

**From:** [Deborah Eppstein](#)  
**To:** [Scott Orr](#); [Crystal Acker](#); [Cannabis](#)  
**Subject:** additional talking points  
**Date:** August 18, 2021 7:56:18 PM

---

## EXTERNAL

Dear Scott and Crystal,

Thank you so much for listening to us today. I know that Judith send in collated comments (except for Rue's) but I wanted to add a few more.

I urge the county to enact a moratorium, at very least stop accepting new cannabis applications until the full water availability and county-wide needs are analyzed, and ideally until the new ordinance is in effect. Either way any permits that are approved now need to fall under the new ordinance once it is in effect. Thus any permit renewal would need to fall under the requirements of the new ordinance.

I appreciated your comment that it is much easier to terminate ministerial permits for failure to follow rules than it is for a CUP. I also urge the county to require conditional use permits for all applications, with a 1 year term, renewable annually if there are no violations or unresolved complaints. That would address the problem you mentioned this morning about the difficulty in terminating CUPs. This also aligns better with state licenses, which are for an annual term.

Concerning the language in the RFP for potential EIR consultants, we greatly appreciate that you will share this with us ahead of time. But what is also critically important is that we are able to provide comments and input on what is in the RFP before it is finalized to send out to prospective applicants. We also would like to see the responses provided by the applicants so we can provide input to the county prior to a decision.

Concerning the Yolo County cannabis EIR, this is a good tool for the county to use in issuing permits under its current cannabis ordinance concerning 1000 ft minimum setbacks, but we still need to fully analyze odor relative to distance under the upcoming EIR. The 1000 ft minimum setback for outdoor grows in the Yolo EIR (limited to 1 acre) should be a guidance for now, but each permit still needs to be analyzed for its particular characteristics that may require longer setbacks, such as topography, meteorological data including fog, humidity and wind. I and others have experience unacceptable levels of cannabis odor 3000 ft away when downwind. No odor should be detectable at parcel boundary. For the county to say that a certain level of odor is acceptable for neighbors is simply not right.

Finally, the discussion in the General Plan on "Interface of homes to wildlife habitat and agriculture" discusses 'gentrification' of Sonoma County, and states that it is 'the highest ranked "small parcel" county in California, reflecting the past history of small parcel development throughout the county. This has created a land use pattern where much of the county's land areas experience an interface with woodlands, agriculture and homes. As people continue to move into these dispersed rural residential areas (gentrification), conflicts arise when area residents not connected with agriculture are exposed to noise, odors, traffic and other activities.'" This now applies even more so to cannabis cultivation which would be classified as 'there activities', which was not even contemplated when the last update to the General Plan was done.

I appreciate your reply to my question, that you will be putting in concrete numbers in the draft ordinance, such as for minimum setbacks, and for cultivation caps by type. But I honestly don't see how this can be done prior to the EIR analysis. I recall supervisors stating that any numbers put in a draft ordinance will not bias what the EIR determines, but it still seems very tenuous. How on earth can you come up with a cap by cultivation type county wide, with no prior analysis?

Thanks again, and I look forward to continuing interaction in this ongoing process.

Debby  
Deborah Eppstein

**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:** [Judith Olney](#)  
**To:** [Cannabis](#)  
**Cc:** [Deborah Eppstein](#); [Scott Orr](#); [Rue Furch](#); [Sonia Taylor](#); [Laura Waldbaum](#); [Cc: Kristen Decker](#); [Judith Olney](#)  
**Subject:** Re: 2015 RRD background document  
**Date:** August 18, 2021 2:43:29 PM  
**Attachments:** [Group 8 August 18,2021 Input.docx](#)

Crystal and Scott: Thank you again for the opportunity to provide input prior to the BOS meeting. Given other commitments, Rue Furch will submit her comments separately. Attached are the collated comments from Group 8 - cc'd above.

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.

## Group Session 8 - Input to County on August 18, 2021

**Sonia Taylor comments: It is essential to establish an adequate baseline of existing conditions:** including all existing permitted, PRP projects and applications in the pipeline, etc. Please see my letter of August 13<sup>th</sup>, which I resent this morning to both of you. I am concerned that, as you stated in our meeting, you believe that the EIR consultant will be establishing the existing conditions/baseline setting, instead of staff.

I'm also sorry to hear that you don't have adequate direction to prepare the draft cannabis ordinance, which will serve as the project description for the EIR. I understand that you'll get more direction when you go to the Board of Supervisors over the next couple of years, and that gathering public input is of course important, and will help to inform the draft ordinance.

My basic comments are:

- I expect the existing conditions to address current demands from all current land use: existing residential, commercial, tourist-serving venues. Also reasonably foreseeable demands, such as RHNA, permits in the pipeline, PRP, etc. Please see my much more specific August 13<sup>th</sup> letter.
- For the EIR's evaluation to be adequate, I believe that the EIR will have to define the capacity of public services, roads and utilities to accommodate the demands from this additional commercial development (water infrastructure, wastewater treatment plants, landfill, police and fire services, safe evacuation capacity, etc. Again, please see my much more specific August 13<sup>th</sup> letter.
- I have a concern with Ordinance as the project description – CEQA requires an accurate, stable and finite project description for the full cannabis program – the EIR can only have a hope of being adequate if existing conditions/baseline are accurately set forth and if the project description is clear.

Finally, there are some things that I think MUST be excluded from any draft cannabis ordinance, including but not limited to:

1. Never in voter approved Community Separators – no security fences, no security lighting, no hoop houses. Period.
2. Never on easements purchased by the OSD with taxpayer dollars (likely not permitted unless/until federal legalization, but should be prohibited in the event federal legalization happens) – no security fences, no security lighting, no hoop houses.
3. Never visible from any public road, any park, any Community Separator, or from any scenic resource, including Scenic Landscape Units, Scenic Highways and Corridors and Greenbelts, Greenways and Expanded Greenbelts – no security fences, no security lighting, no hoop houses.
4. Never in groundwater zones 3 and 4. Never in any other groundwater zone without adequate scientific testing showing adequate reliable water.
5. Never allow trucking in of water or treated wastewater.

## Group Session 8 - Input to County on August 18, 2021

6. Never in any very high/high fire danger zone. Cannabis is very flammable, unlike grapes.
7. Never on any road that is a dead end and/or is not wide enough to allow passage of fire trucks at the same time evacuation is taking place. Never on any road that is not legally adequate under State law.
8. Never allow odor to leave any indoor cannabis cultivation/operations.
9. Never allow conversion of lands currently or in the recent past used for food crops to cannabis operations.
10. Never allow use of hoop houses without a robust enforcement program to ensure that the plastics used are not allowed to enter our environment.

There could be numerous other “nevers,” but those will need to be determined by a robust EIR. For instance, the determination of adequate setbacks from all sensitive uses, what the capacity is for new sheriff and fire coverage for new uses, how much water and treated wastewater is available for all new uses, limitations imposed by the location of cultural/historic resources, determination of the availability of power supply for new uses, determination of the capability of our landfill to dispose of new materials such as disposal of all plastics used by hoop houses, determination of capacity for disposal of new wastewater generated by new uses, etc. These new “nevers,” again, will not be able to be determined until after preparation of the EIR.

Thank you, again, for your time and hard work.

**Judith Olney Comments: I too am speaking for good governance and responsible land use planning.** I am participating in this process to set the expectation that the County will prepare a legal path forward for cannabis permitting— this path requires the County to develop both a thorough analysis of the current Environmental Setting and fact-based technical studies to develop the mitigation measures for the future Ordinance.

In other words, an Ordinance Framework ONLY can be used to identify the expert-led studies that produce the substantive evidence required to define siting criteria, performance standards, setbacks, acreage caps and other mitigation measures.

5 main points; and, as with others, multiple submittals into the administrative record:

1. The legal path forward requires permitting through the Conditional Use Permit process – this includes parcel and site-specific analyses as required by state cannabis licensing and environmental law.

The County can streamline the permit process by integrating state-agency requirements into our process UPFRONT so that long-term water availability, wastewater disposal capacity, safe access roads, adequate minimum setbacks and other state protections are assured before the Applicant spends time and money on other studies.

2. A key role of an EIR is to address cumulative community, public safety and impacts to natural systems— Cumulative impact analyses will determine what areas must be excluded. Likewise, as the County identifies the least impactful locations for cannabis operations, it is

## Group Session 8 - Input to County on August 18, 2021

still important to set caps or cultivation acreage limits by watershed as well as density caps to prevent future cumulative impacts.

3. I support the General Plan's goals for city-centered growth and preservation of our natural landscapes: Thus, I support clustering intensive cannabis cultivation, processing, manufacturing and retail on industrial and commercially zoned lands – these are areas with adequate water, wastewater processing capability and police and fire protection. In addition, city centered growth will have the least impact to our tourist-based economy.
4. Regulations require the County to assess ALL costs of additional public services and utilities needed to service the full cannabis program: Although the cannabis commercial product promises tax revenue to our County and cities, other counties have learned that addressing externalities, including the costs of additional police and fire services and upgraded utilities, has significantly reduced potential benefits. Measures must be taken to prevent imposing additional taxpayer and ratepayer burdens on Sonoma County taxpayers.
5. Last, and most important: Water is our most precious public trust resource: Land use patterns and intensity of use have changed significantly in the past 20 years since the last comprehensive EIR. Thus, it is imperative that the County conduct a **water resources availability study**, including continuing drought scenarios, to ensure supply for all current permitted uses, and to set measures that protect against continued groundwater overdraft and reduced groundwater recharge.

One issue with preparing the ordinance framework before the environmental setting is defined is that many areas have already exceeded their carrying capacity – this is why parcel-specific analysis is so important on our Ag and Resource zoned lands ... For example, recent hydrogeology reports for new winery applications, even in our water rich valleys along the Russian River, have shown that new water demands may draw water from the zone of influence of neighboring wells.

Thus, per the Ag Resource Element of our General Plan and the recommendations by both Federal and State agencies, all cannabis operations, using groundwater sources in ANY groundwater zone, should complete a peer-reviewed hydrogeologic study, not just well tests, to ascertain whether the new water demand will negatively impact existing wells or groundwater recharge. And, trucking of urban wastewater should remain prohibited as proof of on-site water is required and recycled water contains unprocessed chemicals that may degrade confined or fractured rock aquifers.

**Laura Waldbaum Comments: It is well established that groundwater and surface water are connected.**

Recent letters from both NOAA and CDFW have put the County on notice that groundwater withdrawals are harming flows in impaired waterways containing listed species. Low summer flows are the largest contributor to decreased salmonid survivorship. (NOAA 12-19-2019, CDFW

## Group Session 8 - Input to County on August 18, 2021

3-17-2021, Grantham et al 5-4-2012)

Recent Court decisions in Siskiyou County have found that Cities and Counties have “an affirmative duty to protect Public Trust Resources” including decisions made concerning groundwater. (ELF vs Siskiyou County and SWRCB).

Watersheds provide water to the basins and the Russian River which supply the drinking water to Sonoma and Marin County residents. Extracting groundwater changes streams from “gaining streams” which contribute to groundwater supply and surface flows in the Russian, to “losing streams” causing diminishing streamflow.

Differing types of aquifers react differently to groundwater withdrawals. The County groundwater mapped zones are not based on actual site specific water availability but rather on regional geologic mapping done decades ago. The studies on groundwater availability and sustainability done as part of the current SGMA planning process pertain to alluvial aquifers found in the Santa Rosa Plain and Sonoma Valley. Current SGMA planning is limited to the basins.

The aquifers found in the watersheds and those mapped as Class 3 and 4 are fractured rock aquifers. In these aquifers water is found in pockets and may or may not be connected to rivers and streams. Recharge areas may be distant from a specific aquifer and there may be long delays from the time of groundwater extraction before effects are felt on neighboring wells or surface water flows. Even after groundwater pumping ends depleted conditions can continue in streams for decades.

“ In many cases the time from cessation of pumping until full recovery can be longer than the time the well was pumped” USGS Circular 1376

Water collected in winter to fill offsite storage can have impacts on summer flow because sheet flow is not allowed to infiltrate and recharge groundwater supplies.

Water availability studies required in water zones 3 and 4 by the existing ordinance are inadequate to determine impacts on parcels outside of the applicant parcel for several reasons.

1. The studies are based on decades old well data.
2. No site-specific data is collected, rather the reports rely on a decades old regional publication which the authors of the publications specifically warn “This analysis is based on limited available data and relies significantly on interpretation of data from disparate sources of disparate quality”.
3. The hydrogeologist authors of the site-specific reports submitted as part of the application process all provide a limitation section which states that the reports are based on assumptions and may or may not accurately assess conditions at the site.
4. It is not actually possible to accurately assess water drawdown without installing and continuously gauging streams and monitoring wells in the area.

**Summary: Managing water withdrawals in impaired watersheds (which are already in overdraft in the summer months) as well as in water zones 3 and 4 is critical for both listed**

## Group Session 8 - Input to County on August 18, 2021

species and domestic water supplies in Sonoma County. Removing any additional water from these areas is not appropriate without first understanding where specific isolated aquifers are located. To do this a real regional water availability study would need to be done which would be enormously expensive and extremely difficult and time consuming. The few available water balance studies are based extensively on modeling with little to no ground truthing or continuous metering of streams or test wells. Site specific water availability studies currently being conducted as part of the CUP process are inadequate to “prove” no impacts to streams or wells because of the inability to collect data on neighboring properties and streams. In other words the true extent of available water in these areas is unknown and will likely remain so. For this reason these watershed should be excluded from commercial cannabis cultivation to protect the environment and future drinking water supplies.

**Deborah Eppstein Comments: Siting in appropriate locations must take Health and Safety laws into consideration:**

### Fire Safety

Human activity and development in the WUI cause over 90% of wildfires- eg from power infrastructure (includes solar/batteries), increased traffic/vehicles, cigarettes, campfires, etc)

Consistent with the General Plan Land Use and Public Safety Elements (LU-7, PS-3), commercial activities including cannabis operations should NOT be located in:

- Areas subject to high or very high fire hazards
- Areas constrained by water availability. Water scarce zones 3 and 4, and impaired watersheds, should be categorically excluded. Even in water zones 1 and 2, peer-reviewed hydrogeological reports are needed for all water zones; all water availability and present and future needs countywide needs to be properly analyzed
- Remote areas where adding intense power usage such as for indoor or greenhouse grows (including batteries for solar arrays) increases fire risk

Consistent with State law and the Public Safety Element, commercial activities including cannabis operations should NOT be located:

- On subpar roads that don't allow safe concurrent fire apparatus ingress and civilian evacuation
- Using any access roads that do not meet the state fire safe regulations

Such locations result in additional fire and safety risk including:

- Additional fire risks from human activity
- Additional fire risk from oil-containing cannabis plants (unlike vineyards)
- Remote locations make access by fire apparatus challenging
- Trucking in water on narrow mountain roads for fire fighting creates additional hazards (Note that water should never be trucked for cultivation)
- Evacuation risks on narrow or dead-end roads. Many of our roads are already unsafe for evacuation with current development; this includes both windy or narrow rural roads but also even larger collector roads that



## Group Session 8 - Input to County on August 18, 2021

have been unable to efficiently move traffic during mandatory evacuations

- Emergency access issues (sheriff, fire apparatus, ambulance,)

A 2015 study (Key Issues and Policy Options: Cannabis Cultivation within RRD) by the county enumerated these situations and associated risks in RRD. It acknowledged that many illegal grows were in RRD (they could be hidden due to remote location) and some of these populated the Penalty Relief Program applications. Despite that many of these PRP sites are in direct opposition to the points mentioned above (including state law) and illustrate historical bad locations for illegal grows, the county has approved some of these.

Eliminating RRD for cannabis cultivation would remove many fire, water and safety concerns.

### **Proximity to Residents: Odor, Noise, 24/7 Activities, Crime, Safety (public nuisance)**

#### Odor

- Prevailing cannabis odor will negatively impact the scenic beauty of Sonoma County. Outdoor grows need to be limited within areas to prevent overconcentration issues including associated odor
- For outdoor cultivation, odor can and must be objectively analyzed for each site
- Scientific modeling using grow size, topography and meteorological data is available to determine distance terpenes travel (eg Ortech consulting). Odor should not be detectable off-site
- A minimum 1000 ft setback to parcel line may be insufficient for odor control in many situations. Site topography and meteorological (eg wind) data may require setbacks of ½ mile or more. I have smelled strong cannabis odor 3000 ft downwind from a remote outdoor grow
- Outdoor grows should be limited in size, up to 1 acre max and only on very large ag parcels far removed from residences. Suggest limiting outdoor cultivation to smaller grows of 10,000 sf meeting state's appellation requirements (grown in ground (no soil bags), no artificial light, no hoop houses). Hoop houses are very bad environmentally, encompassing visual blight, carbon footprint, contributing micro plastics to the environment, and filling landfills
- Although low-odor strains for outdoor cultivation should be considered, enforcement would be subjective and this would not remove the need to large setbacks
- For indoor and greenhouse grows, require filters to prevent odor from leaving all structures
- Indoor and greenhouse grows should be in industrial zones only, or in existing structures if on Ag land. They should never be in RRD due to high energy requirements increasing fire risk
- The current situation is clearly not working when near residences or on unsafe roads (many objections from public)

## Group Session 8 - Input to County on August 18, 2021

Other Public Nuisance: Noise, 24/7 Activities, Crime, Safety (for all cannabis activities)

- Distance is only mitigation
- Never locate cannabis operations on dead-end roads shared with residences or on private easements unless agreed by all parcel owners. This usurps rights of parcel owners to peaceful and safe enjoyment of their property and can necessitate that they file lawsuits just to maintain their property rights. The county did recognize this as an important issue in its PRP application, where applicants had to show that they had rights to use a private road for their commercial use
- Never locate cannabis operations in remote locations over 10 min from emergency response. Crime is always a real danger and burglaries happen on near-by residences as well as cannabis sites
- Indoor/greenhouse grows also need setbacks even when odor is kept within the structure. If they are restricted to industrial zones with good 24/7 security and infrastructure, this also benefits growers. The county could evaluate if such pre-determined locations with adequate water, wastewater disposal, renewable energy and security may be suitable for ministerial permitting
  - Such grow operations generally appear to be working in industrial zones, based on lack of objections

**Cultivation caps** - Currently there is a huge over supply of cannabis in California relative to use in California (both legal and illegal). In addition to analyzing caps on cannabis cultivation due to adequate availability of water, wastewater disposal, landfill capacity and setbacks from residences in conjunction with all other needs county-wide (agriculture, housing, commercial, industrial), Sonoma County should also consider total need for cannabis production statewide.

### **Kristen Decker Comments:**

No ministerial permitting.

- i. This is a new industry with a high risk of unintended consequences, as seen in many other California counties and other states. Each location must be evaluated on its own merits with neighbor opportunity for input.
- ii. Each location must have defined CUP permitted uses that include acceptable maximum canopy size/count, water use, wastewater removal, impact on wildlife species, chemicals, noise abatement, odor abatement, minimum 1,000 foot setback to neighbors (or more depending on winds, topography, etc. as determined by EIR), access, traffic evaluation including fire and crime safety standards for roads and connections to potentially overburdened major thoroughfares (ie, dead end road with fire or active crime scene blocking residents from only exit to safety). These permitted uses must be kept and posted at location at all times for county inspections.

## Group Session 8 - Input to County on August 18, 2021

- iii. Each location must be evaluated to insure the health, safety and peaceful enjoyment of neighboring properties especially in light of 24/7 operations. Use of private roads and easements only with consent of landowners/easement owners. Many of these roads cross private land and serve neighboring residences, and landowners should have the right to NOT participate in the cannabis industry. The county should not give permission for cannabis facilities to use someone else's land without the landowner and shared easement right owners granting permission.

### Robust enforcement a necessity for the success of an ordinance both for legal growers and for neighborhood compatibility

- iv. An ordinance that requires funding for monitoring and enforcement.
- v. Development of a Marijuana Enforcement Task force within the sheriff's department, similar to the MET in use in Humboldt County working with other agencies: PRMD, Fish & Game, Water Resources. MET to investigate and serve search warrants on suspected illegal locations including immediate eradication of all plants & processed product by county personnel, stiff penalties and fines along with any related criminal charges.
- vi. Unannounced inspections of permitted locations. County to monitor legal facilities without giving notice, confirming cannabis permit requirements are being followed. Stiff fines and penalties for breaking ordinance or permitted uses that are NOT waived or reduced, and ordinance framework for loss of permit by offenders, including false information on permit application. Potentially shorter permit timeframes to provide non-renewal for those that break the rules or extend beyond permitted uses.
- vii. Regular monitoring, without notice, by the Ag department of Hemp locations with plant testing to insure hemp growers are not growing cannabis and circumventing the ordinance. Stiff fines and penalties, destruction of all plants and forfeiture of all current hemp and cannabis permits (if any), and disqualification from future cannabis and hemp permits.
- viii. No tolerance policy for breaking the ordinance and permit requirements. Potentially segregate requirements into categories specific to "no tolerance" part of the ordinance as discussed (ie, not losing license for trash can with no lid, but losing license for growing more than permitted use or closer to neighboring parcels than allowed).

**From:** [Sonia Taylor](#)  
**To:** [Scott Orr](#); [Cannabis](#); [Crystal Acker](#)  
**Cc:** [Judith Olney](#); [Deborah Eppstein](#); [Kristen Decker](#); [Rue Furch](#); [Laura Waldbaum](#)  
**Subject:** Re: INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE: Cannabis Program Update Small Group Outreach - Group 8  
**Date:** August 18, 2021 8:36:06 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[8\\_13\\_21\\_EIR\\_exisitng\\_conditions\\_ltr\\_final\\_1.pdf](#)

---

Thanks for your response, Scott.

I am attaching my August 13th letter, again, as it is germane to today's small group meeting. I will attempt to get any/all additional comments regarding our meeting to you promptly so they can be indexed with our group.

Sonia

Sonia Taylor  
707-579-8875  
[great6@sonic.net](mailto:great6@sonic.net)

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.

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

13 August 2021

McCall Miller  
Crystal Acker  
Scott Orr  
Sonoma County Planning Department

Re: Cannabis Environmental Impact Report

Gentlepersons:

While I had the opportunity to participate in each of the “visioning session” this week about what a draft cannabis ordinance might look like, I have to object to what seems to be the idea that Sonoma County intends to use a draft cannabis ordinance as the project description for the upcoming Cannabis Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

I do not believe that a draft cannabis ordinance is an adequate project description for this EIR, and unless and until Sonoma County adequately describes the existing conditions in Sonoma County, it will be difficult to develop an acceptable project description for the EIR.

A successful cannabis ordinance EIR will adequately and accurately evaluate existing conditions in Sonoma County, which must include not just listing and taking into account the impacts of all existing legal cannabis operations, but all illegal operations, all operations in the Penalty Relief Program, and all permits under consideration as of the date of commencement of the EIR. It also would be prudent to take into account all permits reasonably foreseeable during the duration of the EIR so that the EIR can adequately evaluate their cumulative impacts.

Further, the EIR must include evaluation of all constraints on our water supply by all users in Sonoma County (including the total water Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA) has available, identification of how much of that available water SCWA sells, whether inside or outside Sonoma County, identification of all remaining unsold and/or available water SCWA has at its disposal, AND identification of all users in Sonoma County with any water rights, adequately identified so they can be evaluated as a draw on our overall water system), so the EIR can adequately reach a conclusion about how much water is available for any/all new users in the unincorporated areas. This must include all housing units Sonoma County – including the incorporated jurisdictions – will be required to build over the next 20 year period (as assigned by RHNA), as all those housing units will require water resources from both SCWA, the Russian River, and groundwater, leaving less water available for other uses.

Any water evaluation must also include the availability of treated wastewater in the County, including accurate assessment of all Sonoma County users with preexisting rights to any treated wastewater, total amount of available treated wastewater (after preexisting right holders are satisfied), identification of the location of that treated wastewater, and identification of all means of transferring that treated

wastewater to potential end users, such as through existing pipes, through planned new pipes, through trucking, etc.

The evaluation of existing conditions must also include identification of all parcels in Sonoma County that are in very high and high fire danger areas, as well as all uses currently in those areas, reach a conclusion about the adequacy of available fire protection services for existing uses, and then reach a conclusion about the amount of fire protection services capability remaining for new uses. This evaluation must include an accurate evaluation of all roads serving all parcels in very high and high fire danger areas, including whether those roads are legally adequate. In addition, the evaluation of parcels within very high and high fire danger areas must include an evaluation of evacuation routes for those properties and the ability for those properties to safely and timely evacuate any residents, employees and/or guests then on site in the event of an emergency.

Of course, there are many other conditions that also must be adequately and accurately evaluated to establish existing conditions for the cannabis EIR, including but not limited to:

- Establish the location of all sensitive receptors – including residential uses – throughout the County.
- Establish the location of all parks, all lands protected with easements by the Sonoma County Agricultural and Open Space Preservation District, all Community Separators, all Scenic Landscape Units, all Scenic Highways and Corridors and Greenbelts, all Greenways and all Expanded Greenbelts, and set forth the limitations and restrictions on all other county properties as a result of these designations.
- Establish the location of all existing permanent structures on all County properties that are being used or could be used for cannabis cultivation, including the age, condition and size of each such building.
- Accurately set forth the limitations and restrictions imposed by the current Sonoma County General Plan and the current Sonoma County Zoning Code on all County parcels being considered for cannabis operations.
- Work with all Native American tribes and representatives to establish the location and/or probable location of all cultural resources, including possible human remains, on all unincorporated County lands.
- Establish the location of all County lands impacted by endangered, protected and sensitive species, including specific identification of all restrictions and protections imposed on those lands by Federal law, State law and County law, ordinance or regulation.
- Establish the amount of electric power available for all unincorporated lands in Sonoma County, including identification of properties currently served by electric power and whether that power is currently adequate to serve proposed cannabis operations, identification of properties with power adjacent to the property even if not currently available on site, identification of unincorporated properties without either existing electric power or adjacent power lines, and identification of all expansions of electric power planned in the foreseeable future.
- Establish the availability of space in Sonoma County's land fill/dump for all new uses, including but not limited to available space for disposal of plastic sheeting and plastic pipes from hoopouses.
- Evaluate the ability of individual parcels in unincorporated Sonoma County to dispose of wastewater and list the manner each parcel will dispose of wastewater; and evaluate the

capacity of each and every municipal wastewater treatment plant, including their unused capacity to determine the wastewater disposal capacity available for new uses.

- Evaluate the ability of the Sheriff to provide law enforcement services to all existing uses in the County, and their capability remaining to provide law enforcement services to these new proposed uses.<sup>1</sup>

While the “visioning sessions” may have provided interesting information the County was not previously aware of, again, I don’t believe that drafting a new proposed cannabis ordinance to use as the project description for the cannabis EIR will be adequate, and would instead encourage the County to take a different path. Commencing the hard work of preparing the existing conditions would seem to be a much better use of time.

Frankly, if Sonoma County had done a parcel by parcel evaluation of all of the unincorporated areas years ago, it would be likely that there would be multiple parcels identified that would be suitable for cannabis operations, which would have been an enormous benefit to all cannabis operators, as well as to all neighbors.

Thank you for your consideration.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or would like additional information.

Very truly yours,

Sonia E. Taylor

---

<sup>1</sup> As you may be aware, a lawsuit was filed in July, 2021 against Sonoma County where the plaintiff stated that his cannabis operation has been vandalized 6 times over a 2 year period, and that he received “no assistance from law enforcement.” While it’s unclear why this allegation is being made, it is clear that cannabis operations do have unique public safety issues and can pose a danger to themselves, their employees and all surrounding uses, and adequate law enforcement coverage is necessary to ensure everyone’s safety.