

Sonia E. Taylor  
306 Lomas Lane  
Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
707-579-8875  
[Great6@sonic.net](mailto:Great6@sonic.net)

18 March 2021

Larry Reed, Chair, District 2  
Todd Tamura, Chair, District 2  
Gina Belforte, District 3  
Greg Carr, District 1  
Caitlin Cornwall, District 1  
Pam Davis, District 5  
John Lowry, District 5  
Cameron Mauritson, District 4  
Jacquelynn Ocaña, District 3  
Sonoma County Planning Commission

McCall Miller -- [cannabis@sonoma-county.org](mailto:cannabis@sonoma-county.org)

[PlanningAgency@sonoma-county.org](mailto:PlanningAgency@sonoma-county.org)

Via email

Re: Draft Cannabis Ordinance and Draft Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration  
Planning Commission Hearing Scheduled for March 18, 2021

Gentlepersons:

My apologies. I thought I was done writing letters on this subject, but I have one final concern that I want to bring to your attention.

Proposed Chapter 38, in Section 38.12.050, contains a requirement for a Cultural Resources Survey at paragraph C. Both the Sonoma County Farm Bureau and Erin Gore of the Garden Society (and perhaps others) have requested that you eliminate all requirements for a Cultural Resources Survey in proposed Chapter 38, because:

“[W]e are concerned this regulation will eventually be imposed on all of agriculture.”  
[Farm Bureau]

And

“No other agriculture crop is required to do a Cultural Resource Survey.” [Ms. Gore, the Garden Society]

In the limited time I have to write and submit this letter, I believe that they are correct that no other agricultural activities are required to do such a Cultural Resources Survey.

However, I believe that all agricultural activities are required to comply with subparagraph D of Section 38.12.050, which covers what I believe are State requirements regarding human remains and cultural resources (see, for example, Section 26.18.040 of the current Zoning Code).

Frankly, given the fact that Native Americans lived throughout Sonoma County historically, and that all human remains and cultural resources are not only protected under State law, but are important to preserve not only for the Tribes, but for all of us, I believe that instead of eliminating the requirement for a Cultural Resources Survey from proposed Chapter 38, it should instead be required of all agricultural and other activities that disturb the ground.

Other letters from cannabis cultivators have a different talking point about this section, requesting that a list of cultural surveyors be pre-approved by local Tribes and be available for cannabis businesses (and other agricultural activities, in my opinion) to utilize. I think that this is a reasonable request that should be fulfilled.

Again, of course, I do not believe that the proposed Chapter 38 can be adopted as is, or with changes, because the Supplemental Mitigated Negative Declaration herein is defective under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

As always, I am happy to talk with any one of you regarding this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or require additional information.

Very truly yours,

Sonia E. Taylor

Cc: Tennis Wick, Permit Sonoma Director  
Scott Orr , Permit Sonoma Deputy Director  
Sonoma County Board of Supervisors  
Robert Pittman, Sonoma County Counsel  
Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria  
Andrew Graham, Press Democrat  
Julie Johnson, Press Democrat  
Jim Sweeney, Press Democrat  
Will Carruthers, the Bohemian  
Sierra Club  
Sonoma County Conservation Action  
Greenbelt Alliance  
Preserve Rural Sonoma County  
Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition