

Sonoma Valley Next 100  
PO Box 391  
Glen Ellen, CA95442

[sonomavalleynext100.org](http://sonomavalleynext100.org)



**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE** September 10, 2025

**Contact:** Norman Gilroy/Jon Wilson

Tel: 707-956-0148

## **SONOMA VALLEY NEXT 100 FILES AMENDED COMPLAINT AGAINST CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES AND DEVELOPERS ROGAL AND GRUPE**

Glen Ellen, CA. On Thursday, September 4, 2025, Sonoma Valley Next 100 filed an Amended Complaint in the Sonoma County Superior Court against the California Department of General Services (DGS) - (Defendant and Respondent) and the Grupe Company, Rogal and Partners, and Eldridge Renewal LLC (Real Parties in Interest).

The Amended Complaint requests that the court:

- Set aside the selection of Rogal/Eldridge Renewal as the developer of the Sonoma Developmental Center (SDC) site.
- Prohibit DGS from signing on to any applications for development until a valid Specific Plan is in place.
- Require DGS to obtain legally required measures from the Office of Historic Preservation to protect historic assets at the SDC.
- Direct DGS to fund necessary maintenance and upkeep for the historic buildings and landscape at SDC, and to address any remaining deferred maintenance there, until a transfer to a third party is completed.
- Require DGS to rescind the transfer of the 52 acres to CalFire, and to make no subsequent transfers for that purpose until the terms of Government Code section 65041.1 have been met.

“When DGS submitted the development proposal for the SDC site, it violated its duty under the Enabling Legislation and Public Resources Code section 5024.5(a) by proposing to develop the site before an adopted Specific Plan was in place,” said Norman Gilroy, President of Sonoma Valley Next 100, the local non-profit organization that filed the Amended Complaint.

“DGS’s development proposal calls for the demolition of more than 95% of the historic resources on the SDC site, and it was apparently, submitted without completing the required consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) to obtain prudent and feasible measures for the protection of historic resources. We also assert that DGS violated the mandatory provisions of Government Code Section 11011.1, the State law that governs all disposition of state property, when it selected Eldridge Renewal LLC (a partnership between Rogal and Grupe) without first formally offering the property to other agencies or non-profits. We ask the Court to overturn DGS’ decisions in each of those issues.”

“We have also challenged DGS’ decision to stop maintaining the SDC property as of June 30, 2025,” said Jon Wilson, a member of the legal committee at Sonoma Valley Next 100. “By removing all staff and withdrawing all annual maintenance funding for the site, DGS has violated the clear intent of the Enabling Legislation that DGS protect and preserve the SDC site, including its historic structures, throughout the period required for the final adoption of a Specific Plan for the property. We are asking that appropriate funding and staffing be restored until a Specific Plan is adopted so that these irreplaceable resources are protected until a new plan for the site can be implemented,” continued Wilson.

The Amended Complaint also claims that the transfer of 52 acres of the SDC site for a massive \$250M CalFire Regional Headquarters, a development that would be right on top of a sensitive wildlife corridor on the SDC site, was in violation of Government Code Section 65041.1, which sets “state planning priorities to promote equity, strengthen the economy, protect the environment, and promote public health and safety in the state, including in urban, suburban, and rural communities” for all State development projects.

“Each of these claims has urgency,” said Gilroy, “particularly since the public asset represented by the buildings and landscape at the SDC site is now being allowed to deteriorate as winter and the most active part of the fire season approaches. The time is now for DGS to manage the SDC site responsibly and in the best interests of the people of Sonoma County and the State of California.”