a "grow" dries up our wells?	Nick Houtz	hiediehoe@aol.com
75	This is agricultural and should be treated as such	Vincent Scholten	Norcalgrowers@hotmail.com
76	What are the maximum footprint for outdoor grows, is it the same as winery buildings on parcel size?	Nancy Citro	Citro@sonic.net
77	How can the size of cannabis grows be allowed to increase when we have such huge concerns about water draw down?	Colleen Mahoney	colleenanmahoney@gmail.com

# Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
<p>78 What is the administrative tool for existing, compliant legacy operators to apply for increased acreage under their pending permits?</p> <p>What is the reason for the groundwater monitoring depth to change from 100 to 300 ft in zone3/4?</p>	Shivawn Brady	shivawn@justicecannabisco.com
<p>79 I just want to point out that the permitting for a dairy farm is far more involved than marijuana cultivation - despite similar land use/nuisance issues like odor, water, waste. Perhaps marijuana cultivation permitting should align more with those of what someone who wants to build/operate a commercial dairy.</p>	Stacey Carlo	Stacey.Elisabeth.Carlo@gmail.com
<p>80 Please respect the intersection of DA and RR parcels.</p>	Gregory Koss	gkspam@gregkoss.com
<p>81 Cannabis operators are already subject to cultural, archaeological, biological and hydrogeological surveys and reports as a part of the permitting scientific review process. How can we let the "Not in my back yard" group cripple the growth of a legal agricultural industry? It's time for everyone accept that cannabis is a legal agricultural product that is essential to the future recovery and growth of Sonoma County's economy. It should be treated the same as every other agricultural product in Sonoma County including vineyards, dairy operators, pig farms or other odor producing agricultural industries within the county.</p>	Lori Pascarella	lori@bangodistribution.com
<p>82 SUGGESTED CHANGE: if a sensitive use chooses to locate within the setbacks of an existing cannabis operation, the cannabis operation ought to reserve the right to expand regardless of the proximity of the sensitive use. In other words, the cultivator was there first and ought to be able to have a degree of confidence in their ability to grow and expand their business without risk of losing that ability at no fault of their own.</p>	Joel S	joel.freston@421.group
<p>83 are you going to ignore the questions already submitted by email</p>	Nancy Richardson	nrchrdsn@sonic.net
<p>84 No equity program means So Co is late and also not positioned to get the 33 Million in State funding. What is the county plan to participate and access those grant funds</p>	Yarrow Kubrin	yarrowkubrin.2013@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
85	for outdoor cultivation the state allows for artificail light for immature plants in non-canopy areas. the county ag dept should allow defined non-canopy area for immature plants. there are many types of weatherproof low wattage lights. and the light can be hidden with tarps for the immature area only.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
86	Clustering should be allowed, if landowners own multiple parcels they should be allowed to locate there cannabis farm in one location, these prevents removing crops that don't need to be removed	Ron Ferraro	Ron@elyoncannabis.com
87	SUPPORT FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF EQUITY PROGRAM	Shivawn Brady	shivawn@justicecannabisco.com
88	Bloomfield is not a commercial neighborhood. They want to start a "Cannabis Spa" in Bloomfield.	Marta May	champagnetaste2002@yahoo.com
89	Mendocino County has extensive experience with cannabis and requires a 1000 ft setback for their community Planning areas as well as a CUP requirement allowing for localized public input. How much research has Sonoma County done in consideration of impacts on residential neighborhoods?	Vi Strain	vcrstrain@yahoo.com
90	In the past, permit decisions went through the Dry Creek Valley Citizens Advisory Council ("the DCVCAC") whose mission is to act as a bridge for communication between the County and local residents and businesses, and the general public on local planning decisions affecting the Dry Creek Valley. Is this no longer a part of the process?	Mark Farmer	markafarmer@msn.com
91	Hemp is the same as cannibis smells the same and yet less regulated	Vincent Scholten	Norcalgrowers@hotmail.com
92	Are you looking at increased increase of traffic on our rural roads that are already in disrepair? What will the County be doing to improve and maintain our roads? Including fire safety and response.	Colleen Mahoney	colleenanmahoney@gmail.com
93	It is impossible to control odor with outdoor cannabis. I am sick and tired of smelling dairy odors.	Bill Northey	Northeyb@gmail.com
94	Many of us are allergic to scented products...cannabis.	Marta May	champagnetaste2002@yahoo.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
95	Not a Question: Cannabis odor is no different than other less-than-pleasant smells we call "The Sonoma Aroma." I've lived next to a pig farm and a poultry operation in unincorporated Petaluma. Those smells aren't seasonal. Cannabis is.	Gretchen Giles	gretchen.giles@humannaturepr.com
96	Herbicide and pesticide use will prevent the cannabis from making it through testing.	Joanna Cedar	jhcedar@gmail.com
97	We are a historical community. We were here before the proposed grow operation in Bloomfield.	Marta May	champagnetaste2002@yahoo.com
98	I am concerned that you read and focus on cannabis industry point of view - many examples - and gloss over neighborhood concerns	Judith Olney	MilestonesMet@gmail.com
99	Incentivize farmers to convert conventionally farmed/pesticide ridden acreage into clean cannabis farms by opening up the program and lowering the barriers to entry by treating cannabis like agriculture.	Shivawn Brady	shivawn@justicecannabisco.com
100	How can you receive comments on March 18th before 12 and have them ready in early afternoon for the Planning Commission on the same day?	Vi Strain	vcrstrain@yahoo.com
101	We fully expect cannabis to be decriminalized under the Biden administration. When cannabis is removed from Schedule 1 status, is the county prepared to quickly roll back all of these overly burdensome regulations and treat cultivation like every other agricultural crop?	Shannon Hattan	Info@fiddlers-greens.com
102	The Sonoma County cannabis advisory committee reviewed the issue of establishing exclusion and inclusion zones and recommended they not be implemented here in Sonoma County.	Shivawn Brady	shivawn@justicecannabisco.com
103	Are we removing the 1 acre cap per person?	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
104	Sonoma County farmers and ranchers see this ordinance as an amazing opportunity to diversify their income form their properties in times when Sonoma County's staple agriculture industries are seeing a decline in demand	Yoel Chetrit	yoel@elyoncannabis.com
105	What will the County be doing about managing human waste? How long will a cannabis grow be allowed to use temporary toilets? What are the plans?	Colleen Mahoney	colleenanmahoney@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
106	The currently existing Cannabis Permit applicants need the 'Priority Processing' they were promised.	Sam De La Paz	sam@greenwaveconsult.us
107	Wait...so does that mean that if you have a 22 acre parcel, you can have an indoor grow that covers 11 acres of land?	Stacey Carlo	Stacey.Elizabeth.Carlo@gmail.com
108	Are there a new setback requirements for greenhouses?	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
109	For nursery production? Is was not clarified	Vincent Scholten	Norcalgrowers@hotmail.com
110	Are you considering impact on rural character?	Nancy Citro	Citro@sonic.net
111	On our large RRD and LEA parcels - structures may be 1 acre to 2 or more structures... how will the County address impervious surface and visual impacts	Judith Olney	MilestonesMet@gmail.com
112	Many farmers have abutting parcels, will the setback of 100' be removed when a property line is in-between two properties owned by the same owner?	Yoel Chetrit	yoel@elyoncannabis.com
113	Grows should not be allowed to expand in order to meet water needs - if a site doesn't have enough water - shouldn't the County just say it is not a good fit?	Colleen Mahoney	colleenannmahoney@gmail.com
114	can AG exempt buildings be used for hanging and drying? these buildings have been on AG properties for years. they should be able to be used for hanging and drying cannabis.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
115	For nurseries there is not any Oder why the use of carbon filters ,a big waste of energy	Vincent Scholten	Norcalgrowers@hotmail.com
116	A growing area which is adjacent to at least 14 families and a historical cemetery should not be allowed	Marta May	champagnetaste2002@yahoo.com
117	hoops houses should not need to be removed. what a waste of labor and resources to take them down and rebuild them every 6 months.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
118	Why are you reading the questions and not allowing anyone from the panel to answer them?	Ayn Garvisch	Agarvisch@yahoo.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
119	It's appropriate to increase the amount of canopy to 10% of the parcels in Ag zones, but the smallest cultivators have been left out of the county's program for years. County staff and the planning commission both recommended cottage licenses on AR and RR parcels in 2016 with a minimum parcel size of 5 acres. With the need for economic development and basic fairness, small canopy farmers and larger farmers should both be able to participate in the regulated market.	Joanna Cedar	jhcedar@gmail.com
120	There is already very limited agricultural use zoned acreage in Sonoma County. What does the county plan to do to protect agricultural acreage from the continued development into residential uses; and, to protect agricultural lands from the continued attack regarding land use rights from neighbors who don't understand what the land use/ zoning laws are?	Lori Pascarella	lori@bangodistribution.com
121	Can cultivators still use 22% of the flower canopy for propagation of which is exempt of the 10% canopy measurement?	Shivawn Brady	shivawn@justicecannabisco.com
122	Sec. 38.12.040. (A)1 of the proposed ordinance states that, "cultivated area must be set back a minimum of 100 feet from the property lines of the parcel on which the cannabis is cultivated." While a setback from typical property lines at 100 feet seems reasonable, the text as written prevents those operators who own adjacent parcels from centralizing their operations. In other words, this text prevents owners of adjacent parcels with separate permits from sharing facilities as well as locating those facilities in a centralized area. Further, the text actually adds to the overall impact of the development on the environment by forcing the operators to develop redundant facilities, build more roads, structures and demands on the respective properties. We ask that you provide a setback waiver for such parties who own adjacent parcels and wish to share the facilities across the permits. The state recognizes the value in this as well as it allows for the use of these shared facilities across adjacent license type	Joel S	joel.freston@421.group
123	Water....we do not have enough in Bloomfield to feed the propose grow. They will be seriously interfere with our water supply.	Marta May	champagnetaste2002@yahoo.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
124	Do not include water regulations in the ordinance; instead let the State Water Board manage water.	Cynthia Murray	cmurray@northbayleadership.org
125	Reduce the park setback to 600 feet and align with state law.	Shivawn Brady	shivawn@justicecannabisco.com
126	If other agricultural operations are allowed to use temporary/portable restrooms services to manage human waste, why should cannabis be singled out and not be allowed to utilize local business providers for this service? This makes no sense that you make one set of rules for all other agricultural operators, but a different set for cannabis operators.	Lori Pascarella	lori@bangodistribution.com
127	For nursery with preexisting structures, will setbacks be waived	Vincent Scholten	Norcalgrowers@hotmail.com
128	Hoop houses are only good if you can cover the crop for the spring and the fall. 6 month limit defeats the purpose.	Joe Rogoway	joerogoway@rogowaylaw.com
129	What controls will the County be putting into place to restrict tourism where roads simply can't handle the increased traffic and impacts on rural roads?	Colleen Mahoney	colleenannmahoney@gmail.com
130	<p>hooray to andrew smith and the ag dept for taking on this task and helping ALL agriculture farmers in the county. they are so much better than PRMD.</p> <p>we should apply to the AG DEPT (not PRMD) for: indoor cultivation indoor nursery central processing transportation</p> <p>the AG DEPT can issue the "use permit" and then the farmers can get only BUILDING PERMITS for building.</p> <p>thank you</p>	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
131	Please remove the plant count (25 Plants) for cottage outdoor permits. - Align with the state which has removed the plant count. Vegetative non-oder producing plants are crucial for breeding stock and vegetative preparedness.	Sam De La Paz	sam@greenwaveconsult.us

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
132	Re: important farmlands - there should be no 1:1 offset for cannabis, and this should be regulated like other ag	Cynthia Murray	cmurray@northbayleadership.org
133	Cultivators should be allowed to truck in recycled water to reduce pressure on groundwater. It should actually be encouraged. Water catchment systems should also be incentivized.	Sam De La Paz	sam@greenwaveconsult.us
134	the setbacks are already extreme. stop trying to make the SOS NIMBYS happy. NOTHING WILL SATISFY THE BULLY SOS	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
135	Even 1000 feet set back will not help the residents of Bloomfield who live around the proposed grow, or anywhere in the town.	Marta May	champagnetaste2002@yahoo.com
136	please lower the parks setback to 500 feet in bloomfeild. the hateful neighbors will never be happy.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
137	Setbacks for preexisting greenhouses?	Vincent Scholten	Norcalgrowers@hotmail.com
138	Will the Ag Department receive the budget it needs to process the amount of cannabis that is needed to be grown to help out the farmers that are in declining industries who are looking to continue putting food on their table from their properties by cultivating a more valuable crop?	Yoel Chetrit	yoel@elyoncannabis.com
139	Slope planting limitations should be eliminated in this ordinance and managed it using the same language as other ag for consistency	Cynthia Murray	cmurray@northbayleadership.org
140	While is sounds heroic to support water catchment - reliance on water should not be dependent on trucking water or collection. How can the County support expansion of a product in water sensitive areas? Why allow increased sizes and demands if a site doesn't have enough water?	Colleen Mahoney	colleenanmahoney@gmail.com
141	These setbacks are not aligned with state law, just reiterating my comments to align with California's 600 ft setback. This also means aligning the definition of sensitive use. Thank you!	Joe Rogoway	joerogoway@rogowaylaw.com
142	How will smells be measured?	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
143	Please align with the State wherever possible for the local ordinance... It saves our county staff time and money and the state regulations are plenty restrictive as is.	Justin Arowcavage	arowcavage@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
158	Maybe when you talk about the proposed changes, could you comment briefly on what exists now. I'm struggling with the setbacks issue because I'm not sure how significant (or not) the changes are.	Stacey Carlo	Stacey.Elizabeth.Carlo@gmail.com
159	Please align with state where possible	Vincent Scholten	Norcalgrowers@hotmail.com
160	How about everyone respecting the comments of neighbors? There are good reasons farmers and ranchers are concerned. County officials - please take our input in the spirit with which it is given. Please protect our resources, our neighborhoods, our environment. Why isn't the County including more existing rancher/farmer input?	Colleen Mahoney	colleenannmahoney@gmail.com
161	Vi Strain Please refer to my initial setback comment	Vi Strain	vcrstrain@yahoo.com
162	Nurseries should be prioritized as there is a local supply chain shortage and traveling and spending monies outside our county. That is money that is leaving our county and creating unnecessary carbon impact. Let's keep our money and our farming in Sonoma County. Please clarify that the new ordinance removes the sqft. cap on nurseries	Sam De La Paz	sam@greenwaveconsult.us
163	new peoposed setsbacks are terrible! They should be considered on a case by case basis.....why should you DECREASE the setbacks when that seems to be the MOST important for rural residents!	Nick Houtz	hiediehoe@aol.com
164	Why can't we truck water to decrease the pressure on ground water?	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
165	How is water supply determined to be adequate and sustainable? Is the cultivator required to commission a water study?	Stacey Carlo	Stacey.Elizabeth.Carlo@gmail.com
166	Why is cannabis subject to these draconian water restrictions when no other crop is? If cannabis is to be treated like Ag, then lets treat it like Ag.	Joe Rogoway	joerogoway@rogowaylaw.com
167	What happens if it becomes clear that a site is drawing water down of neighboring properties? What recourse will neighbors have?	Colleen Mahoney	colleenannmahoney@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
178	The requirement of a dry season well yield test is onerous and an unnecessary burden on applicants, whereas what was acceptable in the past, a professional hydrologist would not only provide more meaningful determination for water use requirements but is a better predictor of the need of water and its use as it varies from site to site. Therefore we believe that a professional hydrologist would be better able to determine water sufficiency, at less of a burden to the applicant, than a dry season well yield test. Cannabis farmers should be held to the same standards as farmers of other agricultural crops and commodities.	Joel S	joel.freston@421.group
179	Cumulative impacts?	Nancy Citro	Citro@sonic.net
180	Water use: if water is already inadequate - then how can a grow be allowed to continue, never mind expand?	Colleen Mahoney	colleenanmahoney@gmail.com
181	How will grow GW consumption be publicly reviewable, albeit anonymous and aggregated as needed to protect individual privacy?	Todd Board	toddwboard@gmail.com
182	what protectiuons did we have to the boomer generation building vineyards on every corner of the county? now this same generation of folks seem to hold a stricter standard to cannabis farmers.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
183	How is fire season being addressed with the water changes?	Nancy Citro	Citro@sonic.net
184	Do these proposed changes address only large outdoor operations, or the current prohibition of small boutique indoor operations in rural residential areas? Seems to me that these two land uses should be separate.	Eric Hanson	Mcmahon6262@gmail.com
185	Is there a provision to protect small, one-lane rural roads from all the trucking from the cannabis industry? Trukicng water is not a good idea!	Viviane Farre	viviane@foodandstyle.com
186	Does Sonoma county have the same water restriction for all other Ag	Kila Peterson	Kilapeterson@gmail.com
187	farmers have RIGHTS to their water and it NO ONE'S right to BULLY cannabis farmers for any reason they can find.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
196	Can you provide more detail on how the Net Zero water use will be approved or enforced? Does Net Zero mean no groundwater withdrawals in impaired watersheds?	Harriet Buckwalter	hbuck@sonic.net
197	Cannabis is a great plant. I am on the Board of the Sonoma County Herb Association. I am an herbologist. Cannabis has helped so many. I just do not think it belongs dead center of a Residential Community such as Bloomfield. There are other more suitable locations.	Marta May	champagnetaste2002@yahoo.com
198	How will this expansion affect our RRV watershed? How is fire services being affected?	Nancy Citro	Citro@sonic.net
199	In my many many years in Sonoma County, I have NEVER seen the BOS side with the individual tax payer and resident OVER Business. I understand the frustration we are feeling when our way of life, property values. health & safety is being threatened!	Nick Houtz	hiediehoe@aol.com
200	Please regulate as all other agricultural crops	Vincent Scholten	Norcalgrowers@hotmail.com
201	SOS wants water meter reports to make things hard for cannabis farmers. they will complain about EVERYTHING they can.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
202	Water is a huge concern. Is the County using a specific measurement of what water draw down is acceptable if any?	Colleen Mahoney	colleenanmahoney@gmail.com
203	maybe these people should do research and not excoect to waste our time getting them up to speed on how to complain about their neighbors family farms.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
204	Will a professional licensed hydrogeologist be allowed to conduct certified well depth readings in lieu of requiring a depth sounding probe for groundwater depth readings?	Lori Pascarella	lori@bangodistribution.com
205	Comment- I think that is great!	Devin James	devinb.james@gmail.com
206	hooray to term limits increasing	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
207	Why 5 years?	Julia Dapore	mosaics.rock@gmail.com
208	thank God	Bill Northey	Northeyb@gmail.com
209	5 years is appropriate	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
210	Does the 5-year permit cost any more than the 1-year permit?	Stacey Carlo	Stacey.Elisabeth.Carlo@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
211	Water uses are not yet measurable across the board and someone stated above in their very apparent opposition of Cannabis. Cannabis can be farmed in many different ways. We are an environmentally conscious and community supportive industry. But we must be provided the opportunity to create dialogue around important topics.	Sam De La Paz	sam@greenwaveconsult.us
212	In the dairy belt area - one year preferred so if there are problems the County can be involved with changes. A five year cycle is too long.	Colleen Mahoney	colleenanmahoney@gmail.com
213	If a grower violates the odor control provisions during the 5-year period, is there a provision for enforcement during that time?	Viviane Farre	viviane@foodandstyle.com
214	less work. we can concentrate on growing	Bill Northey	Northeyb@gmail.com
215	How often do other agricultural industries need to renew their permits here in Sonoma County?	Yoel Chetrit	yoel@elyoncannabis.com
216	odors are not going away	Bill Northey	Northeyb@gmail.com
217	What's the review and comment process for permits?	Gregory Koss	gkspam@gregkoss.com
218	Lessening permit renewal periods from 1 to 5 years seems like a less burdensome permit and regulatory structure.	Yarrow Kubrin	yarrowkubrin.2013@gmail.com
219	disempower hater neighbors. let cannabis farmers be treated with some compassion and not criminals that need to be reviewed every single year.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
220	How will enforcement work - annual review shows violations then is the permit revoked	Judith Olney	MilestonesMet@gmail.com
221	Being that it took four years to get my permit five years is too low	Vincent Scholten	Norcalgrowers@hotmail.com
222	Five years is a good start, but have you considered longer? What happens if a sensitive use moves in during a five year term at renewal?	Craig Litwin	Craig@421.group
223	Why are we treating these permitting requirements any differently than other Ag... again.	Sam De La Paz	sam@greenwaveconsult.us
224	5 years is great- it costs a lot of time and money to get the permit in the first place. With all of that effort and There are already so many regulations we meet, it's great.	Devin James	devinb.james@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
237	Please allow for education on farms as this is how we pass on knowledge	Vincent Scholten	Norcalgrowers@hotmail.com
238	will farms be allowed to process onsite in ag exempt structures similar to other agricultural industries?	Shannon Hattan	Info@fiddlers-greens.com
239	Self distribution is great!	Devin James	devinb.james@gmail.com
240	Mendocino County is aggressively pursuing cannabis tourism and Sonoma County is the natural stop for tourists. Our sungrown cannabis is among the best in the world and should be shared and celebrated.	Gretchen Giles	gretchen.giles@humannaturepr.com
241	<p>The water use issue seems to always be exaggerated when it comes to cannabis.</p> <p>I agree that properties should be bound to the same rules as vineyards. But the amount of water per finished product is actually very low compared to vineyards and livestock.</p> <p>A large cannabis plant provides for the same amount of ‘imbibing’ as a thousand cases of wine. Made that number up, but you see my point. :)</p>	Eric Hanson	Mcmahon6262@gmail.com
242	Align events w/ greater event policy like what the wine industry complies with to ensure community benefit & opportunity for participation in state event licensing program	Cynthia Murray	cmurray@northbayleadership.org
243	Ag tourism (wine, organic gardens, farm markets, etc) are a large economic driver for Sonoma County. Does the county have a plan to help integrate cannabis into other permitted, Agricultural based tourism?	Lori Pascarella	lori@bangodistribution.com
244	Cannabis Spas do not belong in the center of a rural residential town.	Marta May	champagnetaste2002@yahoo.com
245	can you have andrew please expand on the permitting of cannabis events and tourism? how many will be allowed per year?	Ayn Garvisch	Agarvisch@yahoo.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
246	spilt some beer on the ground for all the great county farmers who couldnt make it thru this indutsray transition. please protect the remaining county heritage cannabis operators and consider grandfathering the PRP folks. they have trusted this county for years and most of them should be helped to real permits.	J 7	john77777777777777777777@yahoo.com
247	The wine industry accepts cards. Until cannabis can do the same it's high risk.	Gregory Koss	gkspam@gregkoss.com
248	Medical cannabis def should remain, people and patients have a RIGHT to their medicine, taking away the distinction is infridging on patients rights.	B O	brian@yor-om.com
249	Cannabis events should be prohibited until the cannabis industry proves it can be self-reglating. If allowed a CUP should be required	Vi Strain	vcrstrain@yahoo.com
250	How are you addressing cumulative impacts of wine and now cannabis events in unincorporated parcels?	Nancy Citro	Citro@sonic.net
251	Will permits be allowed to be transfered from one individual to another ? (stay with the property)	Sica Roman	sica@sonic.net
252	Cannabis tourism should not be restricted any further than wineries or vineyards. That is only creating more double standards. Safety concerns that surround alcohol are extrememly well-founded compared to Cannabis consumption.	Sam De La Paz	sam@greenwaveconsult.us
253	Cannabis tourism should not be allowed and remian prohibited	Ayn Garvisch	Agarvisch@yahoo.com
254	will the ag dept issue the permits for infooor cultivation on ag land?	J 7	john77777777777777777777@yahoo.com
255	Self transport is a good idea. 5 year permits are a good idea. Removal of vegetative plant cap is a good idea. Removal of the 1 acre cap is a good idea.	Sica Roman	sica@sonic.net
256	Cannabis is an economic engine like no other, returning \$1 billion in state tax revenue to CA in 2020. We cannot be so foolish as to turn our backs on this opportunity.	Gretchen Giles	gretchen.giles@humannaturepr.com
257	Cannabis events should not be allowed on substandard residential community streets	Vi Strain	vcrstrain@yahoo.com
258	ag dept to approve permits for indoor cultivation?	J 7	john77777777777777777777@yahoo.com
259	Cannabis should be alloted the right to self-transport. Especially for nurseries.	Sam De La Paz	sam@greenwaveconsult.us
260	For preexiting greenhouses will setbacks be waived for nursery	Vincent Scholten	Norcalgrowers@hotmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
261	there are wine tasting events even in residential areas so cannabis should be allowed just the same.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
262	nice job ladies.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
263	is it true that the net reveue after expenses from cannabis in 2020 was only \$70,000	Nancy Richardson	nrchrdsn@sonic.net
264	Do not let money/revenue interfere with our right to safety...Bloomfield.	Marta May	champagnetaste2002@yahoo.com
265	Will wineries who grow cannabis and grapes be able to sample products to the public?	Nancy Citro	Citro@sonic.net
266	Please treat cannabis like any other agricultural industry -Prioritize the farmers that have been stuck in the permitting process for YEARS. - Adopt pro-cannabis policies that allow our essential industry to thrive by creating jobs and stimulating the economy!	Zac Guerinoni	zac@ahti-farms.com
267	Add languages allowing on-site events using CUP on commercial parcels	Cynthia Murray	cmurray@northbayleadership.org
268	Will all the supervisors read the comments that are sent by 3/18?	Viviane Farre	viviane@foodandstyle.com
269	The odor issue and the security issue have always seemed to be the major ones. I agree that those concerns should be solved. Maybe the odor issue can be solved. That would be the problem of cultivators. How many instances of criminal activity have happened at permitted, secured facilities? Maybe the crime that has been reported only happened at unpermitted, underground operations and could have been avoided if they were allowed to be above board? always beenI wonder if the odor issue i	Eric Hanson	Mcmahon6262@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
270	start chatrging the hateful neighbors with the cost of unnecessary site visits over bullcrap complaints.	J 7	john77777777777777777777@yahoo.com
271	Again, how can the comments received the same day the PC meets give them time to review the comments?	Vi Strain	vcrstrain@yahoo.com
272	Thank you!!	Joe Rogoway	joerogoway@rogowaylaw.com
273	In general the comment feed bouncing around when people liked comments was very distracting. It would be great if, for the upcoming meetings you could freeze the feed and have it remain in order of received.	Amber Morris	amber.morris@norcalcann.com
274	thanks for your hard work AG DEPT. lets refine this great together. see you all later today	J 7	john77777777777777777777@yahoo.com
275	Thank you everyone!	Shivawn Brady	shivawn@justicecannabisco.com
276	Thanks!	Gretchen Giles	gretchen.giles@humannaturepr.com

Question Report Town Hall Monday 3/8/2021 5:00 PM - 6:30 PM

Report Generated: 3/8/2021 18:37

Topic Sonoma County Cannabis Permitting Policy Updates

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
1	What has the county learned from the mistakes of other counties.	Rachel Zierdt	rzierdt@gmail.com
2	the state definitrion of "outdoor cultivation" is "the cultivation of matrure cannabis without the use of artificial lighting or light deprivartion in the canopy are at any point in time., Artificial lighting is permissable only to maintain immature plants outside the canopy area." how does the proposed ordinance allow for outdoor cultivators to have an "immature plant area" outside the "canopye area". the state definition allows for outdoor farmers to use rtificial light to keep immatrure plants from flowering. outdoor cultivators need to be abkle to define non-canopy area for keeping immature plants with artificial light. artificail light is used for immature plants by other outdoor cultivators. the county ordinance deleted the second sentance of the state definition of outdoor cultivation. it should be consistent w the state definaition and allow a small immature plant area with sefe and permitted outdoor lighting. maybe i am mimssing something. but it should not require a mix-light permit for this.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
3	We know what you are proposing..we want you to hear what we are concerned about. Our voices have not been heard as is obvious when reading the proposals.	Rachel Zierdt	rzierdt@gmail.com
4	We have been giving our opinions for months as you said before/ . They haven't listened before.	Rachel Zierdt	rzierdt@gmail.com
5	Why aren't the supervisors there to hear our ideas and try to defend this ordinance.	Rachel Zierdt	rzierdt@gmail.com
6	Will this meeting cover the exact same material as this morning's meeting ?	Sica Roman	sica@sonic.net
7	What will posting the question do? How Will that help affect policy>	Rachel Zierdt	rzierdt@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
8	when will be able to apply for sonoma county ag dept permits for indoor cultivation, nurseries, and central processing? PRMD is a bad fit for cannabis and should be used for building permits only. all cannabis "use permits" should be through the ag dept since they understand agriculture so much better. thanks to andrew smith and the ag dept for their work.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
9	This is not a helpful process.....	Rachel Zierdt	rzierdt@gmail.com
10	<p>You released a draft copy of the zoning regulations and an amendment of the general plan, but they contradict each other.</p> <p>In the zoning regulations under the definition of "crop production" please remove "except cannabis" to match the General Plan amendment.</p> <p>I support and appreciate the change in the General Plan to classify cannabis as agriculture.</p>	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
11	how can we "like" a posting? the link is gone.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
12	Please align the Sonoma Cannabis Ordinance where applicable to state laws.	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
13	As state laws continue to evolve, the Sonoma County ordinance should change with it.	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
14	<p>Nurseries should be prioritized as there is a local supply chain shortage and traveling and spending monies outside our county. That is money that is leaving our county and creating unnecessary carbon impact. Let's keep our money and our farming in Sonoma County.</p> <p>Please clarify that the new ordinance removes the sqft. cap on nurseries</p>	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
15	Please create an advisory commission for cannabis or agriculture in general. There must be more transparency between county staff and the industry.	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
16	Please create a pipeline for the original applicants that have been stuck in line at PRMD. Give priority to them without additional fees. They were supposed to have a head start and get priority processing, but are stuck in the queue. Now you are allowing 10% canopy without getting them permits first.	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
17	I support 5-year permits and the allowance of ministerial permits in LIA and RRD.	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
18	I would like to see RR and AR added back, as a right to farm in Sonoma County. (Small farming is essential in our agricultural county.)	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
19	How can the Planning Board consider my thoughts that are submitted on March 18 at noon, when they are going to the BOS that same day?	james bracco	jim@sosneighborhoods.com
20	I would like to see RR and AR added back, as a right to farm in Sonoma County. (Small farming is essential in our agricultural county.)	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
21	The state already has strict enough restrictions for water use. Please remove the new water restrictions you have added and treat us like other agriculture commodities	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
22	Regarding the language around forests in 2016, please allow an exception for areas deforested via wildfires. These areas no longer have living trees on them and should not be disqualified.	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
23	The thumbs up option was not working for me this morning- any special directions to use that feature ? Does the thumb have to be blue ?	Sica Roman	sica@sonic.net
24	Please link interactive maps for the "Important Farmlands" and "Critical Watersheds" so those areas are known and easily referenced in the Sonoma County Code.	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
25	Please remove the requirements for plant screening of Cannabis farms. (Other crops are not subjected to this) They draw attention to the fact that there is a cannabis farm behind a fence as opposed to a horse or dog, they cost extra money, and they use extra water.	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
26	dry well test waste a lot of water and should not be allowed	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
27	What about legacy farmers in Sonoma County that are zoned in RR? Can an exception be made for the "right to farm"?	Devin Scharff	Dscharff@sbcglobal.net

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
28	Please remove the requirement of carbon/air filters for indoor, greenhouse and nurseries on ag and resource properties. These smells are already mitigated by large parcel sizes. Also, many if not all of these properties will be eligible for outdoor growing making the filters a moot point. They are expensive and a waste of carbon and energy resources. Lastly, hemp is now allowed and also smells the same as cannabis, because they are essentially the exact same plant.	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
29	Please remove the requirement for an emergency to be government declared (Example: There may be a power outage on a single parcel that will still create an emergency for that farmer. They must be able to pump water or turn on lights to save their crop.)	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
30	Please treat us like other ag and don't threaten us with misdemeanors	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
31	Don't give "Stop Work" orders unless there is due process. This may allow a whole year's worth of crop to be lost over a misunderstanding. This should only occur during the most serious offense and after arbitration.	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
32	Please remove the plant count (25 Plants) for cottage outdoor permits. - Align with the state which has removed the plant count.	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
33	How will health, safety, environmental be protected...words mean nothing.	Rachel Zierdt	rzierdt@gmail.com
34	How will the county deal with the Board of Forestry's new Fire Safe Ordinance? Will farms be required to have 20 foot wide roads? Will that only be required if there is new construction? Or are you changing the zoning code to classify us as an agricultural crop?	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
35	How will renewals be handled	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
36	If protective of the public healthy as you just stated, why was the health and safety clause not included in Chapter 38?	Deborah Eppstein	depstein@gmail.com
37	why is the state alignment only where possible? Right to Farm is a huge change that does not align with state.	Rachel Zierdt	rzierdt@gmail.com
38	Why are we spending more time on minimal changes vs focus on the substantive changes	Judith Olney	MilestonesMet@gmail.com
39	How are we protecting RR owners when they are adjacent to DA for odor and ability to comment in permit requests?	Gregory Koss	gkspam@gregkoss.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
40	This is agriculture. Periodic smells from agricultural uses are nothing new to the residents of Sonoma county. Cannabis harvest will add to the already prevalent agricultural scent for only a few weeks out of the year. The environmental consultants who drafted the County's Mitigated Negative Declaration found that smells associated with cannabis cultivation will not be a significant environmental impact	Ron Ferraro	Ron@elyoncannabis.com
41	how will detection be measured?	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
42	How is odor detected? What is the standard?	Gregory Koss	gkspam@gregkoss.com
43	please do NOT require odor mitigation for mixed light and outdoor grows.	Sica Roman	sica@sonic.net
44	Actually, the farmland protection and split-zoning language being propsoed are more stringent than the current rules.	Lauren Mendelsohn	Lauren@omarfigueroa.com
45	this is not a helpful format for anyone not completely familiar with the previous and proposed documents	Elizabeth Lawson	elsbethlawson@comcast.net
46	Oder controls apply to outdoor? How is that possible?	Aaron Keefer	aaronkeefer1@yahoo.com
47	Odors are NOT only present for a few weeks during the year! Anyone who has lived near a grow knows this. Odors are prevalent during grow, harvest, drying, and processing.	Gregory Koss	gkspam@gregkoss.com
48	How is odor control defined and implemented?	Joan Conway	joanc358@gmail.com
49	Odor is a huge issue....should not extend beyond property growing.	Rachel Zierdt	rzierdt@gmail.com
50	Hemp and cannabis smell the same. How can one odor , but not the other be required to be mitigated ?	Sica Roman	sica@sonic.net
51	Under California law cannabis is considered a product not a crop. Isn't the Countys proposal to treat cannabis as a crop in conflict with state l aw	Marc Bommersbach	mbommersbach@att.net
52	How is outdoor order controlled. What are PROVEN methods for those of us are downwind of odor.	Toby Levy	Toby@levydesignpartners.com
53	Think the thumbs up and chat function is disabled	Brantly Richardson	nrchrdsn@sonic.net
54	Explain the difference between ministerial permit and what was there before?	Lynn Behling	lynn.behling@me.com
55	How do you think you are going to keep the oder at the property line€? How can that possibly work?!	Lynn Behling	lynn.behling@me.com
56	Water use is a major concern especially with the environmental changes. Drought and fire are a major concern and new water intensive ag of any kind is a problem	Elizabeth Lawson	elsbethlawson@comcast.net

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
57	Why is the slope noted at 50%; that is extreme. Is 50' from top will still be very visible.	Toby Levy	Toby@levydesignpartners.com
58	Can agricultural zoned parcels owned by the same property owner be co-allocated when considering the 10% maximum acreage? IE can a person who owns multiple Ag zone parcels co-allocate the parcels for the cannabis Ag permitting considerations instead of treating each individually?	Lori Pascarella	lori@bangodistribution.com
59	What ministerial standard and method will be applied when reviewing odor control plans to determine that they are adequate to prevent offsite odors from being detected?	Tony Linegar	tonynkrista@comcast.net
60	Odor should end at the property line. Homeowners have the right to enjoy their entire property.	Brantly Richardson	nrchrdsn@sonic.net
61	There should be a pathway for applicants and licensees under the existing permit pathway to transition to being reviewed/regulated under the new pathway, without having to start from scratch and pay duplicate fees.	Lauren Mendelsohn	Lauren@omarfigueroa.com
62	The county makes the statement that, "Ministerial permits in those zones to protect public health, safety, and the environment and to promote neighborhood compatibility " If Sonoma County is focused on "neighborhood compatibility", why are you amending the code and no longer notifying residents of upcoming cannabis operations near their homes? Why do you feel residents do not deserve the right to know about and comment on such proposed projects?	Lauren Marra	lmarravmd@gmail.com
63	Putting cannabis in AG is terrible idea...too little oversight.	Rachel Zierdt	rzierdt@gmail.com
64	The only sure way to control odors is to require airtight enclosure and filtration. This is exactly what Santa Rosa has done, as a reference.	Gregory Koss	gkspam@gregkoss.com
65	What is being done to ensure the penalty relief program operators are taken care of as the county regulations change?	Lori Pascarella	lori@bangodistribution.com
66	It is a myth promoted by industry advocates that plants and vegetation absorb odor. No scientific data to support.	Brantly Richardson	nrchrdsn@sonic.net
67	Cannabis smell is pervasive and constant during harvest and harvest and harvest...	Rachel Zierdt	rzierdt@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
68	Cannabis order is very different than other farming orders!!	Lynn Behling	lynn.behling@me.com
69	Are there odor tests for dairy farms, grapes and apples? They all give unpleasant smells as well. Why would we treat cannabis any different?	Herman G. Hernandez	h.hernandez.ms@gmail.com
70	Please consider eliminating setback requirements on interal parcel lines on contiguous parcels under the same ownership. This provision is provided for in other jurisdictions including Lake County. This action would allow for the aggregation of cultivation operations and would serve to protect County resourses, reduce the overall footprint of operations, and reduce the burden on cultivators with operations on contiguous parcels.	Josh Abrams	Josh@HigherPathConsulting.com
71	We have orders of cow manure, duck feces, etc in Sonoma. The new ag Sonoma aroma is cannabis! Many think it's an upgrade	Aaron Keefer	aaronkeefer1@yahoo.com
72	Ministerial permit approval removes the right to contest by the public. This is not the right way to get community input before the permit is granted.	Gregory Koss	gkspam@gregkoss.com
73	Considering the other agricultural odors it seems like it would place more constraints on the farmer then is necessary.	Clayton Taylor	Claytoncraigtaylor@gmail.com
74	Cannabis is heavily regulated industry, there is more oversight then any industry in the state! Every gram is tracked and traced to end user	Ron Ferraro	Ron@elyoncannabis.com
75	If the permitting is ministerial, how can cumulative effects be addressed. And how can forest conversions be halted if the forest is young. How can we be sure to protect oak forests that include grasslands, previously grazed but not cultivated?	Wendy Smit	wsmit8000@gmail.com
76	How can you keep strict environmental standards be kept for cannabis?	Lynn Behling	lynn.behling@me.com
77	Cannabis smells for a short period of time out of the year. What president is ther to monitor odors for cannabis, but not other agricultural uses or cattle ranchers?	Andrew Longman	andrew.longman@421group.com
78	Wouldn't 1000ft buffers around rural residential nighborhoods and even more if the topography demands help to midigate the opposition to commercial cannabis in our county?	veva edelson	veva.edelson@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
79	I've here for 25 years. This is a quiet and safe town so far. I oppose for this cannabis plantation it will endanger wild life, Water wells supply, odor, will bring crime to our beautiful town Why the county allows cannabis where there is population we don't want to risk the safety of our families and kids	Clara Enriquez	clara.enriq@gmail.com
80	If special restrictions are going to be placed on outdoor cannabis agriculture for odor control, in addition to the generous set backs which address this, then is the county going to alter other agricultural regulations to control their odor such as dairy operators, pig farms, chicken farms, etc.?	Lori Pascarella	lori@bangodistribution.com
81	Thank you so much Dr. Bishoff and team. The cannabis ordinance revision is one of the most important things the county supervisors can do right now. Our economy needs it!	Herman G. Hernandez	h.hernandez.ms@gmail.com
82	Why is there only a Mitigated Neg Dec rather than a full EIR? Doesn't a change to allow 65,000 acres ministerially need a complete study	Toby Levy	Toby@levydesignpartners.com
83	What about the allergens that these grow operations will produce? Odor is one thing but allergens is another	Jakob DOBROWOLSKI	jakobstyle@yahoo.de
84	Many of the 65,000 acres identified in the county study are open space lands, and lands with other cultivation prohibitions due to slopes, habitats, and water restrictions.	Ron Ferraro	Ron@elyoncannabis.com
85	The 1,000 foot setbacks to sensitive spots such as schools need to be idenical for people's homes.	Brantly Richardson	nrchrdsn@sonic.net
86	This ordinance has lots of restriction, with slopes, open spaces, climate zones, if every owner property zoned properly decided to grow cannabis legally we would not even see close to 2000 Acres. I don't see Sonoma county ever pass 300 acres in next 10 years.	Ron Ferraro	Ron@elyoncannabis.com
87	Currently the fencing on West County hillsides required attracts more attention; is there a better wau	Toby Levy	Toby@levydesignpartners.com
88	Many projects are still operating after being denied by Planning commission... neighborhoods are still impacted - why is the Board of Supervisors not hearing these appeals?	Judith Olney	MilestonesMet@gmail.com
89	Why doesn't our ordinance ask for the same road width standards as the state?	veva edelson	veva.edelson@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
90	Does Sonoma County have a plan to restrict residential expansion onto agricultural zoned lands to help address residential concerns about agricultural operations and vice versa? It seems like all Agriculture, but most cannabis particularly, is under attack by residential housing development when there is more than ample land zoned for residential purposes.	Lori Pascarella	lori@bangodistribution.com
91	Are local cemeteries considered cultural resources?	Toby Levy	Toby@levydesignpartners.com
92	Is the presentation available for us to download? You're moving fast through the slides, so not possible to capture all the notes. Thank you!	Dennis Rosatti	drosatti@yahoo.com
93	Lighting and security will add electric demand and infrastructure on the grid. Can solar sources be required?	Wendy Smit	wsmit8000@gmail.com
94	Youll expand to allow cannabis tourism and events. How will you handle fire safety for those events?Will there be a capacity on attendance for safety and evacuation purposes?	Lauren Marra	lmarravmd@gmail.com
95	cannabis allows for opportunities to diversify local agricultural crops. A farmer who can grow 10% of their property in cannabis is able to fund the entire vineyard management fee of the other 90% of their property, or install an orchard, raise animals, or other crops. Allowing for incredible income diversification and a chance to supplement farms in times of economic shortages is good policy.	Yoel Chetrit	yoel@elyoncannabis.com
96	How are you going to keep the beauty of Sonoma County when you are allowing so many acres to be developed for cannabis?! Fields of hoop houses are going to change the look of our beautiful county and must be considered and controlled!	Lynn Behling	lynn.behling@me.com
97	Chapter 38 now allows electrical in hoop houses which will lead to night sky impacts	Judith Olney	MilestonesMet@gmail.com
98	California state law considers cannabis a product not a crop. Isn't the County's proposal to designate cannabis a crop a violation of state law?	Marc Bommersbach	mbommersbach@att.net
99	Can you confirm that the water resources permitted cannabis farmers are installing; ponds, catchment tanks and wells available for fire fighting should they be needed?	Craig Litwin	craig@421.group

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
100	Doesn't the presence of fencing in our landscape represent a significant impact visually?	veva edelson	veva.edelson@gmail.com
101	How will the county maintain safety when each grow will have large amounts of cash? There's already been some murders in the county because of this issue.	Gregory Koss	gkspam@gregkoss.com
102	For consistency, If cannabis is to be considered an agricultural crop, odor should be regulated just like hemp. Doesn't make sense otherwise.	Tony Linegar	tonynkrista@comcast.net
103	Why do the aren't the grows integrated polyculture gardens including diverse plantings along with cannabis?	veva edelson	veva.edelson@gmail.com
104	In spite of how many acres the facilitator thinks will be cultivated, the SMND gives a figure of 65,000 maximum potential acres.	Brantly Richardson	nrchrdsn@sonic.net
105	Under a ministerial process, cannabis grows will not align with State environmental standards, which are designed to protect waterways, wetlands and species.	Jo Bentz	jobobs@comcast.net
106	Setbacks need to be defined from property lines. 100 ft is totally inadequate. Children's backyard play areas could be 100 ft from a large cannabis grow. Schools require a 1000 ft setback. Yet children spend more of their time at home. A 300 ft setback from a residence is totally inadequate and will without question lower property values. Who wants their front door/bedroom/kitchen 300 ft from a cannabis grow? A buyer has options they will avoid any house for sale with a cannabis grow close by	Robert Nissenbaum	oakparknews@mac.com
107	Can we make zoning exceptions for legacy farms that have been recently affected by the fires?	Devin Scharff	Dscharff@sbcglobal.net
108	will the ag dept protect us from the SOS bullies? will ag dept and prmd schedule inspections 24 hours in advance to minimize trauma and stress for families. these zero-day raid have a culture of treating the cannabis farmers like criminals.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
109	Yolo county and Humboldt county have done a program EIR, why aren't we doing one here?	veva edelson	veva.edelson@gmail.com

# Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
123	is the impact of employment at new cannabis operations on evacuation routes being accounted for? What emergency preparedness measures will be required?	Elizabeth Lawson elsbethlawson@comcast.net
124	<p>Suspend issuing permits until Phase 2 is worked out. Then do a complete re-do on the ordinance following standard land use approach – IE: identify the best places for cannabis up front, rather than have rural residents having to figure it out for you.</p> <p>The best approach is to secure as many acres as needed for local growers in a single area where adequate security, water, lighting, power, etc can be had and where rural neighborhoods won't be impacted by this activity, which is much more labor, resource intensive and more intrusive than agriculture. It's commercial product development, not agriculture.</p> <p>Then growers can rent space in this area and share functions as needed. Processing can be placed nearby</p>	james bracco jim@sosneighborhoods.com
125	Do we really want the county vistas to be covered with fully visible and ugly hoop houses? I am concerned about losing our beautiful countryside and the effects on our tourism industry and tourists who come to see the beauty.	Brantly Richardson nrchrdsn@sonic.net
126	This crop is illegal federally. Please do not forget that. Thus much demand for the product all over the nation.	Wendy Smit wsmit8000@gmail.com
127	Contra Costa County allows armed guards on site to prevent robbery/theft	Devin Scharff Dscharff@sbcglobal.net
128	Is there a maximum number of hoop houses?	Toby Levy Toby@levydesignpartners.com
129	Cannabis has security fencing and night time lighting which are not typical of Ag cropla. Cannabis should not be considered an Ag crop.	Jo Bentz jobobs@comcast.net
130	How is the county going to ensure that impacts from the "trimmigrants" is mitigated? Even some growers blindfold their temporary workers, so they don't know where they are going when they are transported to the site, for fear of crime. If they are worried, we ALL should be worried!	Gregory Koss gkspam@gregkoss.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
131	Many ranchers and farmers that are looking to cultivate cannabis to diversify their income having abutting parcels, will they have to maintain a 100' setback of a property line that is in between two properties owned by the same owner??? Many other counties allow for clustering of canopy to consolidate operations which makes more sense for land owners, operators and county staff by not having to review multiple applications for 1 owner's collective properties.	Yoel Chetrit	yoel@elyoncannabis.com
132	In RRD or LEA parcels which may be 100 acres - this change to 10% allows 10 acres and 2.5 acres of structures... this are large projects requiring a discretionary use permit	Judith Olney	MilestonesMet@gmail.com
133	Can you review the maximum of 50% of lot areas for built structure; Isn't that a lot	Toby Levy	Toby@levydesignpartners.com
134	<p>i think it is fair to try to help these PRP people within reason although they are NOT all the original operators. they were the first ones to risk their farms to be protected with penalty relief. this does not give them carte blanche to receive a permit for less than the same criteria than anyone else. they 5 acre to 10 acre reduction was brutal to some of these PRP operators. think about their families.</p> <p>dont try to satisfy the SOS NIMBYS. nothing at all will ever satisfy them as they move from issue to issue trying to find any way they can to harm their neighbors farms.</p> <p>think about the young families trying to navigate this process.</p> <p>zero day raids are uncompassionate and unreasonable. treat these family farmers like human beings.</p> <p>hooray to ag dept and andrew smith for standing up for local hard working farmers of all crops.</p>	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
135	Growers neglect to put tarps over their hoop houses in Humboldt county and now there are "glow worms" lighting up what were originally dark areas. Moreover the 180 days allowed per year for hoop houses do not have to be contiguous meaning that hoop houses can produce two to three crops a year if they are using nursery clones thus the odor will be around for a period of eight months or so not two months as indicated in the SMND.	Brantly Richardson	nrchrdsn@sonic.net
136	The definition of "new buildings" should reflect when the ordinance is adopted (not Jan. 1, 2021 — the draft wasn't even available then)	Lauren Mendelsohn	Lauren@omarfigueroa.com
137	Hoop houses are not photogenic...but many would argue that rows of vineyard aren't either.	Yarrow Kubrin	yarrowkubrin.2013@gmail.com
138	so you could allow a 43,560 sqft operation 300 feet from my home and it could be built without my knowledge? Why does the county feel that I do not deserve the right to know about this BEFORE it is approved?	Lauren Marra	lmarravmd@gmail.com
139	My understanding is they grow in pots. There is no terroir or special sunshine or other magic that requires they be on our scenic vistas, invading our unique rural enclaves and the unique rural character that draws \$2.1 Billion in tourism money (jobs) Put them out by the airport in a single location.	james bracco	jim@sosneighborhoods.com
140	10% lot coverage is big area on some parcels. How can we allow this without an EIR?	veva edelson	veva.edelson@gmail.com
141	We are competing with Santa Barbara, Mendocino, and Lake County for tax dollars. 10% of the land allows for Sonoma to be competitive.	Aaron Keefer	aaronkeefer1@yahoo.com
142	with more cannabis growth, is there going to be a proportional increase in the number of code enforcement officers? How do we make sure that resources will not be stretched too thin?	Jakob DOBROWOLSKI	jakobstyle@yahoo.de
143	We need to make sure setbacks include indoor grows to mitigate odor and noise. They should be the same as outdoor setback requirements.	Gregory Koss	gkspam@gregkoss.com
144	10% of parcel makes sense! We also need clustering.	Andrew Longman	andrew.longman@421group.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
145	Temporary hoop structures and manipulation of light for control of quality or yields is very common in other agriculture. Why not allow for mixed lighting in temporary hoop structures and shift to tax on total annual yield tax as reported in METRC track and trace versus a canopy tax?	Lori Pascarella	lori@bangodistribution.com
146	i think this is a great way to discuss these issues. these facilitators are very skilled at moderating these difficult topics. i very much look forward to seeing the answers to the common questions.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
147	Drying and processing structures should also be included in setback requirements.	Gregory Koss	gkspam@gregkoss.com
148	why not limit grows to 1 acre only	Marc Bommersbach	mbommersbach@att.net
149	hoop houses are BEAUTIFUL	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
150	Allowing so much built area can possibly change the character of the rural nature of Sonoma?	Toby Levy	Toby@levydesignpartners.com
151	As stated, new buildings are not agriculture. They require discretionary permit applications. The changes will allow many more hoop houses and greenhouses.	Wendy Smit	wsmit8000@gmail.com
152	Hoop houses are temporary structures	Ron Ferraro	Ron@elyoncannabis.com
153	Hoop houses make sense to keep cannabis less visible from public, clustering cannabis operations makes sense .	Clayton Taylor	Claytoncraigtaylor@gmail.com
154	Allowing hoop houses on outdoor cannabis maintains the yields while creating a higher quality product per square foot and protects it from pesticide drift and other contaminants. Hoop houses are a critically important allowance for Sonoma County cannabis farmers in order to protect the medicine from contamination of smoke, dust, and spray from adjacent neighbors	Herman G. Hernandez	h.hernandez.ms@gmail.com
155	NIMBYS dont get to take their hatred of cannabis out on family farmers. they need to stop bullying cannabis farmers. they dont get to bully people anymore. please stick up for hard working family farms. METRC (pronounced metrec)	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
156	Clustering-- If an owner owns multiple parcels with cannabis permits, they should be able to operate on one parcel using the cultivation square footage allotment granted to all parcels. It's common sense.	Herman G. Hernandez	h.hernandez.ms@gmail.com
157	Setbacks should align with the state	Joanna Cedar	jhcedar@gmail.com
158	Electricity, plumbing can be extended to hoop houses. what is impermanent about such a structure? They are just unpermitted inexpensive green houses without filters for ventilation	Brantly Richardson	nrchrdsn@sonic.net
159	How come Sonoma is trying to expand cannabis grows when Napa county just prohibited them in agricultural areas	Marc Bommersbach	mbommersbach@att.net
160	hoop houses should NOT be forced to be removed every 6 months. so much wasted labor and expense.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
161	I agree	Sica Roman	sica@sonic.net
162	What happens to all the plastic? It only lasts 2 years	veva edelson	veva.edelson@gmail.com
163	600-1000 ft setbacks should be a minimum to property lines.....not residences. Anything less will create constant, ongoing conflict and between cannabis growers and their rural neighbors. Is this the situation the county wants to create in perpetuity in rural Sonoma County neighborhoods?	Robert Nissenbaum	oakparknews@mac.com
164	Vegetables are grown in hoop houses frequently. They are equal to ag operations and should be allowed without restriction. Interesting comparision with constructed vineyard rows.	Dennis Rosatti	drosatti@yahoo.com
165	RRD and LEA parcels are huge... clustering only impacts confined aquifers more. So 2 acres of hoop houses or greenhouses in our open space lands with electrical and lighting	Judith Olney	MilestonesMet@gmail.com
166	I support last comment	Clara Enriquez	clara.enriq@gmail.com
167	county calls hoops temporary. fire marshall allows permits for only 6 months. it should be all year and it will help on all levels.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
168	Clustering of operations make sense in terms of business operations labor resources and minimizing overall traffic.	Lori Pascarella	lori@bangodistribution.com
169	Vineyard overspray contaminates cannabis, allowing hoop houses protects the crop and reduces conflict between vineyards and cannabis farms.	Joanna Cedar	jhcedar@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
170	These ordinance updates are complicated and huge. Why is the County only allowing a 30-day time period for the public to absorb and comment on the material? This feels very rushed and overwhelming, especially in the midst of dealing with a pandemic and recovery from wildfire.	Harriet Buckwalter	hbuck@sonic.net
171	can we not "like" comments anymore?	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
172	How is noise pollution addressed? Fans can be very noisy.	Elizabeth Lawson	elsbethlawson@comcast.net
173	This comment was submitted earlier in the presentation. Please consider eliminating setback requirements on internal parcel lines on contiguous parcels under the same ownership. This provision is provided for in other jurisdictions including Lake County. This action would allow for the aggregation of cultivation operations and would serve to protect County resources, reduce the overall footprint of operations, and reduce the burden on cultivators with operations on contiguous parcels.	Josh Abrams	Josh@HigherPathConsulting.com
174	: Has the County looked at the setbacks provided for residential communities and neighborhoods in other local Counties and if so why has Sonoma County chosen not to provide an adequate setback to protect its residents? The 300 foot setback from cannabis operations is inadequate and results in impacts to residents that can't be adequately mitigated. The setback should be increased to a minimum of 1000 ' and extended a greater distance depending on locally prevailing conditions. In Mendocino County there is a 1000 ft. setback for their Community Planning Areas as well as a CUP. Other Counties such as Napa and Marin Have prohibited cannabis cultivation.	veva edelson	veva.edelson@gmail.com
175	Changes from what?	Wendy Smit	wsmit8000@gmail.com
176	I see a lot of comments from people who still perpetuate the fears derived from the war on drugs and illegal cannabis industry from pre-2016. Is the County doing education to the greater community to destigmatize the LEGAL cannabis industry in our state? Are there farmers who are willing to show the good people of Sonoma County that legal cannabis business is not an illegal, criminal enterprise?	Herman G. Hernandez	h.hernandez.ms@gmail.com
177	Show us the slide you want feedback on while we comment	Dennis Rosatti	drosatti@yahoo.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
178	what are the setbacks for greenhouses? new and existing? is there a change?	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
179	The Noise Element requires measurement from noise source to the property line. Expert testimony shows that setbacks are only effective for odor at 500-1000 feet...	Judith Olney	MilestonesMet@gmail.com
180	What if you're already operating hoop houses that are over 200 ft (the old rule) and under 300 ft (new rule)?	Jamie Ballachino	Jamie@handsintheearth.com
181	Yolo County at two-thirds the population density of Sonoma County, conducted a CEQA study, in which the environmental impact report concluded that outdoor cannabis plants must be 1,000 feet away from neighboring properties. Why doesn't Sonoma County think the same?	veva edelson	veva.edelson@gmail.com
182	i would like all cannabis farms to have a 5000 foot setback from neighbors who want to bully cannabis operators for their own personal beliefs and tastes. stop trying to make the NIMBYS happy. nothing will ever satisfy these hateful folks.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
183	Setbacks should be measured from residential property LINES not their structures. There should be a 1000 ft setback from RR zoning for residential enclaves	Toby Levy	Toby@levydesignpartners.com
184	The setback should be measured from the grow area NOT the property line.	Dennis Rosatti	drosatti@yahoo.com
185	Setbacks for schools should no less than 1,000 feet BUT from property lines -- 300ft (a full football field) is more than sufficient and has been working without issue for the last five years. Furthermore, cannabis is already limited to very few zoned properties, which will limit the amount of circumstances where this will even happen.	Herman G. Hernandez	h.hernandez.ms@gmail.com
186	if owner owns multiple properties and wants to cultivate everything in a consolidated area rather than having multiple operations with one on each property they won't be able to consolidate their operations without clustering or removing the need for setback from and landowner's own property lines.	Yoel Chetrit	yoel@elyoncannabis.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
187	Is it true that a cannabis cultivation projects 7 day a week, 24 hour operation with security lighting and fencing, waste management and water run-off issues, water use and groundwater use, dust control, odor control, energy use and noise limits, 300 feet from my residential home is mitigated by the Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts?	veva edelson	veva.edelson@gmail.com
188	The setbacks as defined are very clear for permitting purposes, and are also generous in terms of respecting the "Not in my back yard" cohort's wishes. These are agricultural, not residential zoned properties.	Lori Pascarella	lori@bangodistribution.com
189	rr= rural residential	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
190	We have already lost forest, wetlands and riparian habitat due to ministerial permitting of vineyards. Ministerial permitting of cannabis will result in loss of more of the same. We cannot afford to loss more then we already have.	Jo Bentz	jobobs@comcast.net
191	agree	Gil L	gil@sonomavalleycannabisgroup.com
192	agree	Gil L	gil@sonomavalleycannabisgroup.com
193	Both sound studies, and odor studies, have been conducted my the very capable scientist consutants to Sonoma County, as such the CEQA declaration is appropriate as it stands with respect to sound or odor mitigation requirements.	Lori Pascarella	lori@bangodistribution.com
194	these ladies could solve world peace. lets line up one of these sounding rooms with world leaders asap. i love your style. i look fwd to the matverial progress from these comments.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
195	totally right	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
196	If a setback is just under the requirement a waiver process should allow consideration with an adequate buffer.	Craig Litwin	craig@421.group
197	Humboldt county has also done an EIR and has adopted 1000ft set backs around comunitis and neighborhoods	veva edelson	veva.edelson@gmail.com
198	Why is there no pipeline clause for the setbacks? Some people listened to the original rules when they set their farms up	Jamie Ballachino	Jamie@handsintheearth.com
199	going from 1 acre to 10% is an expansion in my math	Marc Bommersbach	mbommersbach@att.net
200	There should be a variance process for parcels in RR and AR zoning classifications that may be appropriate for cottage cultivation permitting.	Joanna Cedar	jhcedar@gmail.com

# Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
201 ag propperities have their own water. no nimys have a right to meddle with farmers using their water on their land.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
202 Can there be a difference between buffer zoning adjacent to rural residential enclaves and town vs. agricultural lots further away	Toby Levy	Toby@levydesignpartners.com
203 Keep in mind that Sonoma county's 1000 ft setback already exceeds the state required 600' from sensitive uses.	Tony Linegar	tonynkrista@comcast.net
204 Being a school board member and involved in cannabis consulting I believe the setbacks should be building to building when it comes to schools at times. I don't know what you can do about this but sometimes a MASSIVE parcel in rural Sonoma County is within (or close) to 1,000 feet of a school parcel but the actual farming site and the school are seperated by way more than 1,000 feet.	Herman G. Hernandez	h.hernandez.ms@gmail.com
205 How do you respond to the face that only 645 acres of cannabis cultivation with just one harvest per year will use as much water per year as the City of Healdsburg - with 11,500 population and many visitor serving uses	Judith Olney	MilestonesMet@gmail.com
206 Can you provide specific guidelines for Net Zero Increase Groundwater plans where applicants can replace a previous water use with cannabis? What evidence is required to show previous water use? And what time frame of previous water use is considered valid evidence? Water use from a year previous? Two or three years previous to the application? How can this be included in a way that does not require discretion of the Ag Dept?	Harriet Buckwalter	hbuck@sonic.net
207 we should be allowed to truck in water	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
208 if mixed light is incrazed, water use will increase fi mroe than oen harvest per year. Has thsi been considered? Also, surface water affects gound water, they are connected.	Deborah Eppstein	deppstein@gmail.com
209 If this is a ministerial process, how are cumulative water use impacts monitored?	Wendy Smit	wsmit8000@gmail.com
210 we should be encouraged to set up water catchment systems	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
221	these nimbys only want to stop cannabis and they use every scare tactic in the book. cannabis is a ag crop and should be treated like everything else. let famers try to feed their families and employ their staff. have some compassion for the family farmers.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
222	Regenerative cultivation practices greatly reduce water usage by up to 200% if grown in the ground versus growing in pots.	Sica Roman	sica@sonic.net
223	Will the county put self-reporting meters at grow sites? How is the monitoring going to realistic?	Gregory Koss	gkspam@gregkoss.com
224	the state ready regulates water use for cannabis	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
225	Encourage water catchment! Ponds, swales, and catch basins.	Craig Litwin	craig@421.group
226	Maybe you could only allow one crop per year	veva edelson	veva.edelson@gmail.com
227	NOAA has sent letters to 2018 and 20121 stated Groundwater pumping will impact aquifers and stream flow - Fish and Wildlife is clear that that zone 3 and 4 and impaired watershed should be off limits	Judith Olney	MilestonesMet@gmail.com
228	trucked water is good for everyone. why disallow it?	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
229	Comparing cannabis to grapes Cannabis can be dry farmed or irrigated, and does not need water for frost protection or post processing. 2:1 is a ratio. Depending on the type of grape grown and for what use (table grape, wine grape, etc) the water use for cannabis cultivation can be significantly less. Plus, cannabis requires a much smaller cultivation footprint than grapes for the same financial return.	Ron Ferraro	Ron@elyoncannabis.com
230	So maybe zero water use? Vineyards are going to dry farming, can cannabis?	Elizabeth Lawson	elsbethlawson@comcast.net
231	Dry farming is a great idea!	veva edelson	veva.edelson@gmail.com
232	Require stream depletion evaluation if within 500ft, similar to how the County required water use assessments if in a low water area	Andrew Longman	andrew.longman@421group.com
233	The county should leave the regulation of groundwater to the agencies with primary authority as they have with Winegrapes	Tony Linegar	tonynkrista@comcast.net

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
261	The best solution for Andrew Smith and his department is to keep the process at PRMD. How will he provide personnel to do reviews and inspections. His department doesn't have enough people to follow VESCO and new vineyards and vineyard replants.	Wendy Smit	wsmit8000@gmail.com
262	After five years, at renewal, a sensitive use that came in during the permitted cannabis use should not by itself preclude that renewal. Is this being addressed?	Craig Litwin	craig@421.group
263	I have been in the cup process for four years .it should be higher than 5	Vincent Scholten	Norcalgrowers@hotmail.com
264	I have to get a new license to make jam every year why should it be less restrictive for growing cannabis which uses far more resources	veva edelson	veva.edelson@gmail.com
265	people need to plan and build their farms. with the uncertainty it is difficult to plan and build the cannabis buisness. dont give these cannabis haters more abilities to bully cannabis operators.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
266	If the state licenses on an annual basis why is the County considering a five year permits	Marc Bommersbach	mbommersbach@att.net
267	Absolutely should be five years. Same as vineyard and orchards, 5 years	Natasha Khallouf	Nkhalouf@yahoo.com
268	If you are investing in buildings and equipment, you should be allowed at least five years to use them.	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
269	I need more documentation for a house generator permit than what I see AG is requiring for grows.	Rachel Zierdt	rzierdt@gmail.com
270	Do not continue to say "cannabis haters" or "hateful neighbors" - every property owner has rights to the peaceful enjoyment of their property	Judith Olney	MilestonesMet@gmail.com
271	A grower cannot buid a viable business plan for a one year permit that takes years to be awarded. The investment is huge; and anyone can make complaints so the review needs to consider validity of complaints.	Dennis Rosatti	drosatti@yahoo.com
272	'@ veva there is a spectrum of what is required to get or re-aquire a permit. The permit process for cannabis is complex, costly and not very similar to getting the jamm liscence renewed.	Yarrow Kubrin	yarrowkubrin.2013@gmail.com
273	totally right	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
274	yes	Gil L	gil@sonomavalleycannabisgroup.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
275	Then stop reading posts calling people NIMBYs and haters without calling them out for it	james bracco	jim@sosneighborhoods.com
276	The wine industry makes investments in wineries but they have to get a conditional use permit	Marc Bommersbach	mbommersbach@att.net
277	if you meeting the standards you will be given an new license. If complaints are a problem maybe nighborhood comaptabilty should be addressed	veva edelson	veva.edelson@gmail.com
278	what is wrong with calling out a NIMBY?	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
279	My own experience is that vineyards are hidden in beautiful wild lands that are quickly disappearing in our county. We made the mistake years ago of letting vineyard development become a ministerial process. I don't hate cannabis, but I do hate rampant conversion of our county to parcelized high security hoop houses or greenhouses.	Wendy Smit	wsmit8000@gmail.com
280	Propagation should not have a square foot limit. The state doesn't have one. The county should align with the state.	Joanna Cedar	jhcedar@gmail.com
281	NOT IN MY BACK YARD is not a swear word or anything. thats who you are. own uop to it. if its so bad stop being hateful and stop bullyiong your neighbors please kind sir.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
282	Is there any limit to size of gatherings?	Toby Levy	Toby@levydesignpartners.com
283	'm against all the proposed changes.	Sara Peyton	sara.peyton@gmail.com
284	Cannabis allows for opportunities to diversify local agricultural crops. A farmer who can grow 10% of their property in cannabis is able to fund the entire vineyard management fee of the other 90% of their property, or install an orchard, raise animals, or other crops. Allowing for incredible income diversification and a chance to supplement farms in times of economic shortages is good policy.	Yoel Chetrit	yoel@elyoncannabis.com
285	How is the County going to improve the roads to handle additional traffic? Will there be additional fees heavy vehicle traffic on small rural road?	Elizabeth Lawson	elsbethlawson@comcast.net
286	Why are you allowing an industrial process to extract THC oil, with no oversithgt, no use permit, no ban on flammable solvents? Currently this is only allowed in indistrial zones, and flammable solvents are prohibited. It needs to be kept that way	Deborah Eppstein	deppstein@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
287	Driving while impaired has nothing to do with the county cultivation ordinance.	Joanna Cedar	jhcedar@gmail.com
288	We need to be aligned with the state law	Andrew Longman	andrew.longman@421group.com
289	Sonoma County's motto is literally "Agriculture, Industry, Recreation." Cannabis fits in with all of these and ought to be embraced rather than demonized. I am excited to see the inclusion of cannabis events and tourism in the draft ordinance.	Lauren Mendelsohn	Lauren@omarfigueroa.com
290	ag dept needs a non-canopy immature plant area where artificial light is allowed.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
291	Lets align with the state and remove the vegetative sq. footage restrictions.	Sica Roman	sica@sonic.net
292	the NIMBYs are identifying their issues and the farmers are identifying the NIIMBYS which is fair.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
293	Cannabis is not considered "agriculture" by the State - CDFA will require a project-specific environmental review including event impacts	Judith Olney	MilestonesMet@gmail.com
294	This is a really good time to address neighborhood compatability in the ordinance. If 1000ft setbacks are adopted it will go along way to ease the tension between uses.	veva edelson	veva.edelson@gmail.com
295	yes	Gil L	gil@sonomavalleycannabisgroup.com
296	I am concerned that there can be many events like 4-20 overwhelming small roads and residents	Toby Levy	Toby@levydesignpartners.com
297	I agree with allowing Self transportation being allowable.	Sica Roman	sica@sonic.net
298	Events and tourism are a part of Sonoma county tax base. Cannabis tourism will give tourist another reason to visit. They will also eat at our restaurants and stay at our hotels. And shop at our stores!	Aaron Keefer	aaronkeefer1@yahoo.com
299	why has the LIKE functionality been removed? how can you know which issues are important like the first session	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
300	how many people are on this webinar	Rachel Zierdt	rzierdt@gmail.com
301	Weed & Wine tourism will be what drives the Sonoma County economy forward for decades to come. Allowing for tasting rooms similar to wineries via the use permit process makes sense.	Lori Pascarella	lori@bangodistribution.com
302	Require bicyclists to pay a registration fee to ride on Sonoma County roads. That can help pay for the roads	Len Condor	Condorgrown@gmail.com
303	I absolutely disagree. I do not want to see cannabis tourism	Sara Peyton	sara.peyton@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
304	There should be a trigger in the ordinance that when the state allows cannabis farm stands, the county would follow suit.	Joanna Cedar	jhcedar@gmail.com
305	here's to andrew and the ag dept. he has copmpassion for ALL local farmers and we should rally behind him to help his ag dept refine this bill. i hope there are great answers to these problems.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
306	the cannabis culture helps all the local economy from restaurants to arts.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
307	Cannabis tourism is growing. It is smart to grow with it.	Craig Litwin	craig@421.group
308	In santa Barbara County, the pervasive odor is driving away tourists from wine tasting rooms	Deborah Eppstein	deppstein@gmail.com
309	Colorado found that canna-tourism did not happen... Napa found that visitor serving uses will will damaged by cannabis operation smell, terpenes and noise	Judith Olney	MilestonesMet@gmail.com
310	the county roads need work but cannabis growers should not be responsible for upgrades on public roads	Lisa Lai	allcalilisa@gmail.com
311	Will operators have to remove the infrasture if the crop is no longer grown? When the bottom drops out of the market with low prices, what will clean up the county's new buildings?	Wendy Smit	wsmit8000@gmail.com
312	tourists love cannabis. only NIMBYs making up unverified "facts"	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
313	Cannabis tourism complements the wine and craft beer industries. We're finding that a lot of wineries are very interested in working together (legally, of course).	Jared Giammona	Jared@thesonomacountyexperience.co
314	Our beautiful County should be known for what it is now Wineries and rivers, beaches, forest etc. not tourism coming for their addictions that put at risks our families	Clara Enriquez	clara.enriq@gmail.com
315	I agree I do not want to see tasting rooms...yes, the smell drives away visitors...see Santa Barbara is an example...and again the roads in our county doesn't need more pressure...	Rachel Zierdt	rzierdt@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
316	Why is the County now asking these questions? Why is the County now asking what other counties are doing (!)? Why hasn't the county written an intelligible ordinance so that everyone can understand what is and is not permitted? Why hasn't the County prepared maps so that cannabis cultivators and neighbors both know what properties will be allowed to do what? I feel sorry for the Planning Commission, who will be asked to adopt the existing ordinance in just over a week. Certainly seems like this issue has a variety of strong opinions and this all should have been ironed out -- with everyone being not entirely happy, but at least understanding what is permitted LONG before scheduling a Planning Commission hearing.	Sonia Taylor	great6@sonic.net
317	There is already over supply - when operators go elsewhere - will taxpayers have to clean up the mess	Judith Olney	MilestonesMet@gmail.com
318	will the NIMBYs pay for their own retirement when there is no economy due to their ridiculous complaining? or will they be spending OPM while cannabis operators try to feed their families.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
319	Do we know about consumers of wine vs Cannabis? Should there be "areas" where both coexist happily? I don't know if cannabis users love wine?	Jane Marra	jane.marra@yahoo.com
320	How do these changes align with the efforts to be carbon neutral in the County?	Wendy Smit	wsmit8000@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
321	<p>the state definitrion of “outdoor cultivation” is “the cultivation of matrure cannabis without the use of artificial lighting or light deprivartion in the canopy are at any point in time., Artificial lighting is permissable only to maintain immature plants outside the canopy area.” how does the proposed ordinance allow for outdoor cultivators to have an “immature plant area” outside the “canopye area”. the state definition allows for outdoor farmers to use rtificial light to keep immatrure plants from flowering. outdoor cultivators need to be abkle to define non-canopy area for keeping immature plants with artificial light. artificail light is used for immature plants by other outdoor cultivators.</p> <p>the county ordinance deleted the second sentance of the state definition of outdoor cultivation. it should be consistent w the state definaition and allow a small immature plant area with sefe and permitted outdoor lighting. maybe i am mimssing something. but it should not require a mix-light permit for this.</p>	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
322	<p>for outdoor cultivation the state allows for artificail light for immature plants in non-canopy areas. the county ag dept should allow defined non-canopy area for immature plants. there are many types of weatherproof low wattage lights. and the light can be hidden with tarps for the immature area only.</p>	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
323	<p>cannabis requires a much smaller cultivation footprint than grapes for the same financial return = Less water</p>	Yoel Chetrit	yoel@elyoncannabis.com
324	<p>In 2015 due to the drought, the residents of 5 Sonoma County watersheds were required by Dept. of Fish and Wildlife to reduce our water use during the drought in order to protect Coho Salmon; however commercial and agricultural growers were exempt from these restrictions. So the county is going to expand water use in our area for agricultural use while homeowners maybe restrictedby the state?</p>	Joan Conway	joanc358@gmail.com
325	<p>thanks ladies. great job today. thanks ag dept and andrew smith.</p>	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
326	<p>Code Enforcement team needs to be looked into. Stop harassing personal medical growers</p>	Lauren Mendelsohn	Lauren@omarfigueroa.com
327	<p>Thank you for this process.</p>	Andrew Longman	andrew.longman@421group.com
328	<p>Thank you all, especially the moderators and Andrew</p>	Wendy Smit	wsmit8000@gmail.com

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
329	give jamie ballacino his farm.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
330	no inspections with bullies from PRMD like todd hoffman.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
331	I grow 500+ lavender plants. When a neighbor over 1 mile away was growing cannabis illegally all I could smell was the skunky cannabis odor. Is there any proven way to truly mitigate that odor?	Joan Conway	joanc358@gmail.com
332	treat cannabis farmers like human beings not violent criminals with zero-day raids with jerks like todd hoffman from prmd. have some compassion.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com
333	Thank you!	Elizabeth Lawson	elsbethlawson@comcast.net
334	God Bless Andrew and the Ag Dept. NIMBY's and PRMD enforcement are bullies. defund the PRMD enforcement.	J 7	john7777777777777777@yahoo.com