

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) Siting in General:

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

- Ban all commercial cultivation in Sonoma County.

OR

(CONTINUED)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Land Use –
August 9, 2021 – 5:30 PM – 7:00 PM – Chat**

00:22:45 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Learn more: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/cannabis-program/>

00:25:48 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

00:29:50 Sarah Stierch (she/her): You can learn more about zoning in Sonoma County via Permit Sonoma: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Planning/>

00:32:13 McCall Miller: From Rich Auger: 2. Prioritize neighborhood compatibility by limiting cannabis cultivation and processing to areas that do not create noise and odor nuisances for residents, are not in public view, are not in impaired watersheds or water scarce zones 3 and 4, are accessed by legal fire safe roads and do not impact public safety. No permitting in high fire risk zones or on remote roads with evacuation challenges. Permit cannabis processing only on designated commercial and industrial zoned land. A new ordinance must address neighborhood compatibility and be science-based to ensure cannabis operation permitting does not create individual or cumulative impacts.

00:35:34 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

00:44:45 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Have other questions about this? Please email them to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

00:50:47 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

Learn more about this process and get involved: <http://shorturl.at/ovAPU>

00:53:53 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

01:03:19 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Right to Farm Ordinance:
https://library.municode.com/ca/sonoma_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=CH30AG_ARTIIRIFA

01:05:06 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

01:05:36 Sarah Stierch (she/her): Here is the General Plan's noise element:
<https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Long-Range-Plans/General-Plan/Noise/>

01:11:12 Sarah Stierch (she/her): ✉ Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Land Use –
August 9, 2021 – 5:30 PM – 7:00 PM – Chat**

01:20:29 Sarah Stierch (she/her): ✉ Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

01:21:36 Sarah Stierch (she/her): 📄 Learn more about this process and get involved:
<https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/Cannabis/Comprehensive-Cannabis-Program-Update-and-Environmental-Impact-Report/>

01:21:45 McCall Miller: From M Sidbury: Commercial cannabis growing can be done effectively without destroying the aesthetic, cultural, rural nature of Sonoma County which drew all of its residents here in the first place. It is imperative that the ordinance have strict guidelines for where and how these operations are situated so as to become part of the social fabric of the county rather than a divisive force.

Outdoor permits should only be given in areas that are zoned for agriculture: LEA, LIA and DA zoning with adequate space for setbacks from any school, park, riparian zone, impaired watershed, residential area to prevent lights, security fencing and odor from impacting the visual integrity and gestalt of the community. Parcels should be 10 acre minimums to allow for such set backs.

Community separators are totally inappropriate sites for commercial operations as they are meant to be publically enjoyed and provide natural divisions between residential clusters.
(cont)

01:22:12 McCall Miller: continued: Operations should not be grown on slopes greater than 15 degrees so as to minimize erosion and loss of rainfall absorption.

Our native woodlands and forests must be protected from further loss as they are a necessary component to mitigating the effects of drought and climate crisis.

Indoor operations should be in industrially zoned areas where light and odor pollution is not likely to impact residents. Security measures will be more in keeping with the surrounding pre-existing usage.

Rows and rows of hoop houses with artificial lighting 24/7 is definitively not compatible with our rural environment. These operations also need to have appropriate and adequate power and waste disposal capacity.

The proposed siting of these operations should include a projection of 20 years into the future of where natural growth will occur and what kind of resource demands will be needed to meet that growth. We can expect our current drought situation to be a norm rather than a fluke and need to plan accordingly

01:27:16 Sarah Stierch (she/her): 📄 Learn more about this process and get involved:
<https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/Cannabis/Comprehensive-Cannabis-Program-Update-and-Environmental-Impact-Report/>

01:28:31 Sarah Stierch (she/her): ✉ Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

📄 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

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

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

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

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

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

🔗Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

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

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

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

🔗Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

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

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

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

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

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

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

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

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

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

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Safety Concerns –
August 10, 2021 – 5:30 PM – 7:00 PM – Chat**

00:12:06 Sarah Stierch: 🗨️The Coastal Zone will not be effected by this ordinance. See what comprises the Coastal Zone here: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Services/Zoning-and-Parcel-Report/Zoning-Codes-Coastal/>

00:12:11 Sarah Stierch: ✉️Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

🔗Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

00:12:44 Spanish interpreter, Julie Burns: Habrá interpretación simultánea inglés/español y español/inglés durante todo el taller

Por favor, seleccione el idioma en el que prefiere seguir el taller en el menú de interpretación en la parte inferior de su pantalla de Zoom.

- LOCALICE EL ÍCONO DE INTERPRETACIÓN – está en la parte inferior derecha de su pantalla
- SELECCIONE su canal – Spanish (ESPAÑOL)

- Seleccione "mute original audio" para silenciar el audio original

00:20:02 Sarah Stierch (she/her): ✉️Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

🔗Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

00:27:52 McCall Miller: From M Sidbury: Fire and emergency in- and egress must adequately meet State regulations, which limits the use of many of our sub-standard roads and lanes. Any dead end road would not be suitable Any area that has been designated as a evacuation risk should be off limits. High and very high fire zones should be off limits and any area in the wildland-urban interface zones should be required to have multiple access points for safe evacuation of the neighborhoods. (cont)

00:28:04 McCall Miller: Continued: Processing sites should be located away from fire risk areas to assure that any accident with chemicals does not contribute to fire danger and is easily accessible to first responders. There should be access to proper wastewater hook up to make sure that any runoff of chemicals does not end up in our riparian areas or groundwater supply. Use and storage of these chemicals needs to fall under state/federal regulation for safely compliance. Only extraction processes and solvents that have federal and state approval for health and usage safety should be permitted.

00:29:18 McCall Miller: From N Fleig: No permitting in high fire risk zones or on remote roads with evacuation challenges. Permit cannabis processing only on designated commercial and industrial zoned land.

00:41:45 Sarah Stierch (she/her): ✉️Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Safety Concerns –
August 10, 2021 – 5:30 PM – 7:00 PM – Chat**

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

00:45:54 McCall Miller: From K Roberts-Gutzman: We are finding the sheriff's department won't respond to our calls, about gun shooting, fire works during fire season. Grows don't belong in neighborhoods. Next door to families

00:55:06 Sarah Stierch: ✉️ Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

00:59:07 Sarah Stierch: 🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

00:59:15 Sarah Stierch: 🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

01:04:01 Sarah Stierch: ✉️ Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

01:12:40 Sarah Stierch: ✉️ Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

01:24:04 Sarah Stierch: ✉️ Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

01:24:59 McCall Miller: From N Fleig: Prioritize neighborhood compatibility by limiting cannabis cultivation and processing to areas that do not create noise and odor nuisances for residents, are not in public view, are not in impaired watersheds or water scarce zones 3 and 4, are accessed by legal fire safe roads and do not impact public safety. No permitting in high fire risk zones or on remote roads with

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Safety Concerns –
August 10, 2021 – 5:30 PM – 7:00 PM – Chat**

evacuation challenges. Permit cannabis processing only on designated commercial and industrial zoned land. A new ordinance must address neighborhood compatibility and be science-based to ensure cannabis operation permitting does not create individual or cumulative impacts.

01:25:15 McCall Miller: From K Roberts-Gutzman: Safety also involves the number of vehicles rural roads a seeing. This product is not a crop and shouldn't be allowed to operate 24/7.

01:29:06 Sarah Stierch: ✉Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Water Considerations –
August 11, 2021 – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM – Chat**

00:19:22 Sarah Stierch: ✉ Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

00:19:47 Sarah Stierch: 📍 The Coastal Zone will not be effected by this ordinance. See what comprises the Coastal Zone here: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Services/Zoning-and-Parcel-Report/Zoning-Codes-Coastal/>

00:26:04 Sarah Stierch: ✉ Please send us your ideas, questions, feedback and thoughts to cannabis@sonoma-county.org.

00:34:19 McCall Miller: From T Levy: Request the Board of Supervisors impose a moratorium on groundwater wells for cannabis cultivation in Groundwater Availability Zones 3 and 4 for ministerial and CUP discretionary approval. Groundwater wells in any areas in the County designated as Groundwater Availability Zones 3 or 4. These are areas where groundwater supplies are limited and uncertain; thus, vulnerable to groundwater overdraft and reduced groundwater recharge.

Require comprehensive Water Availability Analysis: Determine all current and projected water usage needs in the County across all uses - residential, agricultural, commercial and industrial- and based on this information, determine available water for new cannabis operations under drought conditions as well as historical averages. (cont)

00:34:39 McCall Miller: Continued: Recommend the County pre-test the adequacy or reliability of net-zero water plans – (rainwater catchment basins, etc.) and whether they interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. These analyses are crucial in light of the drought that has gripped this State for the past several years.

Demand an adequate analysis of Environmental Setting- by watershed: The County must gather data and complete analyses on:

- the number of existing legal and illegal cultivation sites, including renewals
- then estimate the number of eligible sites (based on siting criteria) that may apply for permits,
- accurately estimate the amount of water supply needed for those sites,
- evaluate the potential impacts on surface and groundwater resources,
- proactively evaluate whether net-zero catchment plans produce needed water supplies and impacts on groundwater replenishment for neighboring well.

00:35:22 McCall Miller: From D Donovan: given the extreme drought we are all in, no new commercial well permits should be issued for the foreseeable future, until several years of rainfall indicate that weather patterns have returned to what they were when recharge rates of aquifers were first calculated as being adequate to support homes and farms. This isn't singling out the cannabis industry, in particular. And it shouldn't pertain to permits to REPLACE aging or drying-up wells; but to adding new wells. It is just common sense for the entire county, to be able to manage the diminishing water resources we all must share.

00:36:57 McCall Miller: From N Graalman: In the end: Sonoma County should be a state leader in recognizing the mega-drought emergency. There are NO new "codes" that would protect an

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Water Considerations –
August 11, 2021 – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM – Chat**

irreplaceable resource in aquifers and in streams and rivers throughout Franz Valley and all of Sonoma County if cannabis operations are permitted. Cannabis permitting should be halted.

00:37:34 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: What do you think are the most important water resources that we need to protect as we develop the guidelines for the cannabis program? Given the current drought and what now appears will be regular future droughts due to climate change, commercial cannabis cultivation should be one of the lowest priorities after uses for housing, traditional agriculture, and wildlife habitat. Existing aquifers and wells, ground and surface water and water from rivers and streams that are currently being used by existing individual residences and neighborhoods should not be depleted or reduced.

00:40:22 Sarah Stierch: ✉️Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

00:41:58 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: What would a successful cannabis operation look like that protects our water resources? All operations should be required to have grey water systems and storage systems installed. All cultivation should be done by drip systems or by hand watering. Given the current and what appears will be the future water shortages, only operations that use onsite water supplies that do not impact any water supplies outside of the cannabis related properties should be allowed if at all. Limit the number of permits issues and permit only small so called “mom and pop” operations. When residential and others are types of uses are asked or mandated to reduce water usage this should also apply to cannabis operations. No special favors for cannabis operations.

00:42:07 Sarah Stierch: ✉️Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

00:44:22 McCall Miller: From D Donovan: In the future, there will be a greater need to dry farm crops. Those which do not lend well to dry farming (such as water-hungry almonds, for example) will not be able to adequately adjust to the "new norm" of less water availability, and may be replaced by crops and varieties which are able to get by on less.

00:46:46 David Kuszmar (he/him/his): Sonoma County Water Supply, Use, and Conservation Assessment Guidelines can be found here: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Policies-and-Procedures/8-2-1-Water-Supply-Use-and-Conservation-Assessment-Guidelines/>

00:48:16 Sarah Stierch: ✉️Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Water Considerations –
August 11, 2021 – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM – Chat**

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

00:54:28 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: What would successfully protecting natural habitats and species look like when it comes to cannabis cultivation? Prohibit any commercial cannabis operations from using water from the Russian River and its tributaries. Require greywater systems. Operations should only use on site water that does not impact sources of water for other properties. Require significant setbacks to streams and rivers and control and recirculate runoff.

00:55:04 Sarah Stierch: ✉️ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

00:55:48 McCall Miller: From T Levy: - Use Geo-spatial analysis to map at parcel scale, then exclude parcels with certain sensitive habitats, per CDFW.

01:00:38 David Kuszmar (he/him/his): The Water Boards' riparian setbacks apply state-wide based on stream type. Here is a link to the statewide Cannabis Cultivation Policy:
https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/cannabis/docs/policy/final_cannabis_policy_with_attach_a.pdf

01:00:44 David Kuszmar (he/him/his): Refer to Attachment A, Definition 100 and General Term 37 for details.

01:02:24 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: What would successfully protecting riparian corridors look like when it comes to cannabis cultivation? Do not allow any commercial cannabis cultivation in riparian corridors or in areas that would have an impact on riparian corridors. Require setbacks that would not allow runoff to get into riparian corridors and recirculate runoff.

01:03:04 Sarah Stierch: Figure out if you should double state water setbacks, or follow the most strict standards that are already in place for any ag

01:04:38 Sarah Stierch: ✉️ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

01:05:15 Sarah Stierch: 📄 Here is the County's Right to Farm ordinance:

https://library.municode.com/ca/sonoma_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=CH30AG_ARTIIRIFA

01:07:26 David Kuszmar (he/him/his): For those interested in learning more about cannabis irrigation sources and water use rates in Northern California counties, check out this 2019 article, co-written by a members of the North Coast Regional Water Board staff:
<http://calag.ucanr.edu/archive/?article=ca.2019a0011>

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Water Considerations –
August 11, 2021 – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM – Chat**

01:07:33 Sarah Stierch: ✉️Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

01:07:44 David Kuszmar (he/him/his): Similar work by UC Berkeley researches is ongoing, and additional published works are expected soon.

01:11:16 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: What would successful water conservation efforts for cannabis cultivation look like in normal years? Newsflash: this year may now be the new normal. Therefore there should not be any further expansion or new approvals of cannabis operations period.

01:18:08 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: What would a successful approach to a drought look like for cannabis cultivation in the county? Put in place an immediate moratorium on accepting, processing, and approving any applications for cannabis cultivation and impose new requirements on existing commercial operations such as grey water systems and rainwater storage

01:19:47 Sarah Stierch (she/her): ✉️Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

01:24:14 Sarah Stierch (she/her): ✉️Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

01:28:00 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: What does successful accountability look like when it comes to water and cannabis? What would it mean to hold cannabis growers accountable? Any violations of any water regulations, conditions of permits, and water conservation measure requirements should be immediately and aggressively investigated (without advance notice to the operators as to on site investigations) and if substantiated should be immediately abated and fines levied. Any cannabis operator violating water requirements should be required to pay all costs of investigation and abatement. There should be zero tolerance. If the operator is in violation of water requirements and regulations more than twice, their permit should be revoked and operation closed down. In addition all permits should be reviewed on an annual basis and if operators are found to be out of compliance, abatement proceedings should be commenced and pursued to conclusion with operator paying all costs. (cont)

01:28:05 McCall Miller: continued: Operators should not be given any special exemptions from County ordinances or regulations regarding water usage. Operators should be required to post a bond

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Water Considerations –
August 11, 2021 – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM – Chat**

upon issuance of any permit to pay for potential abatement proceedings and fines. There should be ownership and residency requirements placed operators to limit out of county operators.

01:31:37 Sarah Stierch (she/her): ✉️Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

01:33:04 McCall Miller: From R Rudnansky: What additional thoughts do you have about the water aspects of a successful cannabis program?

All these visioning sessions and the questions being asked seem to assume that there will expansion of cannabis operations. Rather, it seems to me that the Board of Supervisors should revisit whether there should be any cannabis cultivation or other operations permitted in the County at all rather than how to expand the industry. Given climate change, the current drought, and the continued demand on water from housing development, any new ordinance should not provide for any additional cannabis operations that are not at this time already permitted. (cont)

01:33:19 McCall Miller: Continued: There should immediately put in place a moratorium on accepting, processing, or approving any applications for cannabis operations. Include and analysis in the EIR a “no project” alternative (i.e. no further expansion of cannabis industry) for consideration by the public and the Board. Do not exempt existing operations from any water regulations or conservation measures imposed on or asked of the general public.

01:35:41 Sarah Stierch (she/her): ✉️Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

01:39:01 David Kuszmar (he/him/his): The Water Boards regulate discharges of waste associated with cannabis cultivation sites through its statewide Cannabis Cultivation Policy and General Order. For more information about statewide requirements for cannabis cultivators, click here: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/cannabis/cannabis_water_quality.html

01:40:54 Sarah Stierch (she/her): ✉️Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

01:41:23 McCall Miller: From N Graalman: The siren song of cannabis profits makes moot any true concern about curbing the water-rapacious cannabis operations. The guided sessions to get to "what will a successful cannabis program look like" for water, riparian corridors, safety . . anything . . . seem to be Kabuki theater.

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Water Considerations –
August 11, 2021 – 5:30 PM – 7:00 PM – Chat**

17:33:17 From Sarah Stierch to Everyone:

✉ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

17:33:25 From Sarah Stierch to Everyone:

🐾 The Coastal Zone will not be effected by this ordinance. See what comprises the Coastal Zone here: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Services/Zoning-and-Parcel-Report/Zoning-Codes-Coastal/>

17:36:46 From Sarah Stierch to Everyone:

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

17:40:03 From Sarah Stierch (she/her) to Everyone:

✉ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

17:46:52 From David Kuszmar to Everyone:

Water rates cited are from the Sonoma County Water Supply, Use, and Conservation Assessment Guidelines, which can be found here: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Policies-and-Procedures/8-2-1-Water-Supply-Use-and-Conservation-Assessment-Guidelines/>

17:48:56 From Sarah Stierch (she/her) to Everyone:

✉ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

17:49:05 From David Kuszmar to Everyone:

For those interested in learning more about trends in cannabis irrigation sources and water use rates in Northern California counties, check out this 2019 article, co-written by members of the North Coast Regional Water Board staff: <http://calag.ucanr.edu/archive/?article=ca.2019a0011>

Similar studies by UC Berkeley researchers are underway, and additional published works are expected soon.

17:57:10 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From C Bokaie: Growers use water conserving methods such as dry farming and grow drought resistant strains of cannabis Crops are limited during drought

17:59:04 From David Kuszmar to Everyone:

The Water Boards regulate discharges of waste associated with cannabis cultivation sites through its statewide Cannabis Cultivation Policy and General Order. For more information about

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Water Considerations –
August 11, 2021 – 5:30 PM – 7:00 PM – Chat**

statewide water quality protection requirements for cannabis cultivators, click here:
https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/cannabis/cannabis_water_quality.html

18:13:22 From Sarah Stierch (she/her) to Everyone:

✉ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

18:17:15 From David Kuszmar to Everyone:

The Water Boards' riparian setbacks apply state-wide based on stream type. Here is a link to the statewide Cannabis Cultivation Policy:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/cannabis/docs/policy/final_cannabis_policy_with_attach_a.pdf

Refer to Attachment A, Definition 100 and General Term 37 for details.

18:19:35 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From R Krauss: It is strongly recommended that no cannabis production operations be allowed in upland watersheds (County Water Availability Zones 3 and 4) and in particular watersheds already designated as impaired.

18:19:53 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From J Ballachino: Rip out half (32,500 acres) of vines and replace them with 1000 acres of cannabis . Bring in more tax revenue, save 75% of the water. This is the only solution. Do this or we become a desert.

18:25:04 From Crystal Acker to Everyone:

For all attendees: Please use respectful language. Thank you.

18:27:27 From Sarah Stierch (she/her) to Everyone:

Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

18:27:34 From Sarah Stierch (she/her) to Everyone:

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

18:27:37 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From C Bokaie: Use newly updated data of water reserves and usage to assess the amount of cannabis the county could sustain without threatening current water use and needs.

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Water Considerations –
August 11, 2021 – 5:30 PM – 7:00 PM – Chat**

18:36:13 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From C Dusk: Adopt a moratorium until Sonoma County prepares an EIR to determine environmental conditions and an Ordinance to set standards for the industry. Under the current ordinance we will have cannabis 100 feet from our property lines and 300 feet from our residential homes. Stop accepting new cannabis applications until an environmental setting document is prepared and circulated which analyzes the County's water resource capacity and calculates current water use.

18:36:30 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

Continued: We are in an historic and prolonged drought. Today it was reported that residents living on Harrison Grade are watching their wells run dry. With the progress of Climate Change we can expect to see increased water scarcity and drought (California Department of Fish and Game). Many people in rural areas rely on their wells to provide water. Over-pumping aquifers leads to the collapse of the aquifer. That's it. They cannot be restored. This leaves existing agriculture and residents without the ability to provide water for themselves. It is urgently important to protect our aquifers from over water consumption and deep well drilling by cannabis cultivators. We must protect our wetlands to provide an environmental buffer. We must protect our water sheds. This is not the time to be seriously considering permitting large tracts of cannabis cultivation as it is a crop that requires six times the water that grapes do. Therefore, Cannabis must be prohibited from zones 3 and 4, impaired watersheds

18:37:52 From Sarah Stierch (she/her) to Everyone:

✉ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

18:48:00 From Sarah Stierch (she/her) to Everyone:

✉ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

18:50:34 From Sarah Stierch (she/her) to Everyone:

✉ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Visual Considerations –
August 12, 2021 – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM – Chat**

11:32:47 From Sarah Stierch to Everyone:

✉ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

11:41:29 From Sarah Stierch to Everyone:

We'll be using the dismiss tool in Zoom for any comments that are racist, sexist, homophobic, or ageist, or anything considered vulgar or disrespectful of others. These posts will still be part of the public record, they just won't detract from today's conversation.

11:47:10 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From D Donovan: one of the attractions has always been the county's bucolic countryside and mixed agricultural pursuits. From cows, sheep, and horses to fields of plants, it's a pleasure to drive through the county, see things growing and hear cows mooing, and enjoy the sweeping expanses of countryside unfettered by the dense housing and structures I came from as a San Francisco native.

11:47:50 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From P Pfahl: The beautiful rolling hills of Sonoma County would become an eyesore when covered by plastic "hoop houses" that degrade after a couple years, then shredded by winds and polluting the environment .

11:48:08 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From R Rudnansky: Sonoma County is a special place. The natural beauty rivals any place in the world in my opinion. If the County allows cannabis cultivation such operations should not be visible from individual residences, neighborhoods, roadways, and scenic corridors like Bennett Valley and Sonoma Valley.

11:48:33 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From V Edelson: What I value most about the look and feel of our Sonoma Landscape especially here in west county is the gentle rolling hills and pasture lands.

I love seeing animals on the land. I feel calm and settled by the landscape. This feels like a safe and trusting community of agriculture and residents.

11:50:57 From Sarah Stierch to Everyone:

✉ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Visual Considerations –
August 12, 2021 – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM – Chat**

11:54:52 From Sarah Stierch to Everyone:

REMINDER: We'll be using the dismiss tool in Zoom for any comments that are racist, sexist, homophobic, or ageist, or anything considered vulgar or disrespectful of others. These posts will still be part of the public record, they just won't detract from today's conversation.

11:55:42 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From D Donovan: I picture these hoop houses going in behind hills and in places not visible to the general public or to neighbors. There, they can sweep, multiply, and reside. (However, with a caveat: a more careful environmental consideration of where they are placed, so that they don't uproot endangered wildlife or draw dry the drought-stricken aquifers wildlife and people alike rely on.)

11:56:09 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From R Rudnansky: What are the types of places where cannabis cultivation should be allowed because it wouldn't impact the visual beauty of our county? Other counties and states.

11:57:09 From Sarah Stierch to Everyone:

✉ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

12:01:55 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From R Rudnansky: What are the characteristics of the types of places where cannabis cultivation wouldn't be a good fit? (a) Rural Residential, R1, R2, and R3 Zoning districts, (b) scenic corridors like Bennett Valley and Sonoma Valley (c) any location where a cannabis operation can be seen from public roadways, individual residences, and neighborhoods, (d) properties that are adjacent to Rural Residential, R1, R2, and R3 zoning districts, (e) if staff or the Board of Supervisors want to see what the impact is of allowing commercial cannabis cultivation in scenic valleys, take a road trip to the Applegate Valley in Oregon which was once a beautiful bucolic setting until commercial cannabis operations were allowed and ask whether this is what is wanted in Sonoma County

12:03:19 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From N Graalman: Large-scale cannabis "farms" and associated operations -- especially any structures, lights, etc. -- should NOT be in small, unique valleys such as Franz Valley. Franz Valley qualifies in some considerations as a "boxed canyon" with its small, winding roads.

12:08:47 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From R Rudnansky: What would cannabis cultivation operations look like in a successful program? They would not be allowed or at the very least be invisible from roads, individual residences, and neighborhoods.

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Visual Considerations –
August 12, 2021 – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM – Chat**

12:09:15 From Sarah Stierch to Everyone:

✉ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

12:09:43 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From D Donovan:

A successful cannabis program will not have acres of big plastic houses in full view of residents, tourists, and drivers.

12:11:37 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From D Donovan: Proximity, proximity, proximity. Make setbacks larger when immediate neighbors and residential uses are nearby, and reduce them when grows are located on expansive properties where neighbors already reside far from the property line (no, 100-300 feet is NOT far enough! 1,000-foot is a MINIMUM, and should, in some cases, be larger, when the grow is located near a neighborhood, public park, school, etc.).

12:18:17 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From R Rudnansky: If the County insists on having any cannabis cultivation in the County cultivation,

- should not be visible to surrounding areas because the natural topography hides the operation
- screening should be required and the screening should be natural vegetation (not cannabis) rather than unsightly fences

12:20:29 From Sarah Stierch to Everyone:

👤 Here is the County's Right to Farm ordinance:

https://library.municode.com/ca/sonoma_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=CH30AG_ARTIIRIFA

12:20:53 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

REMINDER: We'll be using the dismiss tool in Zoom for any comments that are racist, sexist, homophobic, or ageist, or anything considered vulgar or disrespectful of others. These posts will still be part of the public record, they just won't detract from today's conversation.

12:22:24 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From R Rudnansky: What would a cultivation site that isn't separated well look like? Really? How about not allowing cultivation sites in the County that are not separated well.

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Visual Considerations –
August 12, 2021 – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM – Chat**

12:24:20 From Sarah Stierch to Everyone:

✉ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

12:26:42 From Sarah Stierch to Everyone:

✉ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

12:29:11 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From R Rudnansky: Again, I don't accept your premises that there should be a cannabis program particularly commercial cultivation, in Sonoma County but if the County insists cannabis operations should be limited to industrial zoning districts with all necessary visual mitigation measures so they are not seen by individual residences or neighborhoods.

12:29:41 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From D Donovan: . Retail sales and tasting rooms should be limited to main corridors, just like retail endeavors always are. Put them in trafficked places where streets, emergency services, and police are nearby, to help growers and residents alike. This also takes the onus of self-policing expenses away from growers and places them where they should be: as part of existing county-wide services designed to support businesses located in appropriate commercial and retail locations.

12:30:24 From Sarah Stierch to Everyone:

Today's powerpoint: <https://share.sonoma-county.org/link/-pn0a5McFKU/PowerPoint%20Presentations/Cannabis%20Update%20Visioning%20Session%20PPT%20Visual%20Considerations%2008-12-2021.pdf>

12:31:11 From Sarah Stierch to Everyone:

REMINDER: We'll be using the dismiss tool in Zoom for any comments that are racist, sexist, homophobic, or ageist, or anything considered vulgar or disrespectful of others. These posts will still be part of the public record, they just won't detract from today's conversation.

12:34:14 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From R Rudnansky: Down lighting that is not visible to residences or neighborhoods, roadways, scenic corridors like Bennett Valley and Sonoma Valley.

12:38:16 From Sarah Stierch to Everyone:

Section 2.4

12:38:16 From Sarah Stierch to Everyone:

<file:///Users/sarahstierch/Downloads/General-Plan-Open-Space-and-Resource-Conservation-Element.pdf>

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Visual Considerations –
August 12, 2021 – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM – Chat**

12:38:23 From Sarah Stierch to Everyone:

<https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Long-Range-Plans/General-Plan/Open-Space-and-Resource-Conservation/>

12:42:58 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From R Rudnansky: Any violations of any regulations, conditions of permits, and other requirements should be immediately and aggressively investigated (without advance notice to the operators as to on site investigations) and if substantiated should be immediately abated and fines levied. Any cannabis operator violating requirements should be required to pay all costs of investigation and abatement. There should be zero tolerance. If the operator is in violation of its permit and other requirements and regulations more than twice, their permit should be revoked and operation closed down. In addition all permits should be reviewed on an annual basis and if operators are found to be out of compliance, abatement proceedings should be commenced and pursued to conclusion with operator paying all costs. (cont)

12:43:11 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

continued: Operators should not be given any special exemptions from County ordinances or regulations. Operators should be required to post a bond upon issuance of any permit to pay for potential abatement proceedings and fines.

There should be ownership and residency requirements placed operators to limit out of county operators.

12:43:59 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From D Donovan: Set up a responsive, effective entity for reporting violations that is mandated to quick response and quick shut-downs of facilities that choose to flaunt the law. In the winery industry, I know of entities that consider fines "part of doing business," for example. They just pay any fines and keep on doing what they want. Have clear guidelines to immediately shut down and lock up a facility that flaunts the laws. Even a stiff fine is considered nothing, by entities with deep pockets.

12:49:02 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From R Rudnansky: Once again all of these questions seem to suggest that the majority of citizens of Sonoma County want commercial cannabis cultivation and operations in the county. The question and issue the Board should consider is whether the majority of their constituents want any expansion of cannabis operations or any at all. Please include that alternative in your report to the Board.

12:51:53 From Sarah Stierch to Everyone:

✉ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Visual Considerations –
August 12, 2021 – 5:30 PM – 7:00 PM – Chat**

17:38:30 From Sarah Stierch (she/her) to Everyone:

✉ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

👤📄 Today's presentation: <https://share.sonoma-county.org/link/-pn0a5McFKU/PowerPoint%20Presentations/Cannabis%20Update%20Visioning%20Session%20PPT%20Visual%20Considerations%2008-12-2021.pdf>

17:39:17 From Sarah Stierch (she/her) to Everyone:

REMINDER: We'll be using the dismiss tool for any comments that are racist, sexist, homophobic, or ageist, vulgar or disrespectful of others or deemed irrelevant to tonight's goals. The comments will still be part of the public record, they just won't detract from today's conversation. Thank you.

17:47:51 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From S Olsen: The visual beauty of Sonoma County that I value as a third generation Sonoma County resident is the open vistas seen from almost any road. Whether it is the undeveloped land with the native grasses and trees, the pasture land with the cows, sheep, horses, and the like, or the vineyards with the annual display of colors, Sonoma County offers an idyllic place to live.

17:49:23 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From D & V Strain: Sonoma County's tourist industry is largely based on its rural character, bucolic countryside vistas and rolling green hills dotting with grazing animals. To protect this valuable industry, Sonoma County must identify existing and eligible cannabis cultivation sites that may apply for a cannabis cultivation permit and provide an analysis of view sheds and simulations of views from public viewpoints such as trails, roadways, parks and scenic vistas to determine the best siting to mitigate visual impacts.

17:50:38 From Sarah Stierch (she/her) to Everyone:

✉ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

17:54:52 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From D & V Strain: Commercial cannabis cultivation operations must not be visible in designated scenic Corridors or scenic landscape units. Siting of operations and/or screening must not degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views and its surroundings and/or have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

17:55:32 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From K Roberts-Gutzman: NO cannabis in rural neighborhoods

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Visual Considerations –
August 12, 2021 – 5:30 PM – 7:00 PM – Chat**

17:56:09 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From C Dusk: Therefore, we urge the County to prohibit cannabis cultivation and processing in rural and residential development zones, slopes over 15%, in voter approved community separators or where visible from scenic roads, parks, public right-of-ways or any identified scenic resource. Prohibit cannabis cultivation/processing in our dwindling oak woodlands or anywhere where the operation will necessitate the felling of native trees.

17:57:30 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From K Roberts-Gutzman: Grow cannabis in warehouses where it is out of sight

18:03:41 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From D & V Strain: Prohibit cannabis hoop house use in any location that can be seen from a Scenic Corridor, a public park or a public right of way, classify hoop houses as outdoor cultivation with no electrical, plumbing or mechanical, limit the siting of hoop houses and require that no flapping plastic exists or contaminates the environment

18:04:39 From Sarah Stierch (she/her) to Everyone:

Map for scenic corridors, etc. <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Long-Range-Plans/General-Plan/Open-Space-Scenic-Resource-Areas/>

18:04:39 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From R Krug: This agricultural crop should not be grown anywhere remotely near suburban neighborhoods. Industrial areas, not residential.

18:05:36 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From G Frederickson: The unsightly tall, plastic screened fences (as seen in construction sites) are commonly used for screening grows, creating a huge eyesore covering acres of a parcel. This is not in character with other properties in rural neighborhoods - traditional farms have fencing that keeps people out but still allows scenic views. We do not want to see those construction fences all over Sonoma County's beautiful countryside. Why must the marijuana plants be screened from view? We would prefer to see the plants rather than eight foot high plastic screens.

18:10:02 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From G Frederickson: Fences in character with the area. Deer or cattle fencing with standard barbed wire. Require vegetation for screening. There are many fast growing shrubs. Do not allow acres of land to be covered with 8+ ft high plastic screened fences that ruin scenic views and property values.

18:10:52 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From S Olsen: Visually separating a cannabis operation means putting it someplace where it is simply not visible. Perhaps what that means is putting cultivation operations where no one expects to have a view. If an operator wants to establish a grow he/she can buy land in an industrial park. If it is not visually separated you end up with an eyesore when you look out your window.

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Visual Considerations –
August 12, 2021 – 5:30 PM – 7:00 PM – Chat**

18:11:14 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

Continued: . Retail and supply chain don't really require visual separation. These businesses simply need to operate within the zoning requirements and the law.

18:15:46 From Sarah Stierch (she/her) to Everyone:

✉ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

18:17:26 From Sarah Stierch (she/her) to Everyone:

💡 Visit this link to learn more about the General Plan's Open Space and Resource Conservation Element which includes lighting, rural character, landscaping, scenic corridors and more.

<https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Long-Range-Plans/General-Plan/Open-Space-and-Resource-Conservation/>

18:18:56 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From D & V Strain: Specifically require the provisions of the County's Open Space & Resource Conservation Elements are applicable to Commercial Cannabis Cultivation.

Require that no light escape structures from dusk to dawn, and that security lights are aimed downward

18:20:38 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From K Roberts-Gutzman: No type of structure makes a difference when everything stinks.

18:21:26 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From D & V Strain: If the use of plastic sheeting is allowed by Sonoma County require cannabis applicants to develop a Recycling and Plastic Management Plan to cleanup cultivation sites and to prevent pollution of natural resources, danger to wildlife and aquatic animals, prevent plastic debris drift on adjacent properties and public rights of way and reduce aesthetic blight

18:24:17 From Sarah Stierch (she/her) to Everyone:

You can download the General Plan's element about lighting here:

<https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Long-Range-Plans/General-Plan/Open-Space-and-Resource-Conservation/> Visit section 2.4

18:28:33 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From N Graalman: Re lighting: Only the absence of light -- except for the night sky -- can preserve the character of Franz Valley and all of Sonoma County.

**Cannabis Visioning Session – Visual Considerations –
August 12, 2021 – 5:30 PM – 7:00 PM – Chat**

18:28:34 From Sarah Stierch (she/her) to Everyone:

✉ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

18:31:04 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From S Olsen: . The accountability for visual issues required an open and transparent permitting process where proposed activities are required to address the visual aspects or their proposed operation and that all affected neighbors are given proper notice and an opportunity to be heard. Ministerial approvals should not be a part of the process.

18:34:23 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From K Roberts-Gutzman: Cannabis rules are the rules. If you can't follow them you done.

18:35:56 From Sarah Stierch (she/her) to Everyone:

✉ Please email us your ideas, questions and comments to Cannabis@sonoma-county.org

🔗 Learn more about this process and get involved:

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

18:38:50 From McCall Miller to Everyone:

From K Roberts-Gutzman: Cannabis should but out of sight. It is a control substance
Protect ou neighborhoods. We are saddened by the loss of our neighbors that are leave the
state. Please know our wonderful neighbors are LEAVING