Cannabis Ordinance Multi-Tenant Urgency Moratorium Public Comment Received September 17, 2021 through September 19, 2021

From:	Chris Coursey
То:	Sheryl Bratton; Andrew Smith; McCall Miller
Subject:	FW: Moratorium on multi-tenant cannabis zoning permits, September 21 meeting
Date:	Friday, September 17, 2021 3:53:38 PM

#### FYI below

From: craigspencerharrison@gmail.com <craigspencerharrison@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2021 11:10 AM
To: district3 <<u>district3@sonoma-county.org</u>>
Subject: Moratorium on multi-tenant cannabis zoning permits, September 21 meeting

#### EXTERNAL

#### Dear Chris,

I strongly support the proposed 45-day moratorium on multi-tenant cannabis zoning permits that is being considered on September 21. It seems to me that the more important issue will be how to direct staff for the October 26 meeting concerning existing multi-tenant cannabis zoning permits. The staff report says:

If a permittee submits an application for either a zoning permit or a use permit prior to their permit expiration date, then the active permit does not expire until there is a final determination on the new application or it is withdrawn. This is the case regardless of whether the applicant is applying to renew the exact same use or is applying to renew with modified or expanded uses.

Staff is essentially recommending a second phase of the Penalty Relief Program, and would extend one of the worst-conceived and implemented programs in this county's history. Allowing one-acre multi-tenant operations to continue to cultivate without a final permit is especially problematic because they violate the plain terms § 26-88-254(f)(2) of the Cannabis Ordinance. The ordinance allows multiple tenants on a single parcel only if the aggregate cultivation area does not 10,000 square feet. Authorizing multitenant grows larger than 10,000 square feet to continue to operate invites a legal challenge the county will have difficulty defending.

In addition, § 26-88-250(c)(1) requires that all cannabis produced under a zoning permit be used only for medicinal, not recreational, use. The Board considered removing this provision on August 7, 2018. It left it limited to medicinal use on October 16, 2018 because county counsel recognized that the 2016 Mitigated Negative Declaration does not support the revision. Unless and until the county enforces this provision, all ministerial permits are vulnerable to legal challenge, not just multitenant permits.

Finally, I hope that in the revised ordinance the board will find ways to reduce the countywide angst concerning cannabis cultivation projects. Creating exclusion zones around the many easily-identified areas where there is strong resistance to cultivation would lower the temperature considerably. Bennett Valley is such an area. I also support creating inclusion zones where permitting might be expedited. Continuing to allow cannabis cultivation in pockets all over the county is the worst possible policy. With all best wishes, Craig S. Harrison 4953 Sonoma Mountain Road Santa Rosa, CA 95404 707-573-9990

https://www.craigsharrison.net/

We support the moratorium on any additional cannabis grows in the County of Sonoma. William and Frances Tett 95403

Hi,

Please vote YES on interim moratorium on multi-tenant cannabis cultivation permit

We need to use wisdom on how our beautiful land is cared for, and consider what is best for the health of our community and future generations.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best Regards,

Karen Girard

429 Benjamins Road Santa Rosa, CA 95409

My husband and I, David and Marta May, support a moratorium on multi-tenant cannabis cultivation.

Our current drought status is a big item towards consideration.

We urge the county to stop all permitting, including annual ministerial renewals, until the environmental impact report is completed.

We live in Bloomfield. We are, as a town, opposed to any permits granted towards a cannabis operation in the center of our town.

Thank you,

Marta and David May

We support the need for an interim moratorium on multi-tenant cannabis cultivation permits until this issue has been properly vetted. Being in a multi-year drought is also a major concern that needs consideration. We do not have enough water for our current population and crops.

Thanks for your consideration

William Porter

Please vote yes!!!

Aldean Noethig 1318 Garden Lane Sebastopol, Ca 95472 (707) 823-1399

Please vote YES on the proposed Cannabis Moratorium! Thank you. Eileen Kortas A voter and Santa Rosa resident

Dear Supervisor Hopkins,

We are asking you to vote in favor of the proposed 45-day moratorium on cannabis *Multi-Tenant* projects. It is our opinion that these projects are an abuse of the intent of the permitting process and impose negative impacts on the environment and adjacent residential communities.

The following succinctly describe the main problems related to M-T projects.

- 1. Multi-tenant applications on a single parcel should not be allowed. The intention was to help small growers of 10,000 square feet or less, but this grouping of permits is an abuse that needs to stop.
- 2. Water is in short supply for everyone in Sonoma County and the state as a whole. We don't need extremely thirsty cannabis grows during a drought.
- 3. The Board of Supervisors already voted to conduct an Environmental Impact Report on cannabis. Wait for that to be completed so we have a full, public picture of possible impacts of cannabis grows in our county.
- 4. The public deserves to know what's happening in their area. When it comes to odor, traffic, visual blight and waste from plastic hoop houses, groundwater depletion, fire and public safety, and all of the cumulative impacts, neighbors like us should be able to weigh in on each permit application. That's not happening with these multi-tenant large grows.
- 5. According to public records, the number of "small" permit applications has increased over 500% since 2019, going from 28 two years ago to 143 this year so far. Compare this to Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) — which allow for public comment — those have plummeted from 113 in 2019 to just 3 this year. The cannabis industry is exploiting the system and it needs to stop.

Sincerely, Gary and Karen Holm Sebastopol

I am writing in support of "Cannabis Ordinance Multi-Tenant Urgency Moratorium: Adopt an interim urgency ordinance establishing a moratorium on ministerial multi-tenant cannabis cultivation permits under the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance."

It is clear that any policy decisions about marijuana commercial cultivation in Sonoma County need a NEW EIR reflecting the reality of our current exceptional drought. The UN Report on Climate Change https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/downloads/report/IPCC\_AR6\_WGI\_Headline\_Statements .pdf, says unequivocally: "Continued global warming is projected to further intensify the global water cycle, including its variability, global monsoon precipitation and the severity of wet and dry events." The report further projects (p. 23) that precipitation will decrease in CA and soil moisture will decrease: "Precipitation is projected to increase over high latitudes, the equatorial Pacific and parts of the monsoon regions, but decrease over parts of the subtropics and in limited areas of the tropics." And "Annual mean total column soil moisture change (standard deviation)" will be affected "Across warming levels, changes in soil moisture largely follow changes in precipitation but also show some differences due to the influence of evapotranspiration."

Because of proven impending catastrophic climate change, to assure sustainability of water in the county, Sonoma County must call an immediate moratorium on marijuana permits until a new EIR is completed.

Besides drought, there are other reasons to vote "yes."

<!--[if !supportLists]-->1. <!--[endif]-->Multi-tenant applications on a single parcel should not be allowed. The intention was to help small growers of 10,000 square feet or less, but this grouping of permits is an abuse that needs to stop.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]-->The Board of Supervisors already voted

to conduct an Environmental Impact Report on cannabis. Wait for that to be completed so we have a full, public picture of possible impacts of cannabis grows in our county.

- <!--[if !supportLists]-->3. <!--[endif]-->The public deserves to know what's happening in their area. When it comes to odor, traffic, visual blight and waste from plastic hoop houses, groundwater depletion, fire and public safety, and all of the cumulative impacts, neighbors like us should be able to weigh in on each permit application. That's not happening with these multi-tenant large grows.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->4. <!--[endif]-->According to public records, the number of "small" permit applications has increased over 500% since 2019, going from 28 two years ago to 143 this year so far. Compare this to Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) — which allow for public comment those have plummeted from 113 in 2019 to just 3 this year. The cannabis industry is exploiting the system and it needs to stop.

As a county taxpayer, I urge you to "do no harm" to our precious agricultural heritage, vibrant Tourism industry, and every landowner who will experience lowered water tables and visual blight because of the County's lax supervision of the marijuana industry to date. It is not too late to change course.

Sincerely,

The Rev. Gail Cafferata

Dear Supervisor Gorin:

#### We fully support the passage of the proposed ordinance "AMENDING THE CANNABIS LAND USE ORDINANCE TO ESTABLISH A TEMPORARY MORATORIUM ON MULTI-TENANT CANNABIS CULTIVATION PERMITS."

We believe that the passage of this proposed ordinance will provide some protection for Bennett Valley residents from the cultivation of cannabis in the vicinity of residential properties. <u>We urge you to vote in favor of this ordinance</u>.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ken and Karen Adelson 6640 Sonoma Mountain Road Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Dear BOS,

When considering the multi-tenant moritorium, I hope you remember the 61 applications that are still in process. I am leasing 10k sq ft from an operator with a greenhouse nursery. This is considered multi-tenant. I got stuck in the Native American consult issue. I don't want to do a use permit for such a small garden, especially when it was already considered CEQA exempt for a plant holding area for the nursery.

I hope you separate out the groups who took advantage of this program from the people the rules were written for. I hope you allow processing for people who already turned their permits in. (I turned mine in on 3/2/21 and it is still not done.)

It seems like this ordinance is written in a way that if multi-tenant operators turn in their use permits before their zoning permits expire that they can keep growing. Sounds like TPR 2.0. Please don't make the same mistakes again: TPR and use permits are not the way to go for agriculture, including cannabis.

Prices dropped to a new low this year and you still get \$100,000 per acre. These 20 acres represent \$2,000,000 of your annual budget.

I look forward to seeing some creative solutions that don't further damage the little guy and the industry as a whole.

Kind Regards,

Lisa Lai

Please support adopting an interim moratorium on multi-tenant cannabis cultivation permits! We have enough problems in our neighborhoods without having large cannabis grows using our precious and very limited water resources. Just imagine the impact on Sweetwater Spring Water District – use water for families and to put out fires – not corporate grows.

I hope you will support this moratorium and insure that during this time period grows are not permitted while waiting for the final decision.

Thank you,

Margaret Holland and Stephen Luce 21505 Highland Terrace Monte Rio, CA 95446

From:	<u>MR R</u>
То:	<u>Cannabis</u>
Subject:	cannabis moratorium
Date:	Saturday, September 18, 2021 11:19:15 AM

#### Please vote yes on the Moratorium

Water is in short supply for everyone in Sonoma County and the state as a whole.

The public deserves to know what's happening in their area. When it comes to odor, traffic, visual blight and waste from plastic hoop houses, groundwater depletion, fire and public safety, and all of the cumulative impacts

Wait for the EIR to be completed so we have a full, public picture of possible impacts of cannabis grows in our county.

Multi-tenant applications on a single parcel should not be allowed.

**Ron Hensic** 

**90 Temelec Circle** 

996 6106

Dear Chair Hopkins & Distinguished BOS Members Coursey, Gore, Gorin & Rabbit,

Thank you again for acknowledging on May 18 that the current Sonoma county cannabis program was not well conceived and an EIR is needed for adequate long term planning for cannabis grows in our county.

In the meantime proceeding under the current structure and enforcement level is obviously not tenable either.

A full moratorium on new permits and improperly issued permit renewals is essential rather than continuing to stumble ahead with rules which have been widely misinterpreted and applied as rationale by Ag Commissioner Andrew Smith.

Clearly current Cannabis Ordinance, section 28-88-254(f)(2) - authorizes 10,000 sq ft is the maximum area grow allowed on a LEA or DA parcel for a "small outdoor" grow on a minimum 10 acre parcel. Yet multiple permits, sometimes registered under false pretenses, have regularly been issued on a single parcel which far exceed that limit, with zero consultation from rural neighbors.

Our neighborhood on Barlow Lane in West county has to deal with the problems of an improperly permitted 20k cannabis grow 100 ft from our fence lines and 300 ft from multiple residences, located down a private single lane non-fire safe road, with an owner who has physically and emotionally threatened multiple neighbors on multiple occasions.

I've become aware of way too many similar situations in rural neighborhoods around the county.

A full moratorium is essential until all the issues pertaining to cannabis grows in our county including odor, traffic, visual blight and waste from hoop houses, groundwater depletion, general neighborhood security and fire safety are clearly understood and addressed.

Respectfully,

Robert Nissenbaum 1706-08 Barlow Lane Sebastopol

Please vote Yesd for moratorium because We strongly believe uncontrolled cannabis cultivation is health and environment hazard for sonoma county besides having negative impact on wine industry and tourism.

#### Here are the key reasons for Supervisors to vote YES on this moratorium:

- 1. Multi-tenant applications on a single parcel should not be allowed. The intention was to help small growers of 10,000 square feet or less, but this grouping of permits is an abuse that needs to stop.
- 2. Water is in short supply for everyone in Sonoma County and the state as a whole. We don't need extremely thirsty cannabis grows during a drought.
- 3. The Board of Supervisors already voted to conduct an Environmental Impact Report on cannabis. Wait for that to be completed so we have a full, public picture of possible impacts of cannabis grows in our county.
- 4. The public deserves to know what's happening in their area. When it comes to odor, traffic, visual blight and waste from plastic hoop houses, groundwater depletion, fire and public safety, and all of the cumulative impacts, neighbors like us should be able to weigh in on each permit application. That's not happening with these multi-tenant large grows.
- 5. According to public records, the number of "small" permit applications has increased over 500% since 2019, going from 28 two years ago to 143 this year so far. Compare this to Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) which allow for public comment those have plummeted from 113 in 2019 to just 3 this year. The cannabis industry is exploiting the system and it needs to stop.

Regards Sandeep & Neera Sent from my iPhone

#### Here are the key reasons for Supervisors to vote YES on this moratorium:

- 1. Multi-tenant applications on a single parcel should not be allowed. The intention was to help small growers of 10,000 square feet or less, but this grouping of permits is an abuse that needs to stop.
- 2. Water is in short supply for everyone in Sonoma County and the state as a whole. We don't need extremely thirsty cannabis grows during a drought.
- 3. The Board of Supervisors already voted to conduct an Environmental Impact Report on cannabis. Wait for that to be completed so we have a full, public picture of possible impacts of cannabis grows in our county.
- 4. The public deserves to know what's happening in their area. When it comes to odor, traffic, visual blight and waste from plastic hoop houses, groundwater depletion, fire and public safety, and all of the cumulative impacts, neighbors like us should be able to weigh in on each permit application. That's not happening with these multi-tenant large grows.
- 5. According to public records, the number of "small" permit applications has increased over 500% since 2019, going from 28 two years ago to 143 this year so far. Compare this to Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) which allow for public comment those have plummeted from 113 in 2019 to just 3 this year. The cannabis industry is exploiting the system and it needs to stop.

Thank You Joe and Theresa

BoS,

I believe you should initiate a moritorium on the issuing of cannabis permit applications, including multi tenant operations. A ban on allowing cannabis operations to continue to function while waiting for the permit process should also be included.

There are too many unanswered questions on what will happen to the land and surrounding areas in the long term. How will neighbors and communities be affected? A good number of these operations have owners from other areas/countries with only a desire to make money but not occupy the land.

With the county freely issuing ministerial permits, it is not in compliance with CEQA. With so much at stake, it is not better to ask for forgiveness instead of permission.

With the county asking the state to reduce required housing due to water supply problems and the government saying water should only be used for basic human health and safety needs, how can you in good concience even consider allowing this permit process to go forward.

Please slow things down and get it right. Mindy Barrett

Please vote yes on a temporary moratorium on multi tenant cannabis grows. The ministerial permit process meant for small growers has been subverted and abused by multi tenant grows which are not small grows. This end-run around neighborhood input, real environmental issues, and meeting regular use permit criteria should not be permitted. The county has called for an EIR thankfully. Let's let that process play out fairly and legitimately without these abuses of the ministerial process. Yes on the moratorium.

M. O'Connell District 5 resident and property owner

Sent from my iPad

September 19, 2021

The Honorable Susan Gorin Supervisor, Sonoma County District 1 575 Administration Drive, Room 100 A Santa Rosa, CA 95403 Susan.gorin@sonoma-county.org

#### RE: Proposed moratorium on multi-tenant cannabis projects

Dear Supervisor Gorin:

As with many evolving industries, initial attempts at regulation are often faced with those who seek to evade the intent of the law while presenting an appearance of complying with requirements as written, and sometimes doing this rather poorly. This requires additional evaluation of the regulations to patch exploited loopholes and clarification of what is required to comply with the law.

Cannabis regulation and the behavior of some growers in Sonoma County is an example of this process in action, and it is now time to hit the pause button during a review of the effectiveness and application of regulations, especially those addressing multi-tenant grows.

In several instances, for example, 2274 Wellspring Road where the 10,000 square foot limit has been evaded through five filings covering approximately one-acre, multiple filings by associated parties are combined. There was no public notice and no opportunity for objection, and no compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act. Other proposed permits are in progress which deserve additional scrutiny during the proposed moratorium.

The current drought affecting Much of California is an additional reason to pause additional planting of this thirsty crop; we are asked to reduce personal use of water, allow landscaping to wither, and make use of all possible conservation measures yet cannabis continues to be grown. As surface water sources disappear well use is increasing taxing aquifers which require many years of rain to recharge. There should be no additional cannabis permits issued until the EIR has been completed and appropriately evaluated. After this has been done it may become obvious that Sonoma County should be a commercial cannabis exclusion area.

Please support the proposed moratorium on cannabis permitting until more effective regulations are created, and a more effective enforcement system has been installed.

Very Truly Yours,

Ron Dodge 4399 Summit View Ranch Road Santa Rosa, CA 95404 rondodge95@yahoo.com

cc: cannabis@sonoma-county.org

via e mail