

Cannabis Ordinance Multi-Tenant Urgency Moratorium
Public Comment
Received
September 21, 2021 9 AM through 12:30 PM

From: [Betsy Lawer](#)
To: [Cannabis](#)
Subject: Vote Yes on the Cannabis Ordinance Multi-Tenant Urgency Moratorium
Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2021 9:28:17 AM

EXTERNAL

Cannabis is not just another agricultural crop. Good governance and planning for this crop should take into consideration:

- The impact of cannabis skunk stink on Sonoma's biggest revenue generator, grapes, and its attendant economic ripple effect on tourism. There is growing evidence that cannabis skunk stink will affect the quality of grapes, and the Sonoma brand of growing premium grapes.
- The impact of cannabis skunk stink on the quiet enjoyment of personal property.
- The impact of cannabis skunk stink on the well earned Sonoma reputation and brand. One of the top reasons tourists visit Sonoma is for the fresh air, and beautiful scenery.
- The impact of increasing cultivation of thirsty cannabis plants during a drought.
- The impact of waste management of cannabis by products - plant materials and plastic.
- The impact of the huge cannabis carbon footprint, which is diametrically opposed to Sonoma's reputation. Nearly 100% of Sonoma's vineyards are now sustainably certified, and there is now a move to require recyclable food materials in Sonoma.
- The impact of crime in neighborhoods with cannabis operations.
- The impact of light from hoop houses.
- The impact of cannabis skunk stink on wildlife, particularly birds. Will cannabis skunk stink cause birds and other wildlife to migrate away from the skunk stink, causing a explosion of insects, and the attendant ecosystem changes?
- The impact of the number of acres planted to cannabis statewide. There are already indications that cannabis is overplanted on a statewide level. The margins for financial success will increasingly drop, as more and more cannabis is planted and pricing drops.

Betsy Lawer
Franz Valley
907.230.8512

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: [Diana Barnacle](#)
To: [Cannabis](#)
Subject: Vote YES today on the moratorium
Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2021 10:21:13 AM

EXTERNAL

In addition to the moratorium on multi-tenant operations where we need to close this loophole, please stop all permitting, including annual ministerial renewals, until the environmental impact report is completed. This would be the right thing to do. Fix the initial error you supervisors ignored when you blindly ran towards growing the environmentally unfriendly cannabis.

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: [Andrew Smith](#)
To: [Cannabis](#)
Subject: FW: Vote YES to enact a MORATORIUM on ministerial Cannabis permits
Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2021 12:02:11 PM

From: Nancy Graalman <ngraalman@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 21, 2021 11:51 AM
To: district4 <district4@sonoma-county.org>; James Gore <James.Gore@sonoma-county.org>; Susan Gorin <Susan.Gorin@sonoma-county.org>
Cc: Lynda Hopkins <Lynda.Hopkins@sonoma-county.org>; Sheryl Bratton <Sheryl.Bratton@sonoma-county.org>; Robert Pittman <Robert.Pittman@sonoma-county.org>; Andrew Smith <Andrew.Smith@sonoma-county.org>
Subject: Vote YES to enact a MORATORIUM on ministerial Cannabis permits

EXTERNAL

To Supervisors Gore and Gorin; County Administrator Bratton; County Counsel Pittman; Agricultural Commissioner Smith:

There are multiple, compelling reasons to enact a MORATORIUM on the issuance of ministerial permits for the cultivation of cannabis. **Please support a moratorium on the issuance of any new or renewing ministerial permits.**

Additionally, I submit the following questions that I believe need to be answered -- and investigated -- in order to learn how we have arrived at what is basically an assault on fairness and quality of life in rural Sonoma County.

How is it that the County's BOS and the Department of Agriculture have allowed certain parcel owners to make a mockery of the intent within the "ministerial" guidelines?

Despite substantial proof and alarms -- raised quite early -- MANY "small-farmer" permit applications throughout Sonoma County are linked to commercial cannabis interests. (And now Franz Valley is the "poster child" for the gaming of the county's policy, with 11 ministerial permits filed on three parcels, with applicants who are easily linked to the original buyer of the parcels.)

====Sonoma County's indifference to the flagrant use of loopholes in the cannabis world is particularly galling to me. Since the 2017 Tubbs fire tore through Franz Valley, I have watched wonderful neighbors -- often representing generations of Sonoma County land ownership -- exhaust themselves financially, mentally and physically in order to satisfy your stringent rebuilding and infrastructure (including well and septic) codes; there was no room or consideration given for exceptional needs.=====

What is the source --- or is there a complicity of sources -- that commercial cannabis operations rely on to enable their "farmers" to provide ambiguous parcel information that results in over-the-counter "ministerial permits"?

What roadmap was/is given to the commercial interests for their pursuit of “ministerial” permits such that applications went from 28 in 2019 to the (so far) 143 in 2021? Should there be a deeper review of how this has been allowed?

Former Agricultural Commissioner Tony Linegar said, in an October 14, 2020, article in *The Bohemian* that he would like to continue as a consultant “when it comes to cannabis.”

He added: “People say, ‘Tony’s in Hawaii and not here anymore,’ but I still have a lot of skin in the game.”

The article continues: “Since he moved out of his office, he’s worked as a consultant on land issues in Sonoma County . . . and with Andrew Smith, the new Agricultural Commissioner, up to his ears in essential tasks, Sonoma County needs Tony Linegar as a cannabis advocate more than ever before.”

Should there be more scrutiny of how it is that Sonoma County citizens – particularly in rural areas -- have been subjected to the flagrant deceptions by commercial cannabis operations?

Are there continued influences on the BOS and Department of Agriculture that allow a continued, flagrant disregard for fairness?

Thank you for your attention and your support of a MORATORIUM on PERMITTING MINISTERIAL APPLICATIONS TO CULTIVATE CANNABIS.

Regards,

Nancy Graalman

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: [Samantha Smith](#)
To: [Cannabis](#)
Subject: Please vote NO today on the cannabis moratorium
Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2021 9:27:28 AM

EXTERNAL

To the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors:

Hello, name is Samantha Loe. I am asking you to please vote **no** today on this rushed moratorium

Few actions could have such devastating effects on our entire local cannabis industry as revoking the ministerial multi-tenant path given to our small farmers.

I own a small farm with my husband along side a farm of a dear friend of ours. The ministerial permits took a year to achieve and required many costly in depth studies. both of our families would not have been able to start our farms if we we required to follow the CUP path.

My husband and I recently had a project make it through the CUP process. It took 4 excruciating years at tremendous expense. It was 4 years of complete uncertainty not knowing when our project would be up for approval and if it would even pass when it got there. It was 4 years of waking up every morning in fight or flight mode wondering did we make the biggest mistake of our lives in trusting this process?

Small farmers cannot afford 4 years of time away from their businesses. They cannot afford the huge fees involved. Small farmers cannot invest into the uncertainty of time or acceptance that comes with a CUP.

Throughout our 4 years we were often told the reason for the long wait was that the county was severely back logged on projects and that the county was severely understaffed. If that is the case then why are we even considering adding 146 projects (85 existing, 61 in cue) to a system that is not able to handle the work they already have?

The majority of these multi tenant permits are being used by small farmers under its original intent. That was to allow our small local families to stay in their industry and not get pushed out by big corporate cannabis. Our small farmers simply cannot afford the CUP process. Please address the few companies abusing this law separately.

Please do not rush this moratorium through that will have such a devastating effect on our farmers, our families, our employees, and the local small businesses that depend on our existence. Please vote **no** today.

Thank you
Samantha Loe

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.