

Q27 Thank you for completing this survey. Please share any other comments you have below: Gracias por completar esta encuesta. Comparta cualquier otro comentario que tenga a continuación:

Answered: 247 Skipped: 425

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Thank you so much for this survey. It made it easier than self generating a letter on my own. I really appreciate the details of the survey and choices given.	12/14/2021 11:43 AM
2	No housing	12/14/2021 11:24 AM
3	Thanks for offering us a chance to participate in these decisions.	12/14/2021 11:21 AM
4	Save the SDC and Glen Ellen	12/14/2021 10:42 AM
5	The plan to put housing on the property will not work with the wild life corridor . The people that did the survey don't seem to understand this is not the location for housing and more traffic .	12/14/2021 10:34 AM
6	Our roads and community services do not support dense housing. Our valley and its natural beauty is being choked out by those who only see \$\$\$ lining their pockets. Let's use the good sense we've got left, hanging by a thread, to preserve the reason people love this area so much!!	12/14/2021 9:50 AM
7	Open space please. Low impact reconstruction. For the people not corporations and hospitality.	12/14/2021 8:39 AM
8	Thank you for this survey You nailed it!	12/14/2021 8:07 AM
9	Thanks for the survey.	12/14/2021 7:06 AM
10	SDC was always a place for the community of all socio economic levels. It was a welcoming location with no boundaries. Please keep it a place for all of us and not another place in the valley just for the wealthy. The majority of our population is middle to lower class. Meet our needs and make us proud. Make us feel heard and valued. And definitely do everything in your power to protect the natural beauty and habitat of this glorious property that has provided incredible recreational activities for its neighbors. Thank you for taking care to create an environment that will best meet the needs of our community as more and more incredible community members move away because of the outrageous cost of housing.	12/13/2021 10:38 PM
11	The character of the area needs to be preserved.	12/13/2021 10:28 PM
12	The roads in Glen Ellen cannot support the proposed number of homes (people, cars). In 2017 it was difficult to evacuate quickly because of the number of cars trying to leave. Over development would be setting the stage for disaster. I feel it is important to limit the development in order to preserve the 'character' of the Glen Ellen area. The wildlife corridor is an important component in the balance of nature and it is necessary to preserve it.	12/13/2021 9:56 PM
13	Help the area housing crisis should be absolute number one priority!	12/13/2021 9:46 PM
14	I was employed at SDC for about 30 years and am familiar with grounds and the Glen Ellen area and lived in Glen Ellen for a number of years. I feel strongly that the rural nature of the area should be preserved.	12/13/2021 9:22 PM
15	Protect our planet! No new development, especially in a fire risk area like this. Keep nature as is.	12/13/2021 9:08 PM
16	Please preserve this unique property. Do not consider grand hotels or homes.	12/13/2021 8:53 PM
17	I would love to see a mix of business/retail, housing, community services, and some trade schooling for industries that are not covered in school anymore.	12/13/2021 8:47 PM
18	The state should be responsible for upgrade or tear down of poorly maintained buildings. Keep	12/13/2021 8:35 PM

SDC Redevelopment Community Input Dec 21

the vast area open as natural resource and any business opportunity should serve the community of Sonoma Valley and not tourists.

19	Hope something good comes of it.	12/13/2021 8:32 PM
20	Arnold Drive would not be able to accommodate a substantial population increase in Glen Ellen. No plan should disrupt the tranquility of Glen Ellen.	12/13/2021 8:05 PM
21	The 3 alternatives lack creativity and do not take into consideration the realities of 2021. I propose going back to the state and asking them to re-evaluate. Since they wrote that legislation climate change has dramatically changed our world. There is no scenario where putting that high of density housing in high wildfire prone Glen Ellen is a good idea. And I dismiss the argument that when SDC was at full capacity the Glen Ellen infrastructure could handle it, I argue Glen Ellen is NOTHING like it was back then and it's not even a comparable scenario. I've also seen the science of the importance of this wildlife corridor, one of the handful remaining in California. The state has acknowledged the urgency in protecting this corridor. I don't think any of these plans will pass any EIR (in either fire safety or wildlife corridor preservation) and thus you are wasting your time perusing any of these alternatives. I reject all these alternatives and insists it's time to get creative and come up with a 4th alternative that takes into consideration both the current 2021 realities and the voice of the people.	12/13/2021 8:01 PM
22	Do not quadruple the population of GE! Make it a better place to raise families and enjoy.	12/13/2021 7:56 PM
23	I believe just a select few historic buildings should be refurbished. Retrofitting for earthquakes may be too expensive and ought only be done for 1-3 prominent structures. Stone walls can give continuity.	12/13/2021 7:51 PM
24	Thank you for this very thoughtful and much needed survey!	12/13/2021 7:44 PM
25	more time for input	12/13/2021 7:40 PM
26	Affordable housing without selling off some land for a resort and luxury housing will never happen. Use one to pay for the other and stop looking for people in the community to subsidize those that expect a free ride. The resort would supply real jobs. The current options are doomed. What developer wants to lose money on a fantasy plan that is unrealistic to ever happen.	12/13/2021 7:33 PM
27	Se necesita vivienda. A bajo costo. Para personas que están trabajando Mi esposo y yo hemos tratado de comprar una casita. Pero no calificamos. Los precios son demasiado caros.	12/13/2021 7:26 PM
28	Hello my name is Ashley. I am 19 and was born and raised in sonoma my whole life. We need affordable housing. If you care about our town please care about the people who live here. Happy holidays.	12/13/2021 6:48 PM
29	I feel that the State of California failed the residents of Sonoma County in not providing upkeep to this property before now. It should not be up to to Sonoma County taxpayers to clean this up. And the proposals did not take into account the desires of the residents and agencies dedicated to the future of Sonoma Mountain and Glen Ellen. Thank you for providing this method of input.	12/13/2021 6:37 PM
30	Please don't build a hotel!!!	12/13/2021 6:09 PM
31	I sincerely hope that the redevelopment of the SDC does not become a land grab where outside monied interests do what they want and the local community bears the consequences.	12/13/2021 5:59 PM
32	FREE PUBLIC OPEN SPACE OVER ALL OTHER CONSIDERATIONS!! This is a unique opportunity to protect access to this beautiful property for ALL - not just the rich and selfish!	12/13/2021 5:58 PM
33	Thanks for your efforts	12/13/2021 5:27 PM
34	Ojalá que se use ese espacio para viviendas en bajos precios para la gente local y sus alrededores principalmente .. y no para gente rica que se hace mas rica...	12/13/2021 5:13 PM
35	N/a	12/13/2021 5:10 PM
36	Whatever is done , it should be of "light day use" or very small quite living spaces with as little traffic added as possible. Like maybe Elder budget housing. We have several ball parks already that I do not see being used enough.	12/13/2021 5:06 PM

SDC Redevelopment Community Input Dec 21

37	High-end development of this property would be tragic.	12/13/2021 4:54 PM
38	Keep it simple and sustainable.	12/13/2021 4:54 PM
39	Muy importante lo de la vivienda a precios accesibles	12/13/2021 4:54 PM
40	Thank you! I could support a very small hotel if a hostel could be part of this (not an option provided so I didn't select hotel). I support a high level of affordable housing, with the necessary mix that affordable housing experts recommend for healthy, vibrant neighborhoods and some concession to financial viability (not sure exactly what this mix is so did my best with survey). I could support an innovation hub (and ticked this box), but not alternative C. Too much housing in C and too dependent on a "what if" since no tenant(s) have been identified and market for office / work space is weak.	12/13/2021 4:44 PM
41	Many of these questions/responses require qualification. For example, on housing there should be some amount of very low income, subsidized type housing, yes, but most should target middle class people/families who grew up here in the valley to should be able to continue living here by sizing homes/lots and construction styles to keep costs low. Totally fine to have some larger, more market rate homes interspersed as well, but again, there should be a residency/legacy test. And yes the state should be responsible for toxics remediation but not necessarily deferred maintenance and historic preservation of buildings. Hotel/motel, institutional/innovation hub and commercial development are all fine to keep housing numbers down and have the thing cost out...as long as planned appropriately and provide job opportunities similar to what SDC provided historically	12/13/2021 4:36 PM
42	I no longer reside in Glen Ellen, though I still own property there. I spent many hours of recreation in the regional park and on SDC property. I was also aware of the central importance of employment. I still enjoy this area when I am visiting. Glen Ellen is a wildlife habitat of importance and should not be devoted entirely to tourism, as seems to be the case since the closing of the SDC. I think most longtime residents would agree.	12/13/2021 4:33 PM
43	All 3 "alternatives" are inappropriate and overbuilt for this sensitive environmental treasure. Not even enough parking and ignores our ability to safely exit during evacuations. STOP THE INSANITY! We need a 4th alternative with pocket neighborhoods surrounded by open space. Focus should be on affordable housing, but even then, no more than 400-450 units in total. Wild life and people needs to roam freely around the pocket neighborhoods. This should not be dense and if market rate housing is included, it should be mixed in with the affordable housing. There should not be a "low income" area. Development should be inclusive. NO speculative office space, etc. Minimal night time lighting so we can remain the Valley of the Moon!	12/13/2021 4:28 PM
44	I would like to see a trade school on site, with childcare facilities. This would be a wonderful option to so many that are unable to attend collage.	12/13/2021 4:23 PM
45	This beautiful piece of property needs to be preserved as much as possible for as long as possible. It will never be able to go back once we start going forward. We don't need large hotels or mansions. Water is scarce and traffic needs to be addressed. SDC used it's own water and treatment plant. The state claims to have a huge surplus so let them come in and clean things up. Then you wouldn't need huge investors.	12/13/2021 4:10 PM
46	I appreciate this survey. Greater attention needs to be paid to actual fire lines in 2017 and the likely recurring evacuations and the risk of another 1000 to 2000 plus vehicles trying to escape on already crowded single lane roads. Parts are difficult to answer. For instance, there is a big difference between 50 and 75% in number or types of housing or how many three story apartment buildings would be considered.	12/13/2021 3:59 PM
47	I really liked the idea of an innovation center or climate hub.	12/13/2021 3:49 PM
48	I would like to see affordable housing be considered for local educators, nurses, firefighters and law enforcement	12/13/2021 3:36 PM
49	The maintenance of the existing buildings is slowly changing for the worse with no heat being sent to each resulting in the most utilizable buildings losing ground each day for tomorrow's viability. The State has a real obligation to keep these building in a condition of stability and not on a list of demolition tomorrow. I am a strong proponent of affordable housing but not at the cost of losing the pristine nature of the grounds. I am also a strong proponent of having Sonoma State U or Santa Rosa Community College assuming ownership of some part of the future use of SDC.	12/13/2021 2:17 PM

SDC Redevelopment Community Input Dec 21

50	There is a huge deficit of affordable housing and housing for the homeless in Sonoma County. This should be the priority for redevelopment of this site. Facilities may also be considered for that population on the site but market rate housing should NOT be on this property!	12/13/2021 1:47 PM
51	Historical preservation questions all depend on the perspective taken-YES to remembering the complex history on the site that includes eugenics/forced sterilization, Indigenous history, etc. NO to the idealized "history of care legacy" being memorialized, especially when it is a result of mostly white, often male, non-disabled people in positions of power setting that narrative.	12/13/2021 1:46 PM
52	Thank you for doing this work. Data speaks and helps give communities a voice.	12/13/2021 1:34 PM
53	Improve the landscaping. This should not be a place for the homeless to camp. Work on the curb appeal.	12/13/2021 1:22 PM
54	The current 3 proposals are all extremely short sighted with little regard for public safety, fire evacuation, drought and the impact on the current community	12/13/2021 1:14 PM
55	Thank you!!	12/13/2021 1:02 PM
56	The three current plans are very similar and very poorly done.	12/13/2021 1:00 PM
57	many of these were leading questions that would have benefited from a comment box to clarify the answers	12/13/2021 12:59 PM
58	I am definitely against this property being for commercial endeavors.	12/13/2021 12:47 PM
59	Excellent survey! Thank you	12/13/2021 12:32 PM
60	We do not need more housing in this Valley. We already have a population that is too high (considering the amount of water used and waste produced). We need full ecosystem protection and an expanded hiking and biking network, with additional 30 bus service. Especially, no 'Affordable Housing', which is more appropriate to existing urban areas like the East Bay and Central Valley.	12/13/2021 12:17 PM
61	I would like to see the site remain as open as possible. It is a jewel that should not be merely for the wealthy.	12/13/2021 11:27 AM
62	DO THE RIGHT THING, MAKE THIS AREA AFFORDABLE AND COMMUNITY BASE CENTER!!	12/13/2021 11:15 AM
63	Apoyo lo que es mejor para Sonoma	12/13/2021 11:12 AM
64	Very good Questionnaire well thought out. Small glitch if you use the back button to check on one of your answers you have to restart the whole survey, perhaps this could be fixed. Thank you	12/13/2021 11:11 AM
65	I would love to see the space used for outdoor recreation for all. It would also be great if the development plan included programs that serve the developmentally disabled of all ages that once lived and were served on the SDC property. I envision special needs camps, art/activity/motor groups and an activity sports hub for this undeserved population. I am an occupational therapist that lives in the neighborhood next to the SDC and would love to someday help in the development of such programs depending on how the development of the property progresses.	12/13/2021 11:03 AM
66	I don't believe more dense housing will bring in more jobs in the long run. Workers will also be brought in from outside our community as there are not enough skilled workers already in our area to hire people for projects. Too much hype on how higher density will improve the community. Still seems like it will be a land grab for big property owners and once again it will be who you know and how you're connected to cash in the land grab opportunity.	12/13/2021 10:59 AM
67	The SDC is a historical location that is precious and should not be redeveloped to include a multitude of housing and activities. Proposing to double a population in a small town is not using our resources in a thoughtful manner. There is a need for truly affordable housing and support for people with disabilities. Please don't saturate our community with a resort and overpriced housing. Please take our open space and quality of life into consideration. Not everything needs to be more housing!	12/13/2021 10:26 AM
68	The area should be self-sufficient housing and retraining for homeless, including counseling, drug rehab, and job training.	12/13/2021 10:10 AM

SDC Redevelopment Community Input Dec 21

69	Very important to keep wildlife corridor open.	12/13/2021 10:01 AM
70	If you'd asked me this 8 years ago, my answers would be very different but after multiple fires, evacuations and power outages that cripple us, dumping more housing where there is only one road in and out is just wrong. We can barely get out as it is. I've lived in this valley over 50 years and what's happening here is not right. New growth vineyards are robbing our water; PG&E shareholders get more from our power utility than we do and solar is now being attacked. And, let's talk wild life corridors, mountain lions and the non-human population that just isn't taken into account. Get the state to clean this mess up and employ our local residents; start using the adequate buildings for shops that further clean up and get the facilities taken care of first while the State is still participating, even though at a minimum.	12/13/2021 9:57 AM
71	Thank you for doing this survey. I would welcome more options for "other," as multiple choice can limit accuracy. Ex. I don't live in the area anymore, but Glen Ellen is my home and I am profoundly concerned about what happens to it.	12/13/2021 9:33 AM
72	Espero que ayga más vivienda porque es una gran preocupación para nuestra comunidad de sonoma	12/13/2021 9:29 AM
73	En Sonoma estamos muy nesecitados de vivienda accesible porque el sueldo es muy poco y la renta es muy alta por favor nesecitamos mucha alluda	12/13/2021 9:28 AM
74	Make it open space, no buildings that wold increase traffic and noise pollution	12/13/2021 9:23 AM
75	I am a Glen Ellen resident, and have a 3 yr old child. I am concerned that heavy construction/development will impact the wildlife around Glen Ellen. The SDC is a beautiful-nature preserve, and continues to inspire children (who are THE future) to love and respect nature, to become environmentalists, and acknowledge that their presence leaves a mark on this world, way beyond their years. As a Glen Ellen family, we do NOT support commercial development, and would like the keep the area as is, and protected as a regional park. If the input of the community who will be directly impacted by redevelopment is, indeed, an important aspect of the County's decision, then I implore you to listen to us, and protect the area as a wildlife/nature preserve.	12/13/2021 9:22 AM
76	The report that the County came up with was a total sham, terrible options offered that provided poor solutions.	12/13/2021 9:14 AM
77	We the people could really love a progressive community, a place to meet, and the history of the place needs to be conserved.	12/13/2021 9:13 AM
78	The State and the County needs to reset the timetable for any final decision. The 3 alternatives are absolutely unacceptable. If they continue pushing for one of these plans to be adopted they should expect that law suites will be forth coming. This land should be protected against any such abominations. The State needs to step up and do the right thing. This property should be kept in a Trust and developed into an historic park and recreation area similar to the Presidio in San Francisco.	12/13/2021 9:12 AM
79	Please don't let greed rule the day.	12/13/2021 9:11 AM
80	It was good enough for the developmentally disabled.	12/13/2021 9:10 AM
81	thank you	12/13/2021 9:03 AM
82	Please make CA DGS remove ALL toxic material placed in and on the property over the 100 plus years of state operation.	12/13/2021 8:51 AM
83	I feel it is extremely important to consider the environmental impact of any development. Maintaining the relatively rural environment of SDC and preserving the wildlife corridor needs to be a high priority. Traffic impacts of all three proposals will be significant. A hotel should be completely off the table, as should be any consideration of a significant increase in any type of housing. I would support a proposal that includes an increase in recreation opportunities, a community center, and/or health or educational related facilities that serve the public.	12/13/2021 8:49 AM
84	I think the existing buildings should be renovated into affordable housing. The garden, farm, bank, laundry, etc should be restored and should put effort into becoming self sustainable again. Some buildings should be used for mental health care/rehab facilities. Do not add more structures for housing. Instead, have affordable housing with on site job opportunities.	12/13/2021 8:34 AM
85	Restore the farm, dairy and orchard which supplied not only SDC but several other	12/13/2021 8:34 AM

SDC Redevelopment Community Input Dec 21

	developmental centers. Would offer work to residents living at SDC.	
86	TY for all the hard work and efforts gone in to this survey.	12/13/2021 8:30 AM
87	Work with the existing footprint of the buildings and leave the green open spaces for public use and wildlife use!	12/13/2021 8:14 AM
88	This community, which has been a good neighbor of this property for decades, has been essentially ignored after years of good faith effort by the community to support a reasonable transition of uses.	12/13/2021 8:03 AM
89	Tiny houses on AFFORDABLE tiny lots. Use the foundations that currently exist when possible/safe. Keep the same housing footprint. NO Market value, single family homes. Preserve open space.	12/13/2021 8:01 AM
90	Please keep open space for people and animals. Couldn't the Ecology Center or Land Trust be primarily involved in stewards of this beautiful land?	12/13/2021 8:00 AM
91	No housing!!! Make SDC a giant multi-use park!!	12/13/2021 7:09 AM
92	An additional comment - the redevelopment of the SDC should occur over a long period of time to decrease the annual cost and facilitate refinement of plans based on lessons learned during the redevelopment	12/13/2021 6:55 AM
93	Good Survey. Thank you.	12/13/2021 6:50 AM
94	Good luck!	12/13/2021 6:46 AM
95	no comment	12/13/2021 5:20 AM
96	Save the land for the wild life as much as possible	12/13/2021 5:15 AM
97	#16 community spaces is vague, should have examples, such as a public square or public gardens. That would be cool!	12/13/2021 5:12 AM
98	Sonoma Valley is of historical importance, and the development plan should maintain that history for future generations. A Jack London museum would be one idea. Maintaining the forested area and the wildlife corridor are our responsibility; one small hotel would probably not impact this too much, but a project like Asilomar could provide space for on-site conferences and a restaurant. Low-income housing could be placed elsewhere, preferably in an area with good bus service. Adding more traffic would be a disaster for many reasons including the potential of wildfire evacuation.	12/13/2021 5:03 AM
99	You cannot force a mega community into the middle of a rural community! It's just plain wrong; and, I didn't bust my ass for 31 years to live in an upscale quiet community only to have some Libtard politicians dilute my property value with some il-conceived robin hood socialist plan for a low income housing gift. No-one ever promised the American dream included free (or assisted) housing. I object to the Socialist affect whereby families in the Firehouse Village and other "affordable housing" drive Cadillac Escalades while enjoying taxpayer funded housing and I drive an older vehicle having worked a full-time job plus two part-time jobs for twenty years just to be able to make ends meet. While I no longer have to work part time jobs, having worked VERY hard to "climb the corporate ladder", you politicians giving away that housing PRIVILEGE to others unwilling to work as hard for it, is just wrong!	12/13/2021 4:10 AM
100	Strongly opposed to any hotels and high- density housing	12/13/2021 3:29 AM
101	I am unable to complete this survey for reasons of: lack of transparency and survey construction issues.	12/13/2021 12:39 AM
102	After listening at online forums and reading the proposals and community input it is very clear that extremely knowledgeable, professional and dedicated community members have created viable and visionary options that will enhance and elevate the land and community. I urge the county to listen and stand behind postponing the deadline and support the hardworking community in creating what they know is needed and wanted for future generations. It would be such a shame to blow this opportunity and alienate the people who actually live in Glen Ellen. Thank you.	12/13/2021 12:20 AM
103	Number issue is support fir disability community .. housing, jobs, training and inclusion in all decision making	12/13/2021 12:16 AM

SDC Redevelopment Community Input Dec 21

104	I find it unbelievable that the State is not doing the necessary updating of the available cottages and main buildings when SDC was only closed in 2018. How long did the State and Sonoma County know it was not inhabitable to clients and employees as well as the public! The State should used it's surplus to upgrade buildings much like was done for the Presidio in San Francisco. We do not need a "boutique hotel or exclusive restaurant let only market rate houses. The community spent years discussing uses of the property and the State and Country have all but ignored the wants and wishes of that community. I can only surmise the obvious- back door agreements with lobbyists, developers, State leaders and the State agency in charge of the Development Centers. Give the Sonoma Valley Community what they wanted not what developers want!	12/12/2021 11:52 PM
105	Resort/hotels/commercial entities are NOT welcome. Unless politicians listen to voters' voices, the wil NOT be re-elected.	12/12/2021 11:33 PM
106	This property is a jewel of open space in the county. Let's keep it rural and attractive. The least development, the better. All of the upper level property should have state park status.	12/12/2021 10:50 PM
107	It is most important to preserve as much open space as possible and to encourage natural habitat	12/12/2021 9:58 PM
108	Property should be open to public usage, inappropriate for housing. Revisit plans after 5 years, 10 years, 15 years	12/12/2021 9:39 PM
109	Affordable housing should be located adjacent to services and multiple modes of transportation.	12/12/2021 9:14 PM
110	I would have thought that the three options would have been quite a bit more different than they are, for real choices	12/12/2021 8:23 PM
111	Land trust	12/12/2021 8:20 PM
112	Thank you for this excellent survey, we need more community input.	12/12/2021 8:19 PM
113	Good job God be with you guys	12/12/2021 7:55 PM
114	Thanks for all your efforts in creating this survey!	12/12/2021 7:43 PM
115	No housing. Keep the natural beauty of the property.	12/12/2021 7:41 PM
116	This is such a unique opportunity, not only for Sonoma - but the country as well. Stop accommodating real estate investing and make a truly magical GREEN environment for all.	12/12/2021 7:35 PM
117	The proposed 3 plans are ridiculous! The pure fabric of our way of life here in Glen Ellen will be forever ruined! This is a high jacking and all of the money hungry planners know it. No water and utilities. Let's put some brains behind this instead of money!	12/12/2021 7:33 PM
118	Lots of affordable housing please, while protecting exiting open space. It is impossible to keep development at bay, we must move forward with thoughtful generosity.	12/12/2021 7:12 PM
119	Quality of life is important for humans and wildlife. We do not need more luxury hotels and estates. The rural charm needs to be preserved, not commercially repackaged as some ostentatious tourist destination. That's what Healdsburg is for.	12/12/2021 7:06 PM
120	How about a youth hostel similar to the ones in Europe	12/12/2021 6:56 PM
121	The state should be responsible for cleaning up any environmental issues and restoring the basic systems (water and electrical) to working order.	12/12/2021 6:52 PM
122	Keep any development on the flatlands that are/were previously developed. NO RESORTS. NO MANSIONS/ESTATES. Leaving this area during fires is already difficult, slow, dangerous and frightening. 1,000 new homes means 2-3,000 more cars. This doesn't even account for the customers at the resort. Protect us and protect wildlife by implementing extreme limits on development	12/12/2021 6:47 PM
123	Part of the existing campus should be used to expand LPS housing for State Hospital patients to free up Napa beds for more Forensic commitments to address court wait lists. The state would save money by repairing existing institutions instead of building new ones.	12/12/2021 6:45 PM
124	I thought the options were brilliant and well rendered. I love hiking there and think the property is exceptional and should be treasured, and also revitalized. The options allow for enhancing a lovely area without degrading the land, and keeping the outdoor opportunities it allows for.	12/12/2021 6:39 PM

SDC Redevelopment Community Input Dec 21

Affordable housing and a clinic (state not bond funded though) are both critical for our town which lacks housing yet requires low income workers. I hope these options succeed.

125	I think it's a real shame that u kicked out developmentally disabled people and want to put rich house in there. U should use the building and facilities for seniors and folks with disabilities. It is what the property was made for	12/12/2021 6:37 PM
126	No more land grabs for the wealthy and tourists	12/12/2021 6:32 PM
127	I don't support any of the three alternative plans. I support Sonoma Ecology Center's vision for SDC	12/12/2021 6:16 PM
128	I support a Trust to oversee and gradually shepherd this gem's transition into its new form. I love the idea of mixed housing to support the underserved- low income workers, special needs, fixed income. We need to plan the minimum infrastructure needed to support these populations as well (like transportation needs). We have a huge responsibility to protect our wildlife corridor. That is SO IMPORTANT to me. Figuring out a workable disaster/evacuation response is also really important for this new development. Thanks Shannon & so many, for your work and care for our precious town! Keep Glen Ellen rural!!!	12/12/2021 6:15 PM
129	What about an acute care hospital on SDC property for Sonoma Valley as well as a skilled nursing facility	12/12/2021 6:13 PM
130	The hotel/resort term can easily be misconstrued. I am FOR a small boutique hotel with sustainable practices, NOT a large resort. I think most people would say no to a hotel, thinking it would be a large resort or a 4 story "Marriott" convention hotel. A small boutique hotel would be good for the community and have F&B and even recreational activities the community could use.	12/12/2021 6:03 PM
131	Absolutely no approval of over 100 resident homes. We don't want another small city to replace this beautiful rural area ! In addition how would current utilities, water, sewer, electric support the number of houses currently proposed !	12/12/2021 5:56 PM
132	The SDC has been a calm Oasis in Glen Ellen, it needs to stay that way. It makes no se se to make it a major housing/office/tourism/anything busy, we need to preserve the rural character of our town. It can support maybe 50 housing units, they should be affordable so people can stay in the valley. But major housing developments belong close to cities and services and major roads. It would be a disaster for Glen Ellen.	12/12/2021 5:42 PM
133	Very thorough survey. Thank you for your time.	12/12/2021 5:41 PM
134	Every household will have 2 or more cars, there are only 2 one lane in each direction roads. Fire danger grows every year, who knows what the aqua levels are....	12/12/2021 5:31 PM
135	Thank you for asking these important questions	12/12/2021 5:30 PM
136	Jordan Winslow	12/12/2021 5:30 PM
137	I believe this survey has allowed me to respond to the most significant issues involved in redevelopment of SDC. I urge that everyone in our area support co-housing and a limit on the number of vehicles allowed per household so that we can minimize the impact of traffic in this unique and fragile place.	12/12/2021 5:21 PM
138	Grew up going there with my parents. I worked Ther as well and absolutely loved my time there. I miss the place, the residents and the people that made it a great place to work. Ty	12/12/2021 5:02 PM
139	It would be nice if redevelopment included Modern shared / community housing for low / lower income retirees. And, in part as a nod to the history, some options for mental health research / clinics.	12/12/2021 4:54 PM
140	Let's use this land wisely for the benefit of the public rather than see it full of new houses and huge traffic problems	12/12/2021 4:45 PM
141	Thank you for contributing to this project I support the legacy of having this property serve the needs of animals & community for recreation. My first consideration for individuals served would be the disabled & elderly as those populations are most in lone with the spirit with which this beautiful property was purchased & cared for	12/12/2021 4:31 PM
142	Preserving the open space & the wildlife corridor are paramount. The Ecology Center should be involved in any aspects of development. Thanks!	12/12/2021 4:30 PM

SDC Redevelopment Community Input Dec 21

143	This property is the heart of Sonoma Valley and needs to be preserved as open space for the current and future residents - both human and wildlife. It is a critical wildlife corridor that must be maintained, not developed for commercial use. Without this open corridor, the Sonoma Valley ecosystem would be damaged forever. We are all custodians of this precious segment of the island - planet that we temporarily inhabit. This property belongs to no one - other than the earth. We owe the native people who inhabited this valley long before us the respect to honor their wisdom and Mother Earth. Save this precious land for future generations to enjoy.	12/12/2021 4:27 PM
144	Protecting the wildlife and natural environment need to be prioritized.	12/12/2021 4:15 PM
145	We need to keep Glen Ellen a small community. There is no room for increased housing with increased traffic. Keep our little town as it is. We love Glen Ellen!!	12/12/2021 4:14 PM
146	None	12/12/2021 4:14 PM
147	Historical equine use and stables should be revisited.	12/12/2021 4:14 PM
148	Where is the water coming from. Number one for me is our water situation. Second is the traffic and schools.	12/12/2021 4:09 PM
149	Listen to the people in the valley and area around the SDC. Not the big businesses.	12/12/2021 3:59 PM
150	Question 18 listed both community center and event space. I support a community center, for use by the local community, not an event space, rented out to tourists and/or business conferences.	12/12/2021 3:54 PM
151	I feel that there really should be an effort to use what is already there. There is a need for housing but those numbers are way too high. We seriously lack the infrastructure. It's obvious!	12/12/2021 3:53 PM
152	None	12/12/2021 3:37 PM
153	thank you for this survey. we as a community can surely get more creative than the 3 alternatives that were offered. we must balance nature, habitat, open space corridors for animals and people, and maintaining a DARK night sky, with community desires and income streams for the site. The State needs to clean up toxic buildings let go for decades... it should not all be on us now... THIS IS OUR LAND BY virtue of being citizens of Calif , and of the Sonoma Valley. we love this land and will fight for it's pureness and access. thank you	12/12/2021 3:29 PM
154	Don't add more population or tourists to the Valley; if commercial activity of any sort is to happen at SDC, it should be of a nature that provides high-paying jobs for those who already live here	12/12/2021 3:14 PM
155	SDC has been an educational campus since inception. Retain sec as an education/research/non-profit center.	12/12/2021 3:10 PM
156	I'm thankful for those who are shepherding this issue through the process.	12/12/2021 2:57 PM
157	I am looking forward to see our community grow with the times. This is like a healing sanctuary for those dearly departed souls and a community that cares what happens to this beautiful space.	12/12/2021 2:51 PM
158	Perhaps this should be presented at levels beyond theeCounty Board of Supervisors.	12/12/2021 2:47 PM
159	Thank you for taking the time, energy and resources to create this survey and give Sonoma Valley residents a voice. SDC is a unique property and this is a unique opportunity to preserve it.	12/12/2021 2:36 PM
160	Can the recently passed Federal Infrastructure dollars be accessed to support redevelopment and preservation of this land as an environmental space for research and recreation? The roads around this area cannot support much more traffic than there was when the SDC was operating at full capacity. Increasingly it is used as a commute path between northern and southern Sonoma County. This area with its limited roads and accesses will become even more high risk with increased population due to housing and businesses than during the Tubbs fire of 2017. Our area is beautiful and wonderful to live in all year around. However, even with "fire safe" building practices, fire season now requires us to be wise and judicious in populating the Eldridge/Glen Ellen area.	12/12/2021 2:33 PM
161	Please show respect to what this property rrepresented. No big money development. It is sacred property.	12/12/2021 2:14 PM

SDC Redevelopment Community Input Dec 21

162	I feel that a healthy wildlife corridor is vital and to build upon the latest data requires time. For a tech center, it would be good to emphasize and utilize extensive local expertise in providing the latest data-based information on maintaining healthy wildlife/human environment, ways to prepare for increased wildfires, etc . Thanks for the opportunity to give more feedback.	12/12/2021 2:04 PM
163	Please: Highest amount of open space and wildlife protection, yes to preservation of historic buildings and museum, no commercial or hotels, lowest amount of housing. Thank you!	12/12/2021 2:03 PM
164	Great survey, unlike the bogus County created one, that did not list choices and alternatives. Good luck and hope you get lots of responses.	12/12/2021 2:02 PM
165	As long as there is a person standing in the rain with a sign asking for help, SDC should be available to that person. NO "HOUSING"! NO RESORT!	12/12/2021 2:00 PM
166	As a direct neighbor of the SDC property we are extremely concerned with the current alternatives presented and do not support any of them. We hope the deadline will be moved so something more in line with our community wants and needs are met. We must protect the wildlife, creek and current Eldridge/Glen Ellen residents	12/12/2021 1:50 PM
167	I am very concerned about WATER and traffic if SDC is developed according to the 3 plans. I am also very concerned about the animals who use SDC to travel back and forth across the valley.	12/12/2021 1:47 PM
168	Many thanks to all persons who are working to facilitate this vision. I do not think the county or state are listening to our community or honoring their legal and verbal commitments to us.	12/12/2021 1:46 PM
169	Please do use this treasured space for anything but for the community and for the public to access. Thank you	12/12/2021 1:40 PM
170	I worked at SDC for 30 years; my children attended Dunbar School. I am deeply invested in seeing Eldridge follow in the Presidio model. Let's be creative!	12/12/2021 1:36 PM
171	Since added housing and commercial ventures on SDC would lead to early exhaustion of water available in the Valley, and seriously degrade environmental qualities, they should be kept to much lower minimums than any of the 3 proposals would sacrifice.	12/12/2021 1:34 PM
172	Not a good area for housing development. It would be too difficult to evacuate during a fire.	12/12/2021 1:30 PM
173	I have lived in Glen Ellen for 35 years and I am VERY concerned about traffic and low-income housing.	12/12/2021 1:30 PM
174	I actually didn't fit into the answers of how often I visit. Sometimes I visit several times a month, and sometimes I didn't visit on a given month. The wildlife corridor is THE most important issue here. Maybe Wildlands can help \$ wise.	12/12/2021 1:15 PM
175	TRAFFIC STUDIES NEED TO LEAD THE QUESTION OF WHAT IS TRULY VIABLE in terms of housing.	12/12/2021 1:04 PM
176	I do support services for the disabled, but in the community at large. I would not like to see another institution return (even a small one). I have always thought that a satellite for SRJC would a perfect use of that property, but I understand that they are not interested. If part of the land is used for housing, please choose a mix of affordability.	12/12/2021 1:03 PM
177	I think any housing and any new/planned use of the property should be kept to an absolute minimum. I think a majority of the land should be preserved as open space and forever protected.	12/12/2021 12:56 PM
178	Escaping a fire down Arnold is already an issue. More housing would create a nightmare scenario.	12/12/2021 12:21 PM
179	The site was originally donated for the homing and care of the DD population and should be utilized to help provide respite care and emergency care for the DD and as a clearing house for specialized services for the DD!!	12/12/2021 12:19 PM
180	Protect the wildlife first and foremost. Listen to the Sonoma Land Trust and their opinions. Using a professional consultant from San Francisco is the WRONG idea -- this is precious rural land and it needs to be protected.	12/12/2021 12:12 PM
181	The alternatives as presented are totally unacceptable and are not in the best interests of the rural community or Sonoma County. It appears the creators are out of touch with the desires of	12/12/2021 12:10 PM

SDC Redevelopment Community Input Dec 21

the community and the established quality of life. Good planning would recognize this and not propose a "metropolitan" approach to an obvious rural entity.

182	SDC needs to remain an open space, wildlife corridor it is extremely important for the health of the wildlife in the area.	12/12/2021 11:51 AM
183	This space is not just what you see on the valley floor. It extends I to the hills and is a beautiful part of the valley that needs to be kept as is or developments need to protect that	12/12/2021 11:38 AM
184	Don't ruin our town, this is a gem that we will never get back. We live here because of the wildlife and open space! This will not fix the housing crisis	12/12/2021 11:37 AM
185	This rare open space property should be kept completely as open space. Do NOT try to improve it by adding structures and other detractors. Do NOT be pressured by developers.	12/12/2021 11:36 AM
186	I worked at SDC 35 years and love the area. Do not support	12/12/2021 11:33 AM
187	This is a beautiful property and has the potential to become a sustainable community to serve all types. There should be mixed housing. Meaning preserving some historical buildings. Creating affordable housing as well as market housing. Have centers that serve the community that are in any small village.	12/12/2021 11:30 AM
188	The State has an obligation to clean up the site and bring the infrastructure up to code. I feel the State has dumped all that responsibility on the County, and Im afraid the County is accepting it in the guise of a "self-sustaining" project, as exemplified in the 3 proposals.	12/12/2021 11:22 AM
189	I hope the beauty of Eldridge does not get lost.	12/12/2021 11:21 AM
190	I support the lock the doors and walk away plan. Let it be taken over by vines and critters like a sunken ship becomes a home for coral and fish. Maybe it can be studied like a body at the body farm.	12/12/2021 11:16 AM
191	No housing development on SDC land! Preserve the open lands	12/12/2021 11:13 AM
192	Thank you for this survey. It is the first I have seen of all of them where I felt that the real issues were addressed and I was able to truly voice my position.	12/12/2021 11:11 AM
193	This beautiful historic land will be absolutely ruined if houses are built! The wildlife corridor is so incredibly important and is not being considered at all! Not to mention we are in a drought, water is an extremely precious commodity- we are being told to conserve, ration and rip out landscaping - so why in the world would you propose housing, and worse, apartments and hotels for an area already struggling region ! We are told to keep water uses at a bare minimum! Not to mention our native wildlife who already struggle with safe passage, food, water and open space to thrive and reproduce! The decision to develop the SDC housing is purely greed driven with absolutely zero thought to what is right and best for the environment, native wildlife, and the tiny town of Glen Ellen.	12/12/2021 11:08 AM
194	The wildlife corridor and preservation and conservation of open space is most important to me. I don't think the 35-42 acres in the 3 proposals is nearly enough. I'd like to see this number doubled.	12/12/2021 11:05 AM
195	Save the past!	12/12/2021 11:04 AM
196	SDC is a beautiful piece of land and should not be wasted. Should really be preserved.	12/12/2021 10:38 AM
197	Make it affordable, sustainable and community oriented, higher learning possibly	12/12/2021 10:35 AM
198	People services ..education .. Rehab .. Job training .. Homeless .. Etc	12/12/2021 10:33 AM
199	The challenge here is to not change the flavor and culture of the valley. Several thousand people used to live and work here. It can probably support those same numbers without hurting the valley. Definitely need a connection to highway 12 to get traffic off of Arnold Drive, Need dedicated bike trail into Sonoma. Need to hide cars under buildings or behind buildings. Minimize car culture as the previous residents did not drive cars. The property functioned well before environmentally as far as having its own water source. Need substantial solar to make it energy efficient and/or energy independent. Trying to make it attractive and then market it to developers seems short sighted. Must be another path to repurpose. Don't know why we need a hotel unless we push to kill all the air B&B's and return sanity to existing neighborhoods in Glen Ellen.	12/12/2021 10:18 AM

SDC Redevelopment Community Input Dec 21

200	Keep Glen Ellen rural!	12/12/2021 9:43 AM
201	Generally support some mixed use with an emphasis on outdoor recreation and land conservation coupled with enhanced walkability and safe bike route infrastructure. Some additional commercial features such as a boutique hotel, a handful of shops and a few restaurants to support community to minimize need for residents to constantly leave property seem reasonable. I am concerned that traffic will become a big issue especially during evacuations if the property is over developed.	12/12/2021 9:42 AM
202	I am particularly concerned about the historic area proposed three years ago which will include a museum, visitor center and event center.	12/12/2021 9:38 AM
203	Thank You for your time and inclusivity on this challenging topic.	12/12/2021 9:22 AM
204	This property is unique and incredibly valuable. Private special interests have had their eyes on it since, and even before, Reagen's governorship . They will ruin much that is precious in the name of profit. The natural open spaces need to be preserved for all of us and future generations. The already developed spaces need to be redeveloped to meet community needs, most particularly those with special needs.	12/12/2021 9:13 AM
205	My priority is maintaining the natural environment and protecting wildlife and keeping any development to a minimum in order to preserve the uncommercial small town nature of Glen Ellen	12/12/2021 8:57 AM
206	Destroying the natural beauty with housing, hotels, or other real estate ventures is egregious. The area should be preserved . DON'T ruin the ecosystem!!!!	12/12/2021 8:45 AM
207	Thank you for providing a way to get more local citizen input to county. I feel community input was very marginalized in the process so far and was not evident in current proposals.	12/12/2021 8:08 AM
208	Housing should be built near city centers or large employment areas, this is not that. At best development should be as a model for sustainable living with maybe 50-100 units in my opinion	12/12/2021 8:01 AM
209	I was totally appalled by the three very similar proposals. The state should not make the condition that this be self supporting . Continuing on with any of these proposals will be something that we will regret tremendously in the future.	12/12/2021 7:57 AM
210	What about a rehab center?	12/12/2021 7:49 AM
211	Na	12/12/2021 7:41 AM
212	Not to be self-centered, but the problem I have with affordable housing options is that I'm very low income and live in substandard housing (old, unmaintained apartment) but the minute nice units are built, they're gone in a flash and you can never get into them. I don't know who manages to get into the very pretty low-income housing units in Sonoma. Do you have to know someone? (Sorry to be cynical.)	12/12/2021 6:08 AM
213	I realize that this is a complicated process that will end in more housing development than wanted, based on the need to make the plan financially feasible. The math seems to require building a new town, so a diversity of uses is important to provide private and public activities to serve the people living there to reduce traffic: food store(s), local pub, barber, hair and nail saloon, businesses, police. Traffic will become a problem because the county is not acknowledging the full impact to Arnold Dr. (a two lane road). Preferred evacuation route for everyone south/east from Kenwood will be Hwy 12 - Madrone - Arnold. The road is a canopy covered one lane escape route that could become a flame trap if fire reaches this road. Power lines run through these trees and could be in danger of being pulled down by fire and wind and blocking traffic. Population density matters when you've got only two two-lane roads, one jammed with traffic and lights already (hwy 12), that serve thousands of people. Plus, giving less than 3 weeks of comment time and the last week a busy holiday, demonstrates that the county or/and consulting firm abandoned its sincere commitment to public input. I worked for county govt. for 32 years, this blatant move got them the distrust that is strong in the community, and it will make the plan harder to sell and make the projects more costly.	12/12/2021 5:16 AM
214	New water wells and storage structures as well as improved dam safety are chief issues that seem to be being ignored in these surveys.	12/11/2021 11:06 PM
215	It's an important historical site, that should be reserved for many generations. The natural habitat can also be affected, the natural habitat and access to the public is high priority.	12/11/2021 10:03 PM

SDC Redevelopment Community Input Dec 21

216	It doesn't look like services to that area are being addressed, such as fire and police. If the state continues to own that property, they will not pay county taxes. The present fire and police will soon go away.	12/11/2021 10:01 PM
217	I appreciate you taking the time to put this together!	12/11/2021 9:23 PM
218	<p>Greetings. I second the concerns and proposals of the Sonoma Ecology Center, and include below the contents of Richard Dale's recent memo on the Site Specific Plan for the Sonoma Developmental Center. Please give the SEC's input your serious consideration; and, be sure to incorporate the following suggestions as the alternatives currently under consideration are simply unacceptable. Any further advancement of the plan should be delayed until these ideas and suggestions can be incorporated. Sincerely, Robert Cherwink, B.A. Environmental Studies and Planning 1515 Fowler Creek Rd Sonoma, California 95476 P.S. I am not a member of the SEC, just a concerned long-time resident of Sonoma Valley. SONOMA ECOLOGY CENTER Protecting the beauty and biodiversity of Sonoma Valley November 27, 2021 Memo: Sonoma Ecology Center Comments on the SDC Specific Plan Alternatives Following are comments from Sonoma Ecology Center (SEC) on the SDC Specific Plan Alternatives presented to the community for comment this month. Our comments can be expanded on if further information is useful. Contact information is included in the footer of this memo. General Comments The Sonoma Valley community has expressed frustration at the process used to develop the three specific plan alternatives, and disappointment about their substance. We share these concerns, and do not support any of the current alternatives. We acknowledge the state code's conflicting constraints that blend protecting the site's extraordinary natural resources with providing housing and creating a plan that will attract third-party purchasers; we also understand that the pandemic and ongoing fire related community impacts have affected the planning and outreach process. Nonetheless, with over twenty months to engage stakeholders and construct a workable basis for the alternatives, there has not been adequate community engagement. A better engagement process would likely have created a better result. The current alternatives have united the same community that came together to create the opportunity for the specific plan process against these alternatives, and for several, against the process itself. SEC feels that there can be a productive response to this concern by bringing together representative stakeholders from the community, with excellent facilitation, to seek out common interests and to find common ground. We think there is more agreement than may be evident, not just about what isn't wanted, but about what can work on the site and meet both the state's and the community's goals. If such a process is to work, there will need to be time for it to be planned, for parties to meet, and for the result to be developed by the county's planning team into a draft alternative. Our request is that both of these actions be seriously considered: a facilitated stakeholder process to build the basic consensus required for a successful alternative, and time to implement that process. Additional time would likely offset other challenges arising from a process the community feels is unacceptable, and we feel the state has significant incentive and funding to get the process right and will accept a request from our county for this extension. The main concern raised by the Sonoma Valley community is the scale of proposed development in all three alternatives. SEC participated in a group tasked with developing a triple-bottom-line concept for the site, the Eldridge Enterprise. That group did an economic analysis for the concept at half the scale of alternatives originally presented to the planning team's PAT (public advisory team). The three draft alternatives recently presented to the public are smaller than the original, and none represent the Eldridge Enterprise concept. Moreover, after seeing how development in the alternatives was mapped onto the site, we strongly agree that all three alternatives presented represent an unacceptable level of impact to natural resource values of the site and to the surrounding community. The Eldridge Enterprise group is revising its concept to be smaller, yet still deliver meaningful results in terms of climate action, affordable housing, and other community and environmental benefits. The right scale for numbers of residents, employees, and other users on the site depends on the impacts they will create. We therefore support our colleagues at Sonoma Land Trust's recommendation, that a science-based, data-driven constraints analysis be done as a framework for development. The more of these data the community and planning team have, the better any emerging specific plan will be, and the more acceptable the resulting impacts will be for the environment and the community. We feel that the opportunity presented at the site to create a world class, sustainable, multibenefit, once-in-a-generation response to the needs and opportunities of our time, can happen on the site, and that it's worth the investment of more time and resources to strive for this result. This should be done in alignment with, and tapping into, the phenomenal resources of our community to reach this potential. Protecting Ecological Resources Humanity faces a global biodiversity crisis on the scale of the global climate crisis. Nearly a fourth of all known species are at risk of extinction. Over 1,060 individual species have been identified on the SDC campus, several of them rare. SDC is</p>	12/11/2021 9:10 PM

located at the center of a biological corridor of statewide significance, established by SEC in the 1990's. Thousands of acres of land acquisition and millions of dollars of investment have been made to expand and protect it. Water resources are likewise of regional significance, with Sonoma Creek recognized as critical coastal stream, hosting several threatened and endangered species including species found in only a few streams in the world. New development on the campus needs to consider and protect the site's extensive ecological resources, especially its significant wildlife corridor and stream corridor. The following recommendations build on this background.

- **Width of wildlife corridor:** The wildlife corridor should be expanded at its narrowest point along the north and northeast side of the campus, pulling the boundary of the developable area inward. Specifically, the campus footprint should be shrunk on the east side of Arnold as shown in Alternative C, and on the west side of Arnold southward to the edge of the current ball field. That is, remove and do not replace Bane, Thompson, the two houses between the bridges, and the road circle northwest of Wagner. The pedestrian access point in the narrowest part of the corridor (yellow asterisk on the maps in the alternatives) should be removed. Do not put trails in riparian corridors except for short distances (these are habitat areas first, recreation areas second). No new pedestrian bridges over Sonoma Creek should be built in new locations.
- **Sonoma Creek setback:** Setbacks along Sonoma Creek should be larger, at least 100 feet, to make room for a reestablished floodplain, riparian habitat, steelhead recovery, and groundwater recharge. Some areas should be wider than 100' in a few places where green infrastructure projects are planned. See Upper Sonoma Creek Restoration Vision on SEC's website.
- **Hill/Mill Creek setback:** Setbacks on Hill Creek should be widened, ideally 50' on north side, more on the south side, to protect stream function and provide for habitat linkage to Sonoma Creek from southwestern open space areas.
- **Open space within the developed area:** Built areas and paths should use Dark Sky standards. Development should face away from protected areas to reduce interactions that might impact natural systems. Landscaping should retain large healthy trees, transition to natives for at least 80% of landscaping to support local biodiversity, and use integrated pest management.
- **Wildlife and habitat quality outside developed area:** Regrade and revegetate land immediately around Jim Berkland bridge so that animals can get down to and across Sonoma Creek. This would aid wildlife passage east-west across this narrowest section of the property. Consider Infrastructure Bill funding to assist with habitat enhancement of culvert or overpass improvements on the eastern area of the corridor over Hwy 12. Fencing should be removed and only used in new projects to direct movement and reduce hazards to wildlife. Work with eastside properties to maintain permeability to uplands. The proposed road to Hwy 12 should not be paved or lighted, and should only be accessible during emergencies. Fire fuels management projects, such as the proposed buffers, should adopt and use standards that maximize biodiversity and water resources benefits.
- **Water resources protection:** Use an integrated, holistic approach to water management on the site, to steward and benefit the site's extensive water resources for the entire watershed, its people and ecosystems. Land use maps should indicate areas where future multi-benefit water projects can take place. "Multi-benefit" means projects that protect or create habitat and recreation benefits, and don't impede wildlife passage, while delivering water benefits to people. These areas, inside or outside the redeveloped area, can promote infiltration, stormwater capture, and groundwater recharge. Such projects could even include a drought-ready water treatment plant to supply treated water for north valley agriculture and other uses, and help reverse Sonoma Valley's groundwater decline. Some beneficial projects might not be possible after parks agencies own the open space areas, unless they are mapped now. Use the Sherwood maps from the WRT assessment report as a first cut.
- **Linkage with surroundings.** As much as possible, innovative design and technology should be used to integrate the developed campus with the surrounding natural environment. Sight lines should preserve and invite connections to open space. Trails should link developed areas to natural spaces, for all the benefits that occur from human connection with them, while assuring those natural areas retain their ecological function. For example, excellent paths and recreational areas should favor the southern area of the property and avoid northern areas where the wildlife corridor is narrowest. Paths should not be placed near Sonoma Creek or parallel to it.
- **Climate change contribution.** The development should be net zero energy, net zero or better emissions, as measured during operations, on an island-able, crisis-ready microgrid.

Overall Campus Design • SEC supports re-use of existing buildings, but only to the degree that re-use can be shown to have greater or equal life-cycle environmental benefits than replacing them. Where cherished buildings are to be replaced, they should be replaced with new buildings that are of similar style, in similar locations.

- We strongly prefer the eventual campus to mirror the diversity seen in the historic buildings: a complexity of angles, materials, and ages. We strongly urge maintaining the historic campus landscape feel, with sightlines between buildings linking spaces around campus to the hills and other natural features beyond. These two factors can make a campus feel great or, if ignored,

feel uncomfortable. 5 Housing for Current and Future Generations We would like to see housing created that serves the needs of current and future generations, with homes for people of diverse economic and developmental capacities. Any housing plan for SDC must go beyond market-driven factors that are driving people—up to and including the middle class—out of the Sonoma Valley. Housing at SDC should be a model for reversing this trend, not exacerbating it.

- We would like to see significantly more than 25% of the site's housing to be affordable to below-AMI residents, including a mix of rental and owner-occupied units, whether via subsidy or affordable "by design." We would support 75%. Community land trusts are one tool for creating permanently affordable housing, and there are funding resources available through state and federal programs that could support it.
- The impact of housing on ecological resources and the surrounding community is more important than the number of units.
- The campus' open feeling and long sightlines can be retained by clustering multiple units into fewer buildings. We support more clustering of units than in the current alternatives, heights of two to three stories to reduce the amount of land area used, and replacing current buildings with new buildings that are of similar style, in similar locations.

VMT, Traffic, Transit, and Roads
 Frequent, adaptable transit is critical for reducing traffic impacts, GHG emissions, and pollution, and to link residents to services without single vehicle dependency. We would like to see imaginative use of transit based on current technology and examples from other areas. This site should be Sonoma County's trigger to finally establish workable transit.

- Assure increased local and regional transit, innovative transit such as car sharing, regional bikeways, and other alternatives to single occupancy vehicles are required with development.
- To reduce VMT, design for onsite employers that pay living wages, and for onsite neighborhood services.
- A bike path should be linked to Sonoma County Regional Parks' Sonoma Valley Trail. Development of the site should elevate the completion of that path to high priority.
- Explore options, including funding mechanisms, developed on other campuses in similar settings.
- The Harney bridge is too narrow to accommodate passing cars. It must be widened or at minimum have its current sidewalks removed and a pedestrian bridge added alongside. If rebuilt, the bridge needs to be longer to avoid the stream corridor.

Safety
 • The campus should be designed to be ready for wildfire, including clustered buildings, roads to the outside, and power lines underground. Please use "Building to Coexist with Fire: Risk Reduction Measures for New Development" at <https://anrcatalog.ucanr.edu/Details.aspx?itemNo=8680>.

- The campus should be designed with spaces and resources to function as a local emergency resource hub, a place that area residents can evacuate to, not just evacuate from.

PO Box 1486, Eldridge, CA 95431 • (707) 996-0712 • fax (707) 996-2452 Sonoma Garden Park • 19996 7th Street East, Sonoma 95476 • 707 996-4883 Sugarloaf Ridge State Park • 2605 Adobe Canyon Rd. Kenwood, CA 95452 • 707 833-5712 info@sonomaecologycenter.org • www.sonomaecologycenter.org

- There are two vertical, actively eroding cliff banks on Sonoma Creek that should be given a wide berth by any new structures. One such area is at the southeast corner of Redwood Road; the other is near the Lux building.

Economic Uses that Support a Resilient Future
 • Economic development. We favor an economic center, built at a scale that protects the natural resources of the site and the surrounding community, that serves current and future community residents with work that is meaningful and that provides a pathway for those who grow up here to stay. This center can and should foster a core vision or purpose for the campus that builds interest and relationships with academic, corporate, government, and philanthropic agencies. These entities can offer interns, funding, and other resources.

- Climate center. To tackle our planetary crisis, we propose a climate response center at SDC that researches, designs, and develops products and processes that mitigate and adapt to climate change. This kind of development can be funded by a partnership of public, private and social sectors— including the state of California, which recently pledged \$15 billion to climate efforts. The center would offer higher-paying jobs plus educational opportunities from internships to vocational training.
- Housing near jobs. Work and housing should be co-located reduce vehicle trips and create a sense of place.
- Meeting space. Meeting and classroom space, with housing, could be shared by several institutions. A nonprofit hub could house local organizations—including SEC—that are involved in the site, and interpret the site's natural resources to students of all ages. This should include a nature discovery center that serves the public.
- Education. We support public and nonprofit education, training, and vocational facilities. These should have dorms or temporary apartments for non-residents, to reduce VMT. Training at these facilities can support a sustainable, triple bottom line future.
- Governance. An integrated site could be governed by a master "Trust," an array of interested citizens and experts, using clear guiding principles. This would provide an ongoing reference for future development, assuring that key principles remain throughout the development of the site and beyond. Our community began to explore the concept at the start of the SDC closure process, and experts are available who can provide

SDC Redevelopment Community Input Dec 21

input. Thank you for your consideration. Richard Dale Executive Director Sonoma Ecology Center

219	The Sonoma developmental center should be closely monitored for fire hazard. The main building should become a library and an access point for residents of Glen Ellen.	12/11/2021 9:04 PM
220	We have to get this right. Extend the deadline. We cannot rush these important decisions because our future depends on it.	12/11/2021 8:52 PM
221	We have one chance to get it right. Preserve open space while supporting affordable housing and community.	12/11/2021 8:21 PM
222	I would support a Asilomar type conversation center at the site as well as an Eldridge Trust to manage the assets at the site. Regional water issues not addressed in the survey or the 3 alternatives by County staff	12/11/2021 7:56 PM
223	Preserving the wildlife corridor is the most important. Development should be done in phases and impact on wildlife measured. Develop WNT should be stopped if it is negatively impacting the corridor.	12/11/2021 7:53 PM
224	The state does not want it. The County will not pay for it. While GE wants NO development, NO ONE, will pay higher taxes to keep it undeveloped.	12/11/2021 7:28 PM
225	The state should keep SDC as a state park. Wildlife are/ have been the residents. More traffic is a direct threat to the Valley/ successful evacuation is already questionable with 2-lane Sonoma Hwy only escape.	12/11/2021 7:25 PM
226	Thanks for creating this survey.	12/11/2021 7:23 PM
227	Put housing where it belongs, near services and schools and adequate public transportation. Use SDC for groundwater and water improvement, community center, institutioanal research.	12/11/2021 7:21 PM
228	In a perfect world, I would love to see the State of CA pay every penny for clean-up of the site, which would mean removing just about everything, leaving only a handful of choice buildings for adaptive reuse for community activities, and making the rest of the campus - along with the 700+/- acres already promised as open space - into a beautiful park that would forever enhance the wildlife corridor.	12/11/2021 7:10 PM
229	The SDC becomes the property of the whole of Sonoma County and not the private reserve of Glen Ellen residents. The County has engaged in a planning process and it should run its course and not be derailed by people who have either just become aware of the process or who are unhappy with the direction it may be going. Let the County do its job and develop a plan without interference. That's what we pay our professionals and their consultants to do.	12/11/2021 6:58 PM
230	Thank you for doing this Survey Monkey! The questions were spot on and gives the community a clear opportunity to speak their mind as individuals!	12/11/2021 6:58 PM
231	Don't get too caught up in enforcing wild life, open space and historical preservation or you'll get stuck in perpetual debate, halt progress, drive up development costs and leave us with nothing but rotting, condemned buildings. Be mindful and be kind; this town is too small to be mean.	12/11/2021 6:44 PM
232	Thank you very much for developing this survey, it feels much more representative of the communities concerns for the space.	12/11/2021 6:42 PM
233	Good luck with getting the extension	12/11/2021 6:34 PM
234	Economics need to be realistic. Balance market rate and affordable housing. Site plan needs to be economically feasible or we will be waiting 20 more years as politicians campaign and nothing happens. There has been no leadership by Gorin. She needs to retire.	12/11/2021 6:16 PM
235	I would like more specifics on what the "innovation hub" consists of. Are we in any conversations with any potential partners on this, or is this just a good idea that we hope somebody can make happen? Also, the costs of remediation of the water, soil, and infrastructure are so massive, it is hard to imagine any developer taking those on, rather than just building on Petaluma Hill road or in Windsor	12/11/2021 5:46 PM
236	What can the Housing Land Trust.org out of Healdsburg offer us?	12/11/2021 5:43 PM
237	SDC was an important part of the surrounding community and redevelopment of the site should	12/11/2021 5:39 PM

SDC Redevelopment Community Input Dec 21

	seek to honor the history of the site and strive to fit in with Glen Ellen's unique character.	
238	Thanks for doing this!	12/11/2021 5:34 PM
239	I think that there should be an Arts and Crafts school modeled after Penland (NC) and Haystack (ME); then there could be artist housing and it would a great draw to the area as an arts town and provide stability to struggling artists at the same time it benefits the county	12/11/2021 5:28 PM
240	The state needs to take responsibility for the years and decades of deferred maintenance of the buildings. Having the proposed development responsible for funding the project is the wrong and a biased formula that ignores the state's responsibilities.	12/11/2021 5:14 PM
241	The current proposals only benefit the developers and not the Glen Ellen community. They are in fact, disgusting.	12/11/2021 5:01 PM
242	Would like more information of # of affordable housing units and proposed planned rezoing of other properties around the valley which will be affordable housing. Make sure affordable housing is planned in areas that allow for affordable everyday living and shopping - like along Hwy 12 near large supermarkets and drug stores. Walking distance for K-12 school.	12/11/2021 4:59 PM
243	Thank you for creating this survey!	12/11/2021 4:54 PM
244	Thank you for the opportunity to share our comments and concerns regarding this very important property that will affect us all in Glen Ellen and the Sonoma Valley	12/11/2021 4:47 PM
245	Thank you for putting this together. Typo in question 25.	12/11/2021 4:40 PM
246	Whew. Thank you, Shannon.	12/11/2021 2:59 PM
247	We need the grace of time and the benefit of open minds and hearts to create the best solution.	12/11/2021 2:55 PM