

Public Comment Regarding Cannabis Ordinance and  
Program Update

Received November 2023

---

**From:** Moira Jacobs <[moiraajacobs@comcast.net](mailto:moiraajacobs@comcast.net)>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 6, 2023 10:36 AM  
**To:** Susan Gorin <[Susan.Gorin@sonoma-county.org](mailto:Susan.Gorin@sonoma-county.org)>  
**Cc:** BOS <[BOS@sonoma-county.org](mailto:BOS@sonoma-county.org)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: More health perils from pot

Good morning Susan,

Doesn't the BOS ever wonder if they may have put Sonoma County in further legal jeopardy long term if the health risks of marijuana far out weigh any benefits?

Since the County is going out of its way to promote the production and distribution, yet also with no, or very minimal, warnings to the general public nor any comprehensive checks on

how/where it's distributed, might a case be made someday for reckless endangerment of public health?

Has the Board of Supervisors ever posed this question to the County legal counsel, and if so what was their answer? Do I need to file a public records request to get this information?

At the very least, why would any health conscious county want to be promoting this drug with zero scientific R&D willy nilly? I'm still wondering about the rationale for Sonoma County's policy.

Moira

Saw this today on CNN--no surprises here, but a focus on older people shows significant health risks:

<https://www.cnn.com/2023/11/06/health/marijuana-heart-stroke-risk-wellness/index.html>

--

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED OUTSIDE OF THE SONOMA COUNTY EMAIL SYSTEM.

**Warning:** If you don't know this email sender or the email is unexpected, **do not** click any web links, attachments, and **never** give out your user ID or password.

---

**From:** concerned citizens <ccobloomfield@gmail.com>

**Sent:** November 27, 2023 1:40 PM

**To:** Scott Orr <Scott.Orr@sonoma-county.org>; Crystal Acker <Crystal.Acker@sonoma-county.org>; Tennis Wick <Tennis.Wick@sonoma-county.org>; McCall Miller <McCall.Miller@sonoma-county.org>; David Rabbitt <david@davidrabbitt.com>; Lynda Hopkins <Lynda.Hopkins@sonoma-county.org>; district4 <district4@sonoma-county.org>; Susan Gorin <Susan.Gorin@sonoma-county.org>; district3 <district3@sonoma-county.org>

**Subject:** Development of the "Residential Enclave" for cannabis EIR

**EXTERNAL**

**TOBY LEVY**  
**6200 BLOOMFIELD ROAD**  
**PETLUMA, CA 94952**

Mr. Scott Orr; Assistant Director

Ms. Crystal Acker; Supervising Planner

Permit Sonoma Staff and Sonoma County Board of Supervisors

Re: Proposed Cannabis Zoning and Residential Enclaves

Dear Scott and Crystal:

Thanks for your recent update on the status of the Cannabis EIR. The current work being done is the "Development of *Residential Enclave* Mapping for the Cannabis EIR". This effort is likely a result of the many years of contention between the commercial growers, the neighbors, and the County over the appropriate places for these commercial operations. Although the criteria of "Residential Enclave" is under development, the concepts of Neighborhood Compatibility, Exclusion zones, Inclusions zones, setbacks and lot size are part and parcel to the concept. We in Bloomfield believe this is the Number 1 issue to get right for a successful Ordinance.

In consideration of the zoning for commercial growing of Cannabis in the county, any rules should acknowledge and respect the historic residential enclaves that have always existing in the Sonoma

County. There are over 20 of such enclaves with less than 2500 residents scattered throughout the county.

Bloomfield is a prime example of a denser concentration of smaller scale residential homesteads within the larger agricultural plots. Many of these towns, like Bloomfield, Graton, Fulton, Cazadero, Valley Ford, Bodega were established in the 1850s and have remained occupied and thriving for the past 170 years. In fact, Sonoma County has already recognized these established areas with the "RR" Rural Residential zoning amid the LEA agricultural zoning. The RR lots are vary in size from  $\frac{3}{4}$  an acre up to 10 and house a variety of families, ages and occupations. Given the origin and limited population, the infrastructure is local and aging. The properties are served by narrow roads, septic systems, and local wells. The homes are protected by limited, distant shared fire and policing services. We are very subject to changing weather patterns including unpredictable wind and rain.

Given the above, we are very concerned about the potential impacts of large-scale cannabis cultivation adjacent to these residential enclaves. We request that you protect the existing residents from the impact of the commercial grows in consideration of the following issue:

Water: and the supply of safe and available water; In fact, many of the towns have limited water supply and new substantial demand would endanger the viability of these neighborhoods.

Air quality: Given the changing wind patterns the odors and other contaminants are of a concern, in particular the prop 65 carcinogenic terpene Beta-Myrcene which is present in the odor of most cannabis strains and poses significant respiratory health impacts to all exposed.

Public Safety: Given the time and distance of Police and Sheriff stations, our communities are very vulnerable.

Fire Access and Road Safety - Proposed grows should be accessed directly from major country roads and not reliant on the existing often narrow and aging street network. Our roads are often impassable due to their widths, flooding and poor conditions, the addition of commercial demands could endanger residents.

Given these concerns we urge you to study in detail the impacts prior to creating any rules and creating any "as-of-right" or conditional use permits in these areas. Commercial Cannabis and Residential neighborhoods don't mix. The BOS experienced it firsthand.

The recent event at the Oct 3rd Board of Supervisors meeting drives home this point (See Press Democrat "More vitriol aimed at Sonoma County Board of Supervisors, this time in person", Oct 6<sup>th</sup> <https://www.pressdemocrat.com/article/news/more-vitriol-aimed-at-sonoma-county-board-of-supervisors-this-time-in-pers/> ). A man who received your approval for a commercial cannabis grow site located in the middle of a residential neighborhood, who opened a gun shooting range on this property and regularly uses it, stormed the BOS meeting, basically takes it over, resulting in the meeting being adjourned before the supervisors had completed their business. Viewing the pictures and dialog from the meeting, the Board of Supervisors looked shaken, understandably so. Supervisor Lynda Hopkins stated, "I've never seen so many deputies there before." None felt comfortable to handle the situation without law enforcement support.

Please get this right in the updated Cannabis ordinance.

Thank you for your attention.

Toby Levy FAIA

[toby@levydesignpartners.com](mailto:toby@levydesignpartners.com)

Member of Concerned Citizens of Bloomfield

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED OUTSIDE OF THE SONOMA COUNTY EMAIL SYSTEM.

**Warning:** If you don't know this email sender or the email is unexpected,  
**do not** click any web links, attachments, and **never** give out your user ID or password.