

**Attachment 17 Addendum: Public Comment Received 09-16-2021  
through 09-21-2021**

**From:** [Diane](#)  
**To:** [Cannabis](#)  
**Cc:** [Crystal Acker](#)  
**Subject:** Cannabis Policy Suggestions  
**Date:** Thursday, September 16, 2021 5:58:56 AM

---

## EXTERNAL

Good morning, Committee members:

Kindly enter into the policy discussion record my request for the following neighborhood compatibility requirements:

1. MINIMUM 1,000-foot buffer zone *starting from the property fence line*, to be expanded as conditions (such as air flow and proximity) warrant, to reduce noise, smell, and security lighting and health and safety impacts on existing residential homes and enclaves bordering *any* proposed cannabis grow.
2. Place an exclusion zone and regulations around existing rural enclaves of communities and residences to limit and ensure that numerous dense grows do not proliferate in close proximity to one another, placing residences in the middle of multiple grow operations and creating another situation where multi-LLCs can flaunt the rules applicable to single parcels of land.
3. Delegate processing plants to industrial centers ONLY where adequate police, fire, and roads already exist, designed to support these commercial endeavors with already-existing public services.
4. Prohibit tasting rooms and events in areas unsuitable for the noise, traffic, parking requirements, and impact they create (i.e. residential communities). *Instead*, locate them in existing event centers and facilities equipped to handle large groups of people, their cars, noise, and these kinds of interactive tourist operations.
5. Permit grows in areas where adequate (2-lane *minimum*) roads *already exist* that can both handle increased traffic, which can be maintained and easily accessed by fire and police support services.

Roblar Road is one example of such a locale, as is Spring Hill Road. Both are located well away from residences and off 2-lane roads.

6. Require Conditional Use Permits and EIA studies on proposed grow sites.

7. Assure that water recharge is available for the grow that does not take away from or threaten any existing neighboring water and well usage. Use water-scarce years as a baseline for determining whether additional wells should be authorized for commercial purposes, or to expand any commercial use.

8. Sonoma County has a LOT of open space, vacant land, and land located far from residences where grows would not impact people's daily lives or stress narrow, marginal roadways. *Disallow* grows which impact daily living and use marginal roads, and *approve* them in areas where they are not abutting neighborhoods and residences.

9. Disallow grows located more than 10 minutes from fire and police support services and encourage them in locales which are closer to support services which can provide quick response to any problems. This better supports growers, as well.

PROXIMITY and IMPACT should be the keys for determining appropriate grow rules, locales, and monitoring. PROXIMITY of residents which values their health and wellbeing, and IMPACT of cannabis should be taken into account.

Rural residents are well used to agricultural pursuits. What is not acceptable is any endeavor that proposes increased traffic over already-marginal one-lane roads, 24/7 commercial activity and noise right next to neighborhoods and residences such as Bloomfield, and a crop so notorious for its high value that high fencing, barking dogs, and extra security must be employed to keep the crop (NOT the neighbors abutting it) safe. This is not your normal agricultural milieu and is unacceptable for quiet residential areas either rural or urban.

More so than most counties, Sonoma County has PLENTY of land

where cannabis would not be an impact and would be quite appropriate.  
Use/choose/approve that kind of land!

Sincerely,

Diane Donovan  
Bloomfield, CA

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:** [BOS](#)  
**To:** [Cannabis](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Issue: cannabis farms  
**Date:** Friday, September 17, 2021 3:50:53 PM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: no-reply@sonoma-county.org <no-reply@sonoma-county.org>  
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2021 3:05 PM  
To: BOS <BOS@sonoma-county.org>  
Subject: Issue: cannabis farms

Sent To: County of Sonoma

Topic: Issue

Subject: cannabis farms

Message: Sonoma County Supervisors:

It's rare that once in a lifetime, one is given the opportunity to make a difference in their community. As elected officials and persons involved with critical changes in Sonoma County, you each have much more than an opportunity; you have an obligation to the tax paying residents that call Sonoma County home as well as the success of the existing business that draw on tourism dollars.

I've been following the rapid growth of cannabis farms since they have become legal in California. Local cannabis farms are trending rapidly without direction into our beautiful countryside. Whatever decisions are made now via the upcoming cannabis/EIR documents in progress will be permanent and if not handled with the future in mind, may very well destroy the alluring countryside in our County.

At issue are water limits, fire concerns, waste facilities capacity, addiction, increase in DUI arrest, unsightly hoop greenhouses, nightly outdoor lighting and even especially offensive odors to those living near a cannabis farm or just driving by. Each of these issues impact the lives of everyone in Sonoma County; either because they directly affect their property values or changes forever more what our County now represents, a financially stable and beautiful place to visit or call home.

It is grossly short sighted to hear over and over again that the cannabis industry will bring more money into our community. Once those dollars are taxed and more government workers are hired to handle all of the down side of this controversial industry; very little in profits other than to the big businesses involved will actually be reintroduced into our County. Not to mention the loss of tourist whose dollars will go elsewhere to view beautiful county side because ours could be lost forever if this current trend continues.

Yet, some influential names in our county have jumped on the cannabis band wagon for their own personal gain; certainly not for love of a picturesque Sonoma County that it now represents. Ask yourselves if the affluent cannabis investors live near to any of the farms or faculties. You all know they do not or ever will.

Right now, the price of cannabis is tumbling; worth half of what it was a short while ago and predicted to go even lower. Surely this is causing angst among the legal cannabis farmers in Sonoma County and can only be detrimental to this industry that has been allow to grow so quickly and without proper guidelines. One has to wonder what the overall reaction will be to this latest development.

It's time to reacquaint yourselves with the majority of the residents and their desires to live in a County that represents mainstream agricultural, not a regional hub for the cannabis industry.

Please take note of the public statistics in the August 15 2021 PD publication. The majority of Sonoma County residents do NOT want to live next door or even within a mile of a cannabis farm or facility.

We voted to end incarceration for smoking a joint or growing a few plants. We did not vote for Sonoma County to become a high-volume cannabis growing region. Please choose to apply conservative, healthy and safe rules to the cannabis industry via the EIR in progress similar to that of our neighboring Yolo County.

In addition, next week an interim moratorium on multi-tenant cannabis cultivation permits is up for discussion and possible adoption. I urge each of you to support this proposal as well.

Thank you.  
Linda Bavo

Sender's Name: Linda Bavo  
Sender's Email: lbavo@sonic.net  
Sender's Home Phone: 707-538-5254  
Sender's Cell Phone: 707-953-9377  
Sender's Address:  
2357 Morningside Circle  
Santa Rosa, CA 95405

**From:** [Donna Wade](#)  
**To:** [Susan Gorin](#)  
**Subject:** Cannabis  
**Date:** Saturday, September 18, 2021 10:27:01 AM

---

EXTERNAL

Please use your power as our county representative to make Bennett Valley a commercial cannabis-free exclusion zone.

Thank you very much for your support on this matter

Donna wade

Sent from my iPad

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:** [Jalena22@modernaction.io](mailto:Jalena22@modernaction.io)  
**To:** [Cannabis](#)  
**Subject:** County Staff - Retract the current Cannabis Survey  
**Date:** Sunday, September 19, 2021 7:28:50 AM

---

Dear County Staff,

We understand that Sonoma County Staff is currently attempting to write the next round of regulations for the Cannabis Industry. Unfortunately, there is clearly anti-cannabis bias behind the wheel. While the Industry is working on harvesting their plants, raising their families, and protecting their farms from fire, a small but well-funded group, of largely older retired citizens, are spilling their reefer madness into the ears of the County Staff.

This is especially clear in the last survey that the county released for community input. The questions are so biased against cannabis farmers that the affected farmers couldn't even participate in the survey. For example:

- What is the most appropriate method to mitigate offsite odor impacts: 1) Physical Barriers (growing indoor) or 2) Separation (large setbacks). How about #3) Normal agriculture has smell's and that is okay?
- Please rank the concerns: Safety, Transportation, Water, Odor. Isn't the point of an EIR, this extremely costly and time demanding study, to say yes - there is some impact. But, that's okay because the good outweighs the bad.
- In relation to setbacks, rank how they should be determined. Noise, odor, safety, visual impact. How about this option: The state has mandated setbacks that are appropriate.

The way this EIR is going, we might as well roll up the sidewalks and send the farmers back to the traditional market where they don't have to pay for taxes, protect the environment, pass pesticide testing, or care about what their nosey neighbors think. Because before these courageous, honest and hardworking farmers stepped out of the shadows, these neighbors didn't complain to any comparable degree, and there were a projected 5,000 to 8,000 of us county-wide. Those are the county's numbers, not some arbitrary made-up number we came up with. Now we can't even get 40 farmers through the pipeline, who 5yrs ago were promised a 6-9month pathway to state licensing?

This is a failed attempt to collect data, it is not a properly conducted questionnaire in any capacity. Surely not for any relevant or equitable data retrieval. With the way these questions are skewing the data, it should be retracted immediately.

Sincerely,  
Jalena Mays

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:** [Christine Marie Field](#)  
**To:** [Susan Gorin](#)  
**Subject:** Cannabis  
**Date:** Sunday, September 19, 2021 8:23:02 AM

---

Dear Supervisors,

Living in Sonoma County we have not had sufficient rains and now with a drought, water supply is at an all time low. Those of us who live in rural areas serviced by wells are needing to consider if they will go dry as is happening in parts of this county. Because of this dire situation, my neighbors and I are calling for a county moratorium on any new agricultural growing which would include new permitting of cannabis.

The county's first priority should be taking care of existing water users. The time to reconsider new additional growing of any product is when the drought is over, or when the county's upcoming Environmental Review shows there is enough water to reinstitute permitting of additional agricultural growth.

Thank you,

Chris Field Sent from my iPhone

Sent from my iPhone

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:** [JEANETTE Lebell](#)  
**To:** [BOS](#)  
**Subject:** Cannabis EIR is essential  
**Date:** Saturday, September 18, 2021 7:50:26 PM

---

Hello:

I live in a rural residential neighborhood in the West County. I've lived in my house for over 20 years. I love it here. I've had to do a lot of work over the years to maintain my quality of life and peace of mind.

I've drilled a deeper well when the water supply seemed to be diminishing.

I've hired professional tree trimmers to try take out old/ailing trees and maintaining the strong, healthy ones through the drought and heating climate.

I've installed solar panels and back up battery.

I've tried to be responsible as a homeowner and a member of the community.

I'd hate to see my peace and quiet shattered by the stench of larger cannabis growing in the neighborhood, plus the potential for traffic and other unwanted intrusions.

Please. PLEASE make sure an adequate and thorough EIR addresses all of the potential impacts of increasing Cannabis growing in all the areas of this wonderful county we call home.

Please.

Thank you.

Jeanette Lebell  
685 Snow Road  
Sebastopol

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:** [Nancy Richardson](#)  
**To:** [Crystal Acker](#); [Scott Orr](#); [Cannabis](#)  
**Subject:** - The Press Democrat - TODAY'S PUBLIC NOTICE  
**Date:** Monday, September 20, 2021 12:25:35 PM

---



[https://santarosapressdemocrat-ca.newsmemory.com/?publink=5ebcab60\\_1345f0c#.YUjfYcUvPvc.gmail](https://santarosapressdemocrat-ca.newsmemory.com/?publink=5ebcab60_1345f0c#.YUjfYcUvPvc.gmail)

We cannot find any materials at the WEB site?  
N. and B.

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:** [Audrey83@modernaction.io](mailto:Audrey83@modernaction.io)  
**To:** [Cannabis](#)  
**Subject:** County Staff - Retract the current Cannabis Survey  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 21, 2021 12:59:35 PM

---

Dear County Staff,

We understand that Sonoma County Staff is currently attempting to write the next round of regulations for the Cannabis Industry. Unfortunately, there is clearly anti-cannabis bias behind the wheel. While the Industry is working on harvesting their plants, raising their families, and protecting their farms from fire, a small but well-funded group, of largely older retired citizens, are spilling their reefer madness into the ears of the County Staff.

This is especially clear in the last survey that the county released for community input. The questions are so biased against cannabis farmers that the affected farmers couldn't even participate in the survey. For example:

- What is the most appropriate method to mitigate offsite odor impacts: 1) Physical Barriers (growing indoor) or 2) Separation (large setbacks). How about #3) Normal agriculture has smell's and that is okay?
- Please rank the concerns: Safety, Transportation, Water, Odor. Isn't the point of an EIR, this extremely costly and time demanding study, to say yes - there is some impact. But, that's okay because the good outweighs the bad.
- In relation to setbacks, rank how they should be determined. Noise, odor, safety, visual impact. How about this option: The state has mandated setbacks that are appropriate.

The way this EIR is going, we might as well roll up the sidewalks and send the farmers back to the traditional market where they don't have to pay for taxes, protect the environment, pass pesticide testing, or care about what their nosey neighbors think. Because before these courageous, honest and hardworking farmers stepped out of the shadows, these neighbors didn't complain to any comparable degree, and there were a projected 5,000 to 8,000 of us county-wide. Those are the county's numbers, not some arbitrary made-up number we came up with. Now we can't even get 40 farmers through the pipeline, who 5yrs ago were promised a 6-9month pathway to state licensing?

This is a failed attempt to collect data, it is not a properly conducted questionnaire in any capacity. Surely not for any relevant or equitable data retrieval. With the way these questions are skewing the data, it should be retracted immediately.

Sincerely,  
Audrey Gagnon

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:** [Cassandra85@modernaction.io](mailto:Cassandra85@modernaction.io)  
**To:** [Cannabis](#)  
**Subject:** County Staff - Retract the current Cannabis Survey  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 21, 2021 12:50:08 PM

---

Dear County Staff,

We understand that Sonoma County Staff is currently attempting to write the next round of regulations for the Cannabis Industry. Unfortunately, there is clearly anti-cannabis bias behind the wheel. While the Industry is working on harvesting their plants, raising their families, and protecting their farms from fire, a small but well-funded group, of largely older retired citizens, are spilling their reefer madness into the ears of the County Staff.

This is especially clear in the last survey that the county released for community input. The questions are so biased against cannabis farmers that the affected farmers couldn't even participate in the survey. For example:

- What is the most appropriate method to mitigate offsite odor impacts: 1) Physical Barriers (growing indoor) or 2) Separation (large setbacks). How about #3) Normal agriculture has smell's and that is okay?
- Please rank the concerns: Safety, Transportation, Water, Odor. Isn't the point of an EIR, this extremely costly and time demanding study, to say yes - there is some impact. But, that's okay because the good outweighs the bad.
- In relation to setbacks, rank how they should be determined. Noise, odor, safety, visual impact. How about this option: The state has mandated setbacks that are appropriate.

The way this EIR is going, we might as well roll up the sidewalks and send the farmers back to the traditional market where they don't have to pay for taxes, protect the environment, pass pesticide testing, or care about what their nosey neighbors think. Because before these courageous, honest and hardworking farmers stepped out of the shadows, these neighbors didn't complain to any comparable degree, and there were a projected 5,000 to 8,000 of us county-wide. Those are the county's numbers, not some arbitrary made-up number we came up with. Now we can't even get 40 farmers through the pipeline, who 5yrs ago were promised a 6-9month pathway to state licensing?

This is a failed attempt to collect data, it is not a properly conducted questionnaire in any capacity. Surely not for any relevant or equitable data retrieval. With the way these questions are skewing the data, it should be retracted immediately.

Sincerely,  
Cassandra Vink

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:** [Ezequias32@modernaction.io](mailto:Ezequias32@modernaction.io)  
**To:** [Cannabis](#)  
**Subject:** County Staff - Retract the current Cannabis Survey  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 21, 2021 1:00:49 PM

---

Dear County Staff,

We understand that Sonoma County Staff is currently attempting to write the next round of regulations for the Cannabis Industry. Unfortunately, there is clearly anti-cannabis bias behind the wheel. While the Industry is working on harvesting their plants, raising their families, and protecting their farms from fire, a small but well-funded group, of largely older retired citizens, are spilling their reefer madness into the ears of the County Staff.

This is especially clear in the last survey that the county released for community input. The questions are so biased against cannabis farmers that the affected farmers couldn't even participate in the survey. For example:

- What is the most appropriate method to mitigate offsite odor impacts: 1) Physical Barriers (growing indoor) or 2) Separation (large setbacks). How about #3) Normal agriculture has smell's and that is okay?
- Please rank the concerns: Safety, Transportation, Water, Odor. Isn't the point of an EIR, this extremely costly and time demanding study, to say yes - there is some impact. But, that's okay because the good outweighs the bad.
- In relation to setbacks, rank how they should be determined. Noise, odor, safety, visual impact. How about this option: The state has mandated setbacks that are appropriate.

The way this EIR is going, we might as well roll up the sidewalks and send the farmers back to the traditional market where they don't have to pay for taxes, protect the environment, pass pesticide testing, or care about what their nosey neighbors think. Because before these courageous, honest and hardworking farmers stepped out of the shadows, these neighbors didn't complain to any comparable degree, and there were a projected 5,000 to 8,000 of us county-wide. Those are the county's numbers, not some arbitrary made-up number we came up with. Now we can't even get 40 farmers through the pipeline, who 5yrs ago were promised a 6-9month pathway to state licensing?

This is a failed attempt to collect data, it is not a properly conducted questionnaire in any capacity. Surely not for any relevant or equitable data retrieval. With the way these questions are skewing the data, it should be retracted immediately.

Sincerely,  
Ezequias Altamirano

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.