

Sonoma Developmental Center Project – Study Phase

Community Advisory Committee Meeting

September 28, 2017, 1:30pm to 5:30pm

Slater Building, Sonoma Developmental Center 15000 Arnold Drive, Eldridge, CA 95431

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Sonoma Developmental Center Project – Study Phase | 1 |
| Community Advisory Committee Meeting | 1 |
| September 28, 2017, 1:30pm to 5:30pm | 1 |
| Slater Building, Sonoma Developmental Center 15000 Arnold Drive, Eldridge, CA 95431 | 1 |
| Meeting Purpose | 2 |
| Welcome and Introductions, Agenda Review | 2 |
| Department of Developmental Services Update | 2 |
| Charge of the Committee | 3 |
| Preliminary Findings | 3 |
| Introduction and Project Overview | 3 |
| Land and Water | 4 |
| Ecology | 4 |
| History and Culture | 5 |
| Infrastructure and Building Systems | 6 |
| Economics | 7 |
| Clarification Questions on Technical Information | 9 |
| Summary of Stakeholder Assessment | 11 |
| Comments and Questions | 12 |
| Group Break-out Session | 12 |
| Comments | 12 |
| Report Backs by Group | 12 |
| Group 1 | 12 |
| Group 2 | 13 |
| Group 3 | 14 |
| Group 4 | 15 |
| Closing & Next Steps | 16 |

Attachments:..... 16
Appendix A: Meeting Attendee List..... 17

Meeting Purpose

To present the planning team’s progress on site assessment preliminary findings and receive stakeholder comments on those findings and their implication on opportunities & constraints for the Sonoma Developmental Center (SDC) site.

Welcome and Introductions, Agenda Review

Jim Stickley, WRT, welcomed participants, made introductions, and reviewed the agenda (see Appendix A for list of meeting attendees). Main agenda items included a review of preliminary findings in the SDC site assessment and break-out sessions for committee members to engage in small group discussion on the implications of preliminary findings.

Mr. Stickley explained that the WRT team for this project phase is built around four core areas:

- Stakeholder and Community Engagement
- Ecological Planning and Green Infrastructure
- Land use, Site Planning and Reuse
- Market Strategy and Economic Feasibility

For each of the core areas there is a team of experts that has performed extensive data collection and in-depth analysis. WRT as the prime consultant, is leading the team and is the primary point of contact with the stakeholders. WRT is currently contracted by Department of General Services (DGS) for the first phase of the project which includes assessment of existing conditions on the site. Future phases could include the development of alternatives and site design, but the team has not been contracted for future phases as of this point in time. The community and stakeholder engagement process is occurring alongside the drafting of the initial findings report. There are two SDC Community Advisory Committee (CAC) meetings planned—September 28th and a second workshop with a date yet to be determined —as well as a public workshop, scheduled to occur after the second CAC meeting.

Department of Developmental Services Update

Nancy Bargmann, Director, Department of Developmental Services (DDS), provided an update on the closure process for SDC. DDS has 21 regional centers in California that provide case management and support services for individuals with developmental disabilities. She emphasized that a key element in the closure plan is stakeholder engagement on how to safely transition SDC residents into the community. DDS is finalizing the resources for the SDC community in transition. As of May 2015, there were 405 individuals residing at SDC; as of the meeting date there were 241 individuals still in active transition into homes in the community. DDS is working to develop 16 homes in Sonoma County, and more in Northern California. DDS is developing a total of 110 residential resources in addition to other support services beyond

residential services—e.g. employment, medical services, and recreation. North Bay Regional Center (NBRC), with the use of Community Placement Plan funds, is developing a unique model at a new federally qualified health center in Santa Rosa, where services are being developed to support individuals who transition to the community from SDC. The FQHC has hired several staff from SDC to work with SDC clients at that center. DDS is still on track for SDC closure by December 2018.

Charge of the Committee

Tania Carlone, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) distributed a draft version of the CAC Charge which she invited members to review and provide input (see attached Charge for full text). The Charge was developed so that CAC members are clear about the role of the committee in the study phase.

CCP and the WRT team are engaging with a broad range of local stakeholders and as such the CAC is made up of local interests. The purpose of the CAC is to provide comments to the team on opportunities and constraints during the study phase. Given this is a study phase to mutually explore what has been discovered, the CAC is not considered a decision-making body. The goal of CAC meetings is to provide a discussion forum to develop a shared understanding of the existing conditions.

Both primary and alternate CAC members are welcome to attend CAC meetings so that all can stay apprised in the site assessment process, but only one representative should speak on behalf of the member organization's interest.

The State may invite observers to learn more about the process and listen to CAC member input, but CAC meetings are not generally open to the public or the press. CAC members are invited to speak with respective constituencies about opportunities for public involvement in the process, including a community workshop.

Preliminary Findings

Introduction and Project Overview

Jim Stickley provided an overview of preliminary findings and outlined five elements of the SDC experience: **land and water, ecology, history and culture, infrastructure and building systems, and economics.** (See attached stakeholder presentation for more detail on each component.)

The SDC site's unique and special qualities of the site, and the emotional connections the team heard from members of the community, inspired the team to make a cognitive map of the SDC experience that included the contrast of different character zones in the landscape, the historic buildings, and other key elements.

Mr. Stickley described the SDC experience in detail, highlighting the developed street trees at the entrance and the unique contrasts in architecture, lawns, playing fields, and ornamental landscapes. There is an aspect of a front yard with a certain scale of building and unexpected

vistas that reorient you to the site experience. There are hidden architectural surprises and gems. Entering the natural landscape on the western side and the rolling aspects of the eastern side, there are strong influences from the oak woodlands. There is a well-developed trail system that passes through different ecologies. Camp Via provides opportunity to connect with the orchard, grasslands, and evergreen forest of the western slope, reading as bands of forest trees from a distance. The farm has many different parts with different functions. There is a classic rural Sonoma farm road and the natural ecology mixes with the agricultural areas. Going up to the lake provides a great view down upon the campus. The lake is an astounding surprise and is much loved.

Land and Water

Locating the site in the regional context, the SDC sits in the upper reaches of the valley between two parallel mountain ranges. The site is also part of the watershed which flows to the San Pablo Bay. The SDC campus represents the uppermost fifty square miles of the watershed that flows down through Sonoma Creek, which flows through campus. Sonoma Creek is made up of many tributaries and two major reservoirs exist on the SDC site.

John Leys, Sherwood Design Engineers, reviewed the hydrological characteristics of the site. Impervious surfaces are concentrated in certain areas of the central campus, leaving much of the site to drain naturally. The Team analyzed future opportunities to enhance on-site storm water management. Water quality is an important aspect, especially related to parking and impervious surfaces. He reviewed the map showing areas for potential groundwater recharge and storage. He emphasized the need and challenge to look forward and anticipate climate change and climate patterns. He reviewed the water system of the site, which includes diversion structures and water storage, among other elements. The topography dictates the need to move and pump water around the site. There is a water treatment facility at an uphill location which takes advantage of gravity. It is an operationally complex system that has a close connection to the terrestrial ecology.

Ecology

Joan Schwan, Prunuske Chatham, reviewed the regional ecology surrounding the site. This is a rich and biodiverse area overlaid with a landscape that people have used in various ways. It is important to keep in mind that plant communities and wildlife species need habitat and the ability to move over time. Ecological systems need to be able to move to be sustainable in the long-term, especially with the changing climate. SDC has a special role in the region, since there is an important wildlife corridor between Sonoma Mountain and Mayacamas Range extending through the site. This corridor is in an important location—a narrow point in the valley—which makes it good for habitat connectivity and for species to move. There is a microcosm of variation that supports biodiversity on the site. Water resources are also crucial to wildlife and plant life. The site's connection to protected lands makes it important as a corridor as well. Finally, its human history has resulted in a particular pattern of development that offers important opportunities for the protection of habitat.

There is a diverse mosaic of plant communities on the site, including wetlands, grasslands, riparian forest, oak woodlands, evergreen forests and redwood forests. Many areas connect beyond the boundaries of SDC on the flank of Sonoma Mountain. The northern spotted owl (an endangered species) has been found in the adjacent preserved areas. Oak woodland in particular is important to many species, including mountain lions. There is one female mountain lion that makes SDC her home.

Highlighting several more challenging issues, she commented that there are places where the width of the stream is narrowed because of buildings. There are issues with invasive species and fish passage, but overall the stream is very healthy. The native plant diversity is not as high in the lower grasslands, but those species provide important functions such as forage and collecting and slowing down rainwater. There is a large wet meadow (wetland) on the site, which is important to diverse insect and bird wildlife. The lower wetlands are also reduced in native plant diversity, but are important for groundwater recharge and other functions.

One way to consider the connection between the natural environment and human use and function is through the concept of ecosystem services. These can be thought of as supporting, provisioning, cultural, and regulating services. These services include pollinator support, water quality protection, carbon sequestration, education & recreation opportunities, maintaining biodiversity, and soil formation.

In closing, she emphasized the connection between recreation and scenic values. The site is well loved and used by the community, and there is overlap between why humans and other animals want to use the site—connectivity being a key reason. She suggested that community members may want to think about the most effective network of trails in the future. All the human uses shape the wildlife, vegetation, and water resources of the site.

History and Culture

Ruth Todd, Page and Turnbull Architects, presented on the built resources on the site that reflect the history. She reviewed seven distinct eras of the site and showed maps of the expansion and construction of buildings on the site over time.

- The prehistoric era of site was the longest (prior to 1889). Yukian ancestors of the modern Wappo people lived in the area, as well as Pomo and Miwok ancestors. The Miwok people controlled the area at the time of California incursion. There are several archaeological sites on the property, including a scatter of stone tools and large habitation site. The site was part of two Spanish land grants, and based on map evidence, used for agriculture since the mid-1800s which continued during the era of the care facility.
- Primary era of development was from 1889-1908. The State purchased 1600 acres and the site became the first public facility for people with developmental disabilities in the West and the largest in terms of acreage. In 1890, the primary hospital building was constructed (the PEC building) based on Eastern philosophy of mental services (the Kirkbride model). The property was damaged during the 1906 earthquake, so very little of that era remains. The first designed landscape feature was Harney road that connected

the building to the railroad depot and the creek. The feature included elm, oranges, and magnolia trees.

- The second major phase of development was 1909-1917. In 1909 the facility was renamed to Sonoma State Home, and transitioned to a more cottage style plan. There was the expansion of buildings on the site, a few of which remain (e.g., Acacia Court II). Fern Lake reservoir was completed in this period.
- Between 1918 and 1949, the property was mostly self-sufficient with a farm, dairy, and walnut and fruit orchards. The facility operated the nation's most active eugenics and sterilization program under superintendent Fred Butler.
- The site entered a new era when Superintendent Butler retired and underwent many changes from 1950-1963. In 1953 the facility was renamed the Sonoma State Hospital. Over this period there was an overhaul of the mental health program approach from the asylum mentality to a modern client-centered approach. There were also changes in architectural styles to reflect hospital services, not confinement.
- The period between 1963 and 1984 was marked by federal legislation that shifted the type of public mental services being offered across the nation. There was a big shift toward decentralization.
- The most recent era (leading up to today) started in 1985 when the facility was renamed the Sonoma Developmental Center. Surplus SDC land was transferred to the surrounding protected areas as services shifted away from agricultural labor.

Infrastructure and Building Systems

David Coyle, Interface Engineering, reviewed the preliminary infrastructure assessment, including building selection methodology and the assessment approach. The assessment team rated the building and site infrastructure systems according to the following categories:

- Moderate upgrade
- Significant upgrade
- Obsolete (no longer functional)
- N/A—building did not have this system to review
- IP—in process

Mr. Coyle reviewed several key infrastructure components and respective assessment rankings.

- Central Utility Plant—this houses steam and chilled water equipment. It was installed in the 1950s and was designed to provide heat and energy for domestic hot water. The plant provided hot water to utility buildings such as the laundry and kitchen. A chilled water system was installed in the 2000s. The steam system will require a complete overhaul. The steam water distribution system was also ranked as obsolete (the team saw areas with scorched grass from escaping steam during the assessment). The chilled water distribution system was ranked as needing significant upgrades.
- The electrical system is functional for its current uses. The team ranked it as needing significant upgrades because there is a single service coming onto the site, and would likely need more service in the future if there are more sites within the campus. There are

transformers all across the site. The team assumes there will be greater demand on the system in the future, so it will have to be upgraded.

- The telecommunications system is also single service (similar to electrical). Additional services would constitute a significant upgrade to the site.
- The domestic water distribution system has about 30-50 years left. The older pipes (secondary system) are aged and leaking, and have asbestos and lead joints. In a redevelopment scenario, those would likely need to be replaced. On the water supply side the reservoirs are in good shape—the tanks and transfer pumps are in good condition. The water treatment plant itself is aging and will need an overhaul as a public water supply system, which will be a significant investment.
- The sewer system is aged and rainfall events infiltrate the system. The main pumps from private system to public system are at the end of their life. Significant upgrades are required for the sanitation and sewer system.

In the smaller scale buildings with moderate development, some of the systems are adequate. The bigger infrastructure items are what need upgrading, and it is important to think about the bigger picture, not just the capacity of each building. It will cost too much to upgrade the big underlying systems if there is not enough residential use. There is a point at which there is enough demand for infrastructural resources that can justify the cost of redevelopment.

One big question is to consider whether to continue with a central plant. When we look at redevelopment, the likelihood is that there will be smaller developments rather than one large user. A central plant strategy is increasingly not used anymore, and developments use smaller package plants that tie into grid systems in the vicinity (e.g. electricity, water). There is a question about the value of upgrading the central plant given the desired use and function of the whole site.

Ruth Todd reviewed the building evaluation methodology. The team subdivided the campus into “character areas” and developed an iPad app for rapid building assessment, where the team made preliminary judgment calls on the condition of buildings in four areas:

1. Ease of access (ADA compliant)
2. General condition (materials, repairs)
3. Seismic/structural upgrade
4. Hazardous materials abatement

The buildings assessment is still in process, and will include an order-of-magnitude cost estimation for upgrading. In closing, the team thanked SDC staff for their help with the assessment and highlighted the terrific job the staff are doing to maintain the buildings and aging infrastructure.

Economics

Walter Keiser, Economic Planning Systems, reviewed the regional economic context, which can be thought of as concentric spheres. Sonoma Valley and SDC are distinctly low density, remote, and contain many rural uses. Sonoma County as a whole has relatively slow annual growth rate

(.62%) compared to Bay Area (0.75%). The Lower Valley and subarea is notably slower in terms of the growth rate.

Sonoma County has not recovered from the great Recession from a housing growth standpoint, unlike other areas in the region. There has not been much job growth and the added jobs are at the lower wage end. Many areas in the county are also under protection and not available to development. The subarea (where SDC is located) has a slightly lower median income than the county overall. In terms of the overall economic makeup, the local economy is primarily driven by the service sector. Agriculture dominates the land coverage, but is not a significant portion of the economic makeup. Sonoma County job growth has been in health and education, government, leisure and hospitality. There is still a question about whether the redevelopment can drive growth or simply draw from or borrow from other areas.

The economic opportunities of the site are varied, and redevelopment has the potential to be part of a larger package of economic growth for Sonoma County. The team expects there to be some growth in population and in jobs, but not substantial growth. In the post-recession era, occupancy rates are increasing and vacancy rates are declining and moving toward normal.

Mr. Keiser reviewed the commercial real estate market trends. In residential real estate there is not a lot of growth, but there is a large increase in the relative value of housing (especially with limited housing construction). The area has a high cost housing market, in part due to the pressure from the Bay Area on housing prices.

He reviewed recent development projects in the region that indicate the prevailing style and density. When the team looks at the market, the only sector to drive demand in real estate is residential (across a range of housing types). This is not uncommon for these types of redevelopment sites. There are opportunities to design the site to have synergistic aspects to increase demand. A “game changer” project would be to attract a major user (e.g., a university). There are many costs associated with reuse, so there is a need to find the “sweet spot” to maximize value and demand to balance the cost of upgrades.

In closing, Mr. Keiser commented that the team is also looking at market values in contrast to the community benefits of the site (e.g., recreation). There are uses that produce a lot of market value but not community benefit, and vice versa.

As of September 28, 2017, the team was still working on data synthesis and analysis in the following areas:

1. Building conditions analysis
2. Transportation Planning and Circulation
3. Assessment of site-wide storm water and sewage systems, and condition of water treatment plant
4. Opportunities and Constraints on site

Clarification Questions on Technical Information

- What is the status of the recent historical report produced by JRP Consulting and how does the public engage with that process?
 - Response: To WRT’s knowledge, the Historic Resources report is currently under review by State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)
 - **Action Item:** WRT team will provide an update on that process.
- Will upgrades have to be in compliance with building codes?
 - Response: Not for currently operating uses, but future uses would need to be code compliant.
- Is there an economic value ascribed to the ecosystem services?
 - Response: WRT is working on the creation of value to answer this question. There is the traditional method of valuing land potential, and then there is valuing it from an ecosystems services perspective. Some of the value can be monetized, other values are “utilities” (e.g. recreation) that are more difficult to monetize.
- In your exploration and assessment of the site, have you had any meaningful surprises and what do you think the meaning of those surprises is?
 - Response: There is a lot of information that people in the community are generally familiar with, and the team is catching up with what people know on the ground. There are some surprises in the infrastructure, and the economic potential is also an area where there is new and interesting information.
- Will the data for the assessment findings report be made available?
 - The data will be included in the site assessment findings report. Participants can follow up with Tania on particular areas of interest.
- I did not see any data on inequities in the region in the economic analysis. Median income in some census tracts in the area is less than \$20K/year. I want to see where the inequities are—this concern is linked to community values. I want to see the data and analysis reflect the broader economic values of the community here. This issue ties back to the ecosystem services conversation and the importance of identifying and asserting the value of certain community benefits (e.g. diversity).
 - Response: The data does not suggest that there can only be certain uses that are only about market value. It is more about combining different options and benefits to make the project pencil out. The question of inequity is largely about the demand for affordable housing beyond the site level. We can monetize some of those community benefits going forward.
 - Follow up: Our only disadvantaged community—technically speaking—is the senior community of Temelec. A lot of the income inequality is not reflected in the technical characterization of “disadvantaged.”
- The Lower Valley is very different from the county as a whole. Is there going to be consideration about what is happening in the Springs area and in the City of Sonoma’s 8th Street Industrial area? The City of Sonoma is also moving forward with an economic study that will result in more data and a report.

- Response: From a planning standpoint, we want to consider all those areas. From a data standpoint, there are constraints on what is available. There will be similar questions for other developments.
- It is hard to comment on some of this because we do not know where the data come from (e.g. the habitat data, economic data). There is a lot of data generated within the county that CAC members are familiar with, so it would be helpful to share where the data come from.
 - The vegetation mapping is based on the Sonoma Veg-Map efforts.
 - Some of the data was generated on-site, but we can be clear about where the datasets are coming from.
 - **Action item:** WRT to clarify where the different data come from in subsequent presentations, in the final report.
- Did the commercial development assessment look at hospitality?
 - Response: Not in great detail. Strong feelings about hospitality came up in the interviews, as it has in this meeting. The WRT team is mindful of these concerns. Going forward into the planning process, we want to be open minded about options since there are going to be hard choices and trade-offs. We do not want to exclude things categorically, since we want to optimize any potential combination of elements.
 - The WRT Team will consider a range of hospitality options in the market analysis along with other land uses, considering appropriate scale and type as well as market potential for these and other uses.
- My primary question is how to balance market-rate housing (and paying for new infrastructure) with the need for low-cost housing? Is low-income housing an option? How is that figured out?
 - Response: Low-cost housing is subsidized housing, and that “subsidy” has to come from somewhere. Figuring that out is part of an orchestrated strategy where the developer works to determine the program in partnership with stakeholders and the County, and develops a formula that is in balance.
- We do not know what the State expects in terms of economic sustainability. It is hard to imagine potential future uses without a sense for what sustainability means (e.g. generating a lot of revenue, breaking even). As CAC members, we want to move forward with what the community cares about, so if there is a number to work with, we can work from there. Also, who makes the decisions matters a lot and we want to know how the decision gets made.
 - Response: From WRT’s experience working with the client, the State is learning about the potential future uses as well as the opportunities and constraints. This is a discovery process and we are working together to figure it out.
 - Response from Michael Wilkening, Undersecretary of the California Health and Human Services Agency: The normal process for closure is different from what the State is doing with the SDC campus. The State has committed to a very different approach here because we recognize the unique needs for this campus

and we are going through the process to figure out the best uses. We do not know what should happen at this site. We are here in the room to hear what you want. We have to figure out how to make it work financially—the State is not in a position to dump a whole bunch of money into the redevelopment process. There are different values and interests here and we have to figure out how to balance them all. The report in December will be just the start of more engagement with other stakeholders at the State level.

Summary of Stakeholder Assessment

Tania Carlone presented highlights from the stakeholder assessment (see attached presentation for full details). She emphasized that working together is an important foundation for this process. The preliminary report will be shared with stakeholders for input and feedback.

She reviewed the assessment purpose and methodology for stakeholder identification. A standard questionnaire was used as a guide for the qualitative assessment of interests, values, histories, visions, and measures of success, among others. Ms. Carlone conducted 20 confidential interviews. Recurring themes included:

- **Protection of SDC land and water**—stakeholders talked about this in a variety of ways such as open space, the wildlife corridor, and people made connections between water and groundwater recharge potential. We heard that future development should not only mitigate but enhance the ecological value of the site.
- **Preservation of a legacy of care**—SDC has created the fabric of community. People who are drawn to this work have created an altruistic community and have built the community capacity for care. We heard that it is important to maintain services for the developmentally disabled (e.g., Northern Star crisis care clinic). We heard that the legacy of care could be carried forward in future uses focused on veterans, the elderly, youth, and others.
- **Community character and historical preservation**—there is a feeling when you come to the place, and people want to maintain a sense of serenity and peace and the rural character. Historical preservation ensures that the story of the place will be told. We heard a particular interest in living history—not just about the past, but the present and the future.
- **Contribution to economic diversity and viability of Sonoma Valley**—the community wants to figure out how people who work here can live here and have a jobs-housing balance locally. We heard the importance of not having just any jobs, but middle-class and professional level jobs.
- **Focus on community benefits**—whatever the future is, the benefit to the local community has to be the central value and redevelopment has to benefit the local community.

Ms. Carlone reviewed the issues, concerns, and potential conflicts raised by stakeholders, which included a lack of affordable housing, well-paying jobs, and higher educational opportunities,

groundwater depletion, saturation in the vacation rentals and luxury tourism markets, and traffic, among others. Stakeholders also had lots of ideas for the potential reuse of the SDC site. She commented that stakeholders emphasized the “how” rather than the “what” of the project, and that it is important to ensure that future development fits into the common themes and values. In closing she reviewed the next steps for the community engagement process.

Comments and Questions

- It is not just about community character, but that redevelopment does not create negative impacts. Add “overall quality of life” to second bullet on the second slide of issues and concerns.
- What does community engagement mean for the public workshop in December?
 - Response: CCP is working on securing the Hanna Boys Center for the workshop venue. We are expecting a lot of people will come and we want to create an interactive workshop to share information and provide opportunities to give feedback.
 - Follow up from Supervisor Gorin: I am working with Senator McGuire on a town hall meeting for October 21st that will hopefully set the stage for further engagement.

Group Break-out Session

Participants broke into four tables to discuss the implications of the preliminary findings on-site opportunities and constraints as they relate to the following:

- Conservation
- Recreational Aspects
- Future Campus Reuse & Infrastructure
- Disposition and Governance

Comments

- Governance and disposition were not covered in today’s presentation. I am concerned about reflecting on these issues without having heard more.
 - Response: The Project team did not cover it today. If you have ideas to share with regard to these issues, then we welcome them. If people are uncomfortable addressing the topics, that is fine too.

Report Backs by Group

Group 1

Disposition and governance

- Maintain “local” control over ultimate disposition and use of site.
- Own governance on SDC.

Reuse and infrastructure

- Cluster development in more compact areas to reduce costs and include some preservation of agricultural land use.
- Maximize the on-site use of on-site water and direct surplus water to help the valley.
 - Zero net water budget.
- Potential for incubator farm (groundwater depletion issue needs to be addressed).
 - Look at synergy for modelling groundwater recharge.
- Undeveloped land—voted in as community separator.
- Complete sustainability campus with respect to wildlife corridor.
 - Denser housing in smaller area.
 - Support wildlife corridor.
- Questions
 - Does historical preservation impinge efforts at all?
 - What is the percentage of DDS integrated housing at the property?
- Comment: Rental rates are low and not a clear reflection of Sonoma Valley rates.

Conservation

- Widen habitat corridor.
- Put in habitat enhancements where they make sense.

Recreation

- Enhance recreation outside central developed area—marry it with wildlife corridor.
- Remove trails impacting creeks or wildlife corridor but enhance new environmentally sensitive trails.
- Connect to adjacent parks.
- Reinvigorate Camp Via for multi-functional use.

Group 2

Disposition and governance

- Documents should not be removed to Sacramento, but remain in the area (local library).
- Northeast flats go to Regional Park, including Suttonfield Lake.
- Explore opportunities to partner with a brand (e.g. Patagonia, Tesla, solar company, etc.) that is aligned with the vision—a sensible brand as part of the trade-offs.

Reuse and infrastructure

- There is a lot of potential to improve water and energy footprint—highly inefficient water use now.
- Opportunity to include development guidelines (e.g. LEED or other sustainable building approach; living roofs).
- Build off of Sonoma’s recognized leadership in conservation—e.g. host revenue generating conferences on how to be more like Sonoma.
- The Children’s Museum wants a 5-acre site to move from their current location in Santa Rosa—this is a proven tourist draw.
- Investigate satellite wastewater treatment plant.

Conservation

- Keep public water rights public; do not privatize.
- Capture and store runoff water in local aquifers—if there is gain, capture that for seasonal gain.
- Need to consider vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gases (VMT/ GHG). Factor in the value of reducing emissions by locating housing here.

Recreation

- Keep the building footprint small, but include some type of museum place. Highlight the cemetery memorial.
- Widen wildlife corridor—upper part should hook into Jack London Park.
- The longevity of certain plants (trees) might be an issue with climate change and groundwater recharge issues.

Group 3

Group 3 did not share reflections on disposition and governance.

Reuse and infrastructure

- Need cost estimates for reuse, and need uses in order to understand future costs.
- If existing water infrastructure remains, need to address water supply access, rights and governance.
- With existing single road access, there is a need to understand traffic impacts (not studied).
- Most buildings will be too costly to retain but want adaptive reuse as much as possible to preserve historic features.
- Want continued consideration for some treatment facilities and educational uses.

Conservation

- Protect open space given ecological resources.
- Cost of bringing infrastructure to open space is non-feasible—build within developed footprint.
- Need ecological buffers.
- Protect open space areas within existing developed site.
 - Gained an understanding from the historical analysis that the calm and openness was purposeful design for therapeutic value to clients. There is still therapeutic value in the design. Stay on the existing building footprint.
- Use informs place. Place informs use.

Recreation

- Community members use the entire SDC property currently.
 - Need well maintained, appropriately located trails
 - Baseball fields
- There was not a lot of detail in the findings presented, about who is using the recreational assets. Who, what, where, why. Would be useful to know how people

actually use the site. (e.g., the number of hikers using which trails? The number of baseball fields users? The number of dog walkers using which areas?)

- Maintain existing recreational features of the property.

Group 4

Disposition and governance

- Request to the State to “give it to us!” (i.e., Sonoma County)
 - Board of Supervisors will want to create new governing institution—could be like the Presidio Trust.
 - County could participate in the governance and State could still retain ownership (e.g. 99 year lease option).
- Governance structure in the middle that meets all needs.
- Still a question on negotiating remedial costs.

Reuse and infrastructure

- Use Enhanced Infrastructure Finance District as a tool (EIFDs)
 - How would we pay for infrastructure financing—tax increment from housing seems likely. Must build something (e.g. 1000 units of housing) to create a tax increment.
 - Sonoma County can allocate that money for infrastructure development. Comes from the County’s general fund.
 - Big question still about how will this pencil out.
- The domestic water system may have value for institutional use.
- There is a strong legacy of community care and a moral obligation to include social services in some form.
 - Retention of social services and “placement center of last resort.”
- Mixed-use, mixed-income community to include homes for those with developmental disabilities; affordable housing and retail sources.
- Still need to address transportation.

Conservation

- The wildlife/ecological corridor is the highest ecological asset.
- Look at the riparian corridor ordinance experience.
- How we pay for conservation is a big constraint. Every acre protected for conservation cannot be developed, but that does not mean it does not have economic value.
 - EIF District tool could help fund conservation; housing could also help pay.
- Is County Parks or State Parks interested in parts of the SDC property? Costs are about acquisition and then managing and stewarding the land.
- Community ethos of protection of nature and environment will limit/drive out choices for reuse and development.

Recreation

- Recreation is the #1 reason for people coming here (e.g., ropes course, Camp Via, lakes).

- Agriculture and tourism are big economic drivers.
- Connect with outdoor recreation initiative from Sonoma County Economic Development Board to promote the area for recreation.
- Develop a visitor center for recreation—State parks, County parks, Chamber.
- Develop a conference center (like Asilomar or Marconi).

Closing & Next Steps

Dan Kim, DGS Director, thanked everyone for their input and feedback. This is a different process than what DGS is used to doing. DGS recognizes how special the SDC campus is and for that reason is doing something different. Mr. Kim reviewed some of his take-aways from the presentations and discussion, including the distinction between a central plant and conventional hookups if there is more than one owner; the difference between current uses (grandfathered in) and new uses that would require new infrastructure and incur costs; and the inverse relationship between dollar value and perceived community benefit. He commented that everyone seemed to be struggling to think about this and how to pay for what is wanted. He thanked the WRT team for their work on developing the building assessment to share in November, and said he recognized the need to balance local control and State needs. For the next meeting he invited CAC members to think about how to make the project a win-win and what the trade-offs are.

In closing, Jim Stickley reviewed the next steps in the community engagement process:

- June to October: Stakeholder Assessment Interviews and Completion of Report
- September: Community Advisory Committee Meeting #1
- November: Community Advisory Committee Meeting #2
- December: Public Workshop

Attachments:

- Appendix A: Meeting Attendee List
- Charge of the Committee document
- PowerPoint Presentation

Appendix A: Meeting Attendee List

| Entity | Name |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Community Advisory Committee Members | |
| Sonoma County Board of Supervisors | Susan Gorin |
| County Administrator's Office | Rebecca Wachsberg |
| General Services Agency | Caroline Judy |
| Permit Sonoma (PRMD) | Tennis Wick- primary |
| | Jennifer Barrett- alternate |
| Economic Development Board | Albert Lerma |
| Sonoma County Department of Health Services | Jen Lewis |
| Sonoma County Regional Parks | Melanie Parker |
| Sonoma County Water Agency | Jay Jasperse |
| Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District | Bill Keene |
| Valley of the Moon Water District | Daniel Muelrath |
| City of Sonoma | Rachel Hundley |
| Sonoma Valley Chamber of Commerce | Becky Ettinger |
| Sonoma Land Trust | John McCaull |
| Sonoma Ecology Center | Richard Dale- primary |
| | Caitlin Cornwall- alternate |
| Sonoma Mountain Preservation | Mickey Cooke- primary |
| | Nancy Kirwan- alternate |
| Parent Hospital Association | Kathleen Miller |
| North Bay Regional Center | Michi Gates |
| Glen Ellen Forum | Vicki Hill- primary |
| | Tracey Salcedo- alternate |
| Glen Ellen Historical Society | Jim Shere |
| Sonoma Community Foundation | Karin Demarest |
| Valley of the Moon Alliance | Todd Board |
| UC Cooperative Extension | Mimi Enright |
| Observers & Guests | |
| Office of Assembly member Cecilia Aguilar-Curry | Laura Beltran |
| The Arc – Lanterman Coalition | Jordan Lindsey |
| Sonoma Ecology Center | Minona Heaviland |
| Habitat for Humanity of Sonoma County | Liz Rentzel |
| Habitat for Humanity of Sonoma County | Jennifer Estrella |
| Sonoma Developmental Center | Aleana Carreon |
| Sonoma Developmental Center | JJ Fernandez |
| State Agency Representatives | |
| California Health and Human Services Agency | Michael Wilkening |
| CA Department of Developmental Services | Nancy Bargmann |
| CA Department of Developmental Services | John Doyle |
| CA Department of Developmental Services | Dwayne LaFon |

| Entity | Name |
|--|-------------------|
| CA Department of General Services | Dan Kim |
| CA Department of General Services | Gerald McLaughlin |
| WRT & Consulting Partners Staff | |
| WRT | Jim Stickle |
| WRT | Poonam Narker |
| WRT | Peter Winch |
| WRT | Sonali Praharaj |
| Page and Turnbull Architects | Ruth Todd |
| Prunuske Chatham | Joan Schwan |
| Center for Collaborative Policy | Tania Carlone |
| Center for Collaborative Policy | Alex Cole-Weiss |
| Sherwood Design Engineers | John Leys |
| Interface Engineering | David Coyle |
| Economic Planning Systems | Walter Keiser |
| Economic Planning Systems | Ben Sigman |
| Equity County Builders | Ted Lieser |

DRAFT