



TO: Sonoma County Board of Supervisors - [BOS@sonoma-county.org](mailto:BOS@sonoma-county.org), [Susan.Gorin@Sonoma-County.org](mailto:Susan.Gorin@Sonoma-County.org), [David.Rabbitt@Sonoma-County.org](mailto:David.Rabbitt@Sonoma-County.org), [James.Gore@Sonoma-County.org](mailto:James.Gore@Sonoma-County.org), [District5@Sonoma-County.org](mailto:District5@Sonoma-County.org), [Chris.Coursey@Sonoma-County.org](mailto:Chris.Coursey@Sonoma-County.org)

CC: PRMD – [Tennis.Wick@Sonoma-County.org](mailto:Tennis.Wick@Sonoma-County.org), [Scott.Orr@Sonoma-County.org](mailto:Scott.Orr@Sonoma-County.org),

County Counsel – [Robert.Pittman@Sonoma-County.org](mailto:Robert.Pittman@Sonoma-County.org)

DATE: December 2, 2024

RE: Agenda Item 52 for the December 3 Sonoma County Board of Supervisors Meeting

*Decertification of the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan Environmental Report and Setting Aside and Abandoning the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan. A) Adopt a Resolution: i) 2024-1283 Repealing Resolution No. 22-0555 and decertifying the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report, and ii) Repealing Resolution No. 22-0556 and Setting Aside the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan and Associated General Plan and Zoning Code Amendments, and iii) Abandoning the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan comprehensive planning initiative. B) Adopt an Ordinance repealing Ordinance 6400 that amended portions of Chapter 26 of the Sonoma County Code related to the SDC Specific Plan and rezoned lands subject to the SDC Specific Plan.*

The Valley of the Moon Alliance (VOTMA) objects to Permit Sonoma's recommendation in its Summary Report in referenced Agenda item 52 that the Board abandon the Specific Plan initiative for the Sonoma Developmental Center.

Today, the County should abide by the Court's order, which is to decertify the SDC SP Environmental Impact Report and repeal Resolution No. 22-0556, set aside the Specific Plan and associated General Plan and zoning code amendments (Agenda Items A(i) and (ii), and repeal Ordinance 6400 (Agenda Item B). But the Board should not walk away from and now abandon the multi-year process that the residents of Sonoma Valley were promised would produce a rational resolution to transitioning SDC from its State-owned surplus property status to an integrated community-oriented development. The Court provided appropriate guidance on the areas of concern that required setting aside the EIR and thus the SP. The County should maintain in place the vehicle for that the process, not abandon it now.

The PRMD staff recommendation appears driven by the faulty conclusion that the pending SB 330 application for development of this State-owned property renders the SDC Specific Plan ineffective. The

staff's conclusory statements that a "builder's remedy" vested right under SB 330 would trump the SDC disposition enabling legislation is not supported by the law or logic. The SDC enabling legislation (Government Code Section 14670.10.5) authorizes a specific vehicle for disposition of this specific State-owned property. The staff's argument that SB 330 vesting should override the legislature's determination of how to dispose of this property, whether at the initial Specific Plan phase or for any revised SP, is simply wrong.

The SDC enabling legislation is a prior existing State law providing for a specific set of directives for disposing of this specific piece of State property that cannot just be tossed away. There is not a shred of legislative history that implies that the State legislature intended to allow a conflict between the general "builder's remedy" statute and the specific provisions of the SDC enabling legislation, or that the legislature intended SB 330 to override the specific SDC legislation it enacted for this property. Staff has provided no logic or legal support for its assertion that once the SB 330 application was accepted the SDC Specific Plan initiative became in effect a nullity. The legislation remains in place and is controlling. VOTMA urges the Board to honor it and not abandon the SP process. At a minimum the proceeding should be maintained in form in the event the pending SB 330 application is either rejected, withdrawn, or otherwise does not move forward and disposition via the SP initiative is viable.

As a final point, VOTMA observes that Staff's abrupt recommendation to abandon the SDC SP initiative comes well before the Court's reply date and over the Thanksgiving period where attention to this sort of shocking action is likely not to have registered for many who have devoted months and years to this contentious land disposition action.

In conclusion, VOTMA believes it is appropriate for the Board today to comply with the Court's order and to adopt Agenda items A (i) and A(ii) and B, but most definitely not Agenda item A(iii), which is neither discussed or required by the Court order, nor is legally sound or appropriate.

Sincerely yours,

The Valley of the Moon Alliance

Board of Directors

**From:** [Tennis Wick](#)  
**To:** [Christina Rivera](#); [McCall Miller](#)  
**Cc:** [Scott Orr](#); [Ross Markey](#)  
**Subject:** TOMORROW'S AGENDA  
**Date:** Monday, December 2, 2024 9:26:03 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---



## **[Attention: Sonoma Developmental Center Before the County Board of Supervisors on Tuesday, Dec. 3, 2024!](#)**

**We need you at the Board of Supervisors meeting!** Item # 52 on the Board of Supervisors agenda for Tuesday, December 3 is about the decertification of the Specific Plan and Environmental Impact Report for SDC as dictated by the Superior Court. In itself, is as ordered by the court but Permit Sonoma staff is also recommending the abandonment of the SDC Specific Plan comprehensive planning initiative and is relying on a state streamlined process for developments called “the Builder’s Remedy”. There is even a question if the SDC redevelopment project actually qualifies for the Builder’s Remedy. It seems the County just wants to wash their hands of the whole SDC development. This leaves the community out in the cold!

Come to the meeting in person, if you can, and be a visible objection to the Supervisors’ abandoning of the legislative planning process in favor of the streamlined Builder’s Remedy process for the redevelopment of the SDC.

**Location:** Board of Supervisors Chamber, 575 Administration Dr., Room 102A, Santa Rosa

**Date and Time:** Tuesday December 3, 2024 by 9:00am

**Link to the Meeting Agenda:** <https://sonoma-county.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7036306&GUID=D8C291FD-75D4-4D78-ADD8-1CC6DAC0C2C6>

Valley of the Moon Alliance



PO Box 95 Kenwood, Ca 95452 unsubscribe



**Tennis Wick, AICP**  
**Director**

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
[www.PermitSonoma.org](http://www.PermitSonoma.org)

**o:** (707) 565-1900  
**d:** (707) 565-1925

[Tennis.Wick@Sonoma-County.org](mailto:Tennis.Wick@Sonoma-County.org)



Lobby hours: Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM, Wednesday 10:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

## Brandt-Hawley Law Group

Chauvet House • PO Box 1659  
Glen Ellen, California 95442  
707.938.3900  
preservationlawyers.com

December 2, 2024

David Rabbitt, Chair  
and Members of the Board of Supervisors  
County of Sonoma  
*via email*

Subject: December 3, 2024 Agenda  
***Item 52 re Sonoma Developmental Center***

Dear Chair Rabbitt and Supervisors:

On behalf of Sonoma Community Advocates for a Liveable Environment (SCALE), I write to express their *support* for Item 52's actions to decertify the SDC EIR and set aside approvals of the Specific Plan. Such actions will comply with the preemptory writ issued by the Honorable Bradford DeMeo in Sonoma County Superior Court Case No. SCV-272539.

SCALE notes that the resolution references the import of the pending 2023 application for a major subdivision and housing development within the core campus of SDC — “provided” it qualifies “under the builder’s remedy.” In fact, the proposed project does *not* qualify for a builder’s remedy process under Government Code section 65589.5 (d), due to its host of “specific, adverse impacts on the public health or safety,” including, for example, the unaddressed water supply and unaddressed and unmitigable wildfire evacuation issues.

SCALE and SCT support substantial affordable housing at the SDC site and are confident that viable, reasonably sized redevelopment can be achieved as sought and supported by scores of County residents in the Valley of the Moon and beyond.

Thank you.

Sincerely,




Susan Brandt-Hawley


**From:** [Tennis Wick](#)  
**To:** [Christina Rivera](#); [McCall Miller](#)  
**Cc:** [Sita Kuteira](#); [Scott Orr](#); [Ross Markey](#); [Wil Lyons](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Item 52 on agenda tomorrow  
**Date:** Monday, December 2, 2024 2:38:26 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

FYI



**Tennis Wick, AICP**  
**Director**  
2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
[www.PermitSonoma.org](http://www.PermitSonoma.org)  
o: (707) 565-1900  
d: (707) 565-1925  
[Tennis.Wick@Sonoma-County.org](mailto:Tennis.Wick@Sonoma-County.org)



Lobby hours: Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM. Wednesday 10:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

---

**From:** Mary Guerrazzi <[maryguerrazzi@vom.com](mailto:maryguerrazzi@vom.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 2, 2024 2:36 PM  
**To:** Tennis Wick <[Tennis.Wick@sonoma-county.org](mailto:Tennis.Wick@sonoma-county.org)>  
**Subject:** Item 52 on agenda tomorrow

## EXTERNAL

Dear Tennis,

With regards to the SDC Development - Item 52 on the agenda for the Board of Supervisors please take into account my comments.

The community generally supports redevelopment of the SDC core campus. However, the community desires a plan that includes more affordable and less market rate housing. It also wants a plan that does not jeopardize public safety and/or public resources. As the Rogal/Grupe plan now stands, the amount of affordable housing is minimal, and numerous environmental impacts (wildlife corridor, traffic, water resources, wildfire risk and evacuation safety, etc.) are a given. **The only feasible mitigation to these impacts is to downsize the project.** The County should facilitate discussions between Rogal/Grupe, County Staff, and the community to develop a better plan.

If the Board of Supervisors deletes the Builder's Remedy I am happy to move forward with the developer's original plan.

Thank you.

Mary Guerrazzi


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:** [Tennis Wick](#)  
**To:** [Christina Rivera](#); [McCall Miller](#)  
**Cc:** [Sita Kuteira](#); [Scott Orr](#); [Ross Markey](#); [Wil Lyons](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Agenda item 52 Board of Supervisors meeting December 3 2024  
**Date:** Monday, December 2, 2024 2:34:58 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

FYI



**Tennis Wick, AICP**  
**Director**  
2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
[www.PermitSonoma.org](http://www.PermitSonoma.org)  
**o:** (707) 565-1900  
**d:** (707) 565-1925  
[Tennis.Wick@Sonoma-County.org](mailto:Tennis.Wick@Sonoma-County.org)



Lobby hours: Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM. Wednesday 10:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

---

**From:** Nancy Ryan <[ryan@vom.com](mailto:ryan@vom.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 2, 2024 2:32 PM  
**To:** Tennis Wick <[Tennis.Wick@sonoma-county.org](mailto:Tennis.Wick@sonoma-county.org)>  
**Subject:** Agenda item 52 Board of Supervisors meeting December 3 2024

## EXTERNAL

To Tennis Wick,

Please do not move forward with Rogal/Grupe plan at Sonoma Developmental Center. Do not allow this developer to slither through the "Builders Remedy" loophole.

The people of Glen Ellen support housing in the main campus area. The plan for 400-500 houses is acceptable, as long as they are houses for families, seniors, working people NOT luxury homes. Not a hotel. Not the Rogal plan.

SonomaNext100 outlined legal reasons why the builders remedy CAN be rejected by you.

Stand up for the people of Sonoma Valley. Stand up for the wildlife at SDC which is a critical part of the wildlife corridor that spans Sonoma County.

Please.

Nancy Ryan  
4210 Lakeside Drive  
Glen Ellen, CA 95442  
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:** [Tennis Wick](#)  
**To:** [Christina Rivera](#); [McCall Miller](#)  
**Cc:** [Sita Kuteira](#); [Scott Orr](#); [Ross Markey](#); [Wil Lyons](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Agenda item 52 Board of Supervisors Meeting Dec 3, 2024  
**Date:** Monday, December 2, 2024 2:23:29 PM

---

FYI

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

From: Barb Roy <b\_d\_roy@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 2:15 PM  
To: Tennis Wick <Tennis.Wick@sonoma-county.org>  
Subject: Agenda item 52 Board of Supervisors Meeting Dec 3, 2024

EXTERNAL

After all the community outreach, it is irresponsible of the County to abandon the SDC Specific Plan and allow the Builders Remedy. Clearly the developers have no regard for the health and safety of our community or they would not propose an oversized plan that endangers both wildlife and people. This community is not opposed to development of a reasonable and sustainable size with a greater level of affordable units. We are opposed to a plan made without regard for the impact on our community particularly in regard to water, wildlife, and our ability to escape wildfire.

This community spent years in cooperation with the County to create a sustainable plan for the SDC campus. Do not abandon us now to please a development group who cares nothing for the area. We are in this situation through a missed State deadline, please take responsibility for that failure, stand up for your constituents, and do what's right. Thank you.


Barbara and Patrick Roy  
1310 Hill Road  
Glen Ellen  
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:** [Tennis Wick](#)  
**To:** [Christina Rivera](#); [McCall Miller](#)  
**Cc:** [Scott Orr](#); [Ross Markey](#); [Wil Lyons](#); [Sita Kuteira](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Agenda item #52 for the Dec. 3 Supervisors Meeting  
**Date:** Monday, December 2, 2024 2:24:07 PM  
**Attachments:** [VOTMA comments on SDC Decertification.pdf](#)  
[image001.png](#)

---



**Tennis Wick, AICP**  
**Director**  
2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
[www.PermitSonoma.org](http://www.PermitSonoma.org)  
o: (707) 565-1900  
d: (707) 565-1925  
[Tennis.Wick@Sonoma-County.org](mailto:Tennis.Wick@Sonoma-County.org)



Lobby hours: Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM. Wednesday 10:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

---

**From:** Kathy Pons <282kpons@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 2, 2024 1:06 PM  
**To:** BOS <BOS@sonoma-county.org>; Susan Gorin <Susan.Gorin@sonoma-county.org>; David Rabbitt <David.Rabbitt@sonoma-county.org>; James Gore <James.Gore@sonoma-county.org>; district5 <district5@sonoma-county.org>; district3 <district3@sonoma-county.org>  
**Cc:** Tennis Wick <Tennis.Wick@sonoma-county.org>; Scott Orr <Scott.Orr@sonoma-county.org>; Robert Pittman <Robert.Pittman@sonoma-county.org>  
**Subject:** Agenda item #52 for the Dec. 3 Supervisors Meeting

## EXTERNAL

Supervisors,

*Decertification of the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan Environmental Report and Setting Aside and Abandoning the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan. A) Adopt a Resolution: i) 2024-1283 Repealing Resolution No. 22-0555 and decertifying the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report, and ii) Repealing Resolution No. 22-0556 and Setting Aside the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan and Associated General Plan and Zoning Code Amendments, and iii) Abandoning the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan comprehensive planning initiative. B) Adopt an Ordinance repealing Ordinance 6400 that amended portions of Chapter 26 of the Sonoma County Code related to the SDC Specific Plan and rezoned lands subject to the SDC Specific Plan.*

The Valley of the Moon Alliance (VOTMA) objects to Permit Sonoma's recommendation in its Summary Report in referenced Agenda item 52 that the Board abandon the Specific Plan initiative for the Sonoma Developmental Center.

Today, the County should abide by the Court's order, which is to decertify the SDC SP Environmental

Impact Report and repeal Resolution No. 22-0556, set aside the Specific Plan and associated General Plan and zoning code amendments (Agenda Items A(i) and (ii), and repeal Ordinance 6400 (Agenda Item B). But the Board should not walk away from and now abandon the multi-year process that the residents of Sonoma Valley were promised would produce a rational resolution to transitioning SDC from its State-owned surplus property status to an integrated community-oriented development. The Court provided appropriate guidance on the areas of concern that required setting aside the EIR and thus the SP. The County should maintain in place the vehicle for that the process, not abandon it now.

The PRMD staff recommendation appears driven by the faulty conclusion that the pending SB 330 application for development of this State-owned property renders the SDC Specific Plan ineffective. The staff's conclusory statements that a "builder's remedy" vested right under SB 330 would trump the SDC disposition enabling legislation is not supported by the law or logic. The SDC enabling legislation (Government Code Section 14670.10.5) authorizes a specific vehicle for disposition of this specific State-owned property. The staff's argument that SB 330 vesting should override the legislature's determination of how to dispose of this property, whether at the initial Specific Plan phase or for any revised SP, is simply wrong.

The SDC enabling legislation is a prior existing State law providing for a specific set of directives for disposing of this specific piece of State property that cannot just be tossed away. There is not a shred of legislative history that implies that the State legislature intended to allow a conflict between the general "builder's remedy" statute and the specific provisions of the SDC enabling legislation, or that the legislature intended SB 330 to override the specific SDC legislation it enacted for this property. Staff has provided no logic or legal support for its assertion that once the SB 330 application was accepted the SDC Specific Plan initiative became in effect a nullity. The legislation remains in place and is controlling. VOTMA urges the Board to honor it and not abandon the SP process. At a minimum the proceeding should be maintained in form in the event the pending SB 330 application is either rejected, withdrawn, or otherwise does not move forward and disposition via the SP initiative is viable.

As a final point, VOTMA observes that Staff's abrupt recommendation to abandon the SDC SP initiative comes well before the Court's reply date and over the Thanksgiving period where attention to this sort of shocking action is likely not to have registered for many who have devoted months and years to this contentious land disposition action.

In conclusion, VOTMA believes it is appropriate for the Board today to comply with the Court's order and to adopt Agenda items A (i) and A(ii) and B, but most definitely not Agenda item A(iii), which is neither discussed or required by the Court order, nor is legally sound or appropriate.

Sincerely yours,

The Valley of the Moon Alliance

Board of Directors

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.



# SONOMA ECOLOGY CENTER

Beautiful. Sustainable. Sonoma

December 2, 2024

**Re: Agenda Item 52, Sonoma County Board of Supervisors, Dec. 3, 2024**

Decertification of the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan Environmental Report and Setting Aside and Abandoning the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan

Sonoma County Board of Supervisors

575 Administration Drive

Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Dear Supervisors,

Sonoma Ecology Center has been active in the assessment, planning, and disposition process for the former Sonoma Developmental Center for many years, because the property is the most important land use opportunity in Sonoma Valley in a generation, from the perspectives of wildlife protection, water security for people and nature, biodiversity, and affordable housing. During the planning process, we submitted detailed letters to Sonoma County with suggestions that were often incorporated into the Specific Plan and EIR.

We will continue to participate actively in the CEQA process, on our own and with other organizations. We are collecting data on biotic resources, water resources, use of the larger property by wildlife, and site conditions. We will assess the impacts of various redevelopment and management scenarios on these valuable, shared public assets. We will make actionable, science-based recommendations for how the campus can be redeveloped, and the larger property managed for recreation and other uses, in ways that protect and enhance the natural assets that belong to all Californians, and that are especially precious to those who live or work in Sonoma Valley.

Sincerely yours,

Richard Dale, Executive Director

[richard@sonomaecologycenter.org](mailto:richard@sonomaecologycenter.org)

**From:** [Tennis Wick](#)  
**To:** [Christina Rivera](#); [McCall Miller](#)  
**Cc:** [Sita Kuteira](#); [Scott Orr](#); [Ross Markey](#); [Wil Lyons](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Agenda Item 52 for the Dec. 3 Sonoma County Board of Supervisors Meeting.  
**Date:** Monday, December 2, 2024 3:41:07 PM

---

FYI

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

From: Stevi Hanson <[stevi.hanson@hitgroup.ca](mailto:stevi.hanson@hitgroup.ca)>  
Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 3:25 PM  
To: Tennis Wick <[Tennis.Wick@sonoma-county.org](mailto:Tennis.Wick@sonoma-county.org)>  
Subject: Agenda Item 52 for the Dec. 3 Sonoma County Board of Supervisors Meeting.

EXTERNAL

Please, as a local resident that loves Glen Ellen, and loves SDC. Please don't destroy it with massive amounts of building that will destroy the wildlife corridor. Some of the historic buildings represent our history, and should not just be replaced with multiple housing, commercial, and thoughtless development. Evacuation in the event of fire would be severely impacted. Green space and historical preservation is very important to local residents.

Thank you,

Stevi Hanson  
1800 Trinity Rd. Glen Ellen, ca 95442

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:** [Tennis Wick](#)  
**To:** [Christina Rivera](#); [McCall Miller](#)  
**Cc:** [Sita Kuteira](#); [Scott Orr](#); [Ross Markey](#); [Wil Lyons](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Agenda Item 52 for the Dec. 3 Sonoma County Board of Supervisors Meeting.  
**Date:** Monday, December 2, 2024 3:07:39 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

FYI



---

**From:** Monica McKey <[monicamckey@yahoo.com](mailto:monicamckey@yahoo.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 2, 2024 3:04 PM  
**To:** BOS <[BOS@sonoma-county.org](mailto:BOS@sonoma-county.org)>; Tennis Wick <[Tennis.Wick@sonoma-county.org](mailto:Tennis.Wick@sonoma-county.org)>  
**Subject:** Agenda Item 52 for the Dec. 3 Sonoma County Board of Supervisors Meeting.

## EXTERNAL

I am unable to attend tomorrow's Board of Supervisors meeting, so I am writing to urge the Supervisors not to hand over the SDC core campus to developers who have never even bothered to engage the community as to the future of this historically important and environmentally sensitive property.

The Court found the EIR and Specific Plan deficient, and the Board should not abandon the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan comprehensive planning initiative in favor of a Builder's Remedy process, but should instead consider alternatives to the Builder's Remedy.

This community is not opposed to the inevitable redevelopment of the SDC core campus, but that should include more affordable and less market rate housing. In addition, any redevelopment plan must not jeopardize public safety and/or public resources. As the Rogal/Grupe plan now stands, the amount of affordable housing is minimal, and numerous negative environmental impacts are a certainty. The only feasible mitigation to these impacts is to downsize the project. The County should facilitate discussions between Rogal/Grupe, County Staff, and the community to develop a better plan.

There is continued overwhelming public concern regarding this project. So



I urge you the County to work with developers and the community to come up with a more reasonable project that avoids significant impacts and potential additional litigation.

Monica McKey  
43-year resident of Sonoma, 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:** [Tennis Wick](#)  
**To:** [Christina Rivera](#); [McCall Miller](#)  
**Cc:** [Sita Kuteira](#); [Scott Orr](#); [Ross Markey](#); [Wil Lyons](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Agenda Item 52 for the Dec. 3 Sonoma County Board of Supervisors Meeting  
**Date:** Monday, December 2, 2024 3:37:42 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

FYI



---

**From:** Arthur Dawson <baseline@vom.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 2, 2024 3:09 PM  
**To:** BOS <BOS@sonoma-county.org>; Tennis Wick <Tennis.Wick@sonoma-county.org>  
**Subject:** Agenda Item 52 for the Dec. 3 Sonoma County Board of Supervisors Meeting

## EXTERNAL

Dear Sonoma County Supervisors and Permit Sonoma,

As a 35-year resident of Glen Ellen, former Chair of the North Sonoma Valley Municipal Advisory Council,

And local small business owner, I strongly request that:

- **The Board of Supervisors NOT approve the portion of the resolution regarding acceptance of the Builders Remedy process.**
- **The County consider alternatives to the Builder's Remedy.**
- The community generally supports redevelopment of the SDC core campus. However, the community desires a plan that includes more affordable and less market rate housing. It also wants a plan that does not jeopardize public safety and/or public resources. As the Rogal/Grupe plan now stands, the amount of affordable housing is minimal, and numerous environmental impacts (wildlife corridor, traffic, water resources, wildfire risk and evacuation safety, etc.) are a given. **The only feasible mitigation to these impacts is to downsize the project.** The County should facilitate discussions between Rogal/Grupe, County Staff, and the community to develop a better plan.

- The Board of Supervisors should object to the Rogal/Grupe Builder's Remedy application on grounds outlined by Sonoma Valley Next 100 in their [July 29, 2024 letter to Permit Sonoma](#).
- The Board of Supervisors should object to the Rogal/Grupe Builder's Remedy application on the grounds that it poses certain risk to public health and safety in the event of a fast-moving wildfire.
- There is still time for the County to work with developers and the community to come up with a more reasonable project that avoids significant impacts and potential additional litigation.

Sincerely,

Arthur Dawson

Glen Ellen, California

Phone: (707) 996-9967

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:** [Tennis Wick](#)  
**To:** [Christina Rivera](#); [McCall Miller](#)  
**Cc:** [Sita Kuteira](#); [Scott Orr](#); [Ross Markey](#); [Wil Lyons](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Agenda Item 52 for the Dec. 3 Sonoma County Board of Supervisors Meeting  
**Date:** Monday, December 2, 2024 3:06:47 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

FYI



---

**From:** Jack Sporer <jesporer@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 2, 2024 3:04 PM  
**To:** Tennis Wick <Tennis.Wick@sonoma-county.org>  
**Subject:** Agenda Item 52 for the Dec. 3 Sonoma County Board of Supervisors Meeting

## EXTERNAL

To whom it may concern,

As a younger member of the Sonoma Valley business community, I am interested in changing this place for the better. I have a strong desire to adapt to the needs of our current populace, and it's clear that we need more housing and homes for the people who live and work here.

All that said, what makes this valley such a great place to live and work--the nature, the agriculture, and the community--is all in jeopardy if we ignore the recommendations of the EIR. The locals have worked hard to impress upon the BOS and the Eldridge Renewal group how important it is to keep the scope of this project to a reasonable size and impact. Instead of caving to corporate bottom lines, I would like to advocate listening to the people who have the best interest of this space in mind.

The current 'builder's remedy' proposal seems like the worst of all worlds. It has no mitigation for wildlife corridors, it has minimal allowances for public transportation, no proper evacuation routes, and is entirely lacking in meaningful concessions to those who are most likely to be affected by this development.

I'll reiterate, we need change, we need housing, and we need to support business in

this space. But we are also in a climate crisis, with all the devastation that entails to local flora and fauna, and we need to utilize the community input to reduce the scope of this project. Please reconsider putting corporate interests ahead of the community and the environment.

--

Jack Sporer  
Winemaker, Magnolia Wine Services  
415-202-3984  
21481 8th St E, Suite 1  
Sonoma, CA 95476

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.