



COMMUNITY SURVEY REPORT #1

September 2020

Sonoma Developmental Center Community Survey Report #1

September 2020

Prepared for

The County of Sonoma

Prepared by

DYETT & BHATIA
Urban and Regional Planners

Table of Contents

1 Introduction.....	5
1.1 Specific Plan Context	5
1.2 Survey Respondent Demographics.....	7
2 Survey Results.....	14
2.1 Analysis of Survey Responses.....	14
2.2 Next Steps.....	30
3 Appendix: Open-Ended Responses.....	31

List of Figures and Tables

Figure 1-1: Q10 - “Optional: What is your relationship with the SDC site? (check all that apply)”	8
Figure 1-2: Survey Response Zip Codes	9
Table 1-1: Current Population Characteristics (2018-2019).....	10
Figure 1-3: Q12 – “Optional: What is your age?”	11
Figure 1-4: Sonoma County Age Demographics (2018)	11
Figure 1-5: Q13 – “Optional: Have you been involved in other visioning or outreach activities focused on SDC’s future?”	12
Fig 2-1: Q1 - What are the greatest assets of the SDC Site?.....	16
Fig 2-2: Q2 - What are some of the key issues facing the SDC Site?	17
Figure 2-3: Q3 - What are some of the key issues facing Sonoma Valley that have implications for planning SDC?	18
Figure 2-4: Q4 – “What are some of the key issues facing Sonoma County that have implications for planning SDC?”	19
Figure 2-5: Q5 – “What are some of the key issues facing the State of California that have implications for planning SDC?”	20
Figure 2-6: Q6 – “On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), please score each of the following as priorities for the 200-acre campus.”	22
Figure 2-7: Q6 – “On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), please score each of the following as priorities for the 200-acre campus.” (weighted average, overall)	23
Figure 2-8: Q6 - “On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), please score each of the following as priorities for the 200-acre campus.” (weighted average, respondents less than 35 years old).....	23
Figure 2-9: Q7 - Which of the following uses should be considered to help pay for improvements and ensure long-term economic sustainability? (Multiple Choice).....	26
Figure 2-10: Q7 - Which of the following uses should be considered to help pay for improvements and ensure long-term economic sustainability? (Multiple Choice) (Younger demographic)	26
Figure 2-11: Q7 - Which of the following uses should be considered to help pay for improvements and ensure long-term economic sustainability? (Overall comments)	27
Figure 2-12: Q8 – “How best do you think historic preservation should be balanced with the need of new development?”	28
Figure 2-13: Q8 – “How best do you think historic preservation should be balanced with the need of new development?”(Respondents less than 35 years old)	28

Figure 2-14: Q9 – “Which of the following types of housing are most desirable at SDC?” (all respondents)..... 30



1 Introduction

This report summarizes findings from the community survey conducted as part of the Community Kickoff Visioning Activity for preparation of the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan. The survey was conducted online and was available to everyone from April 27, 2020 to June 22, 2020 at the project website.

The rest of this chapter provides the context for the SDC Specific Plan and demographics of survey respondents. Chapter 2 summarizes findings of the survey. Detailed responses to the questions, including all responses to the open-ended questions, are provided in the Appendix.

1.1 Specific Plan Context

Specific Plan Planning Context

Established in 1891 in the heart of the Sonoma Valley, the Sonoma Developmental Center (SDC) encompasses a total area of 945 acres, with more than 700 acres of undeveloped open space surrounding an approximately 200-acre historical developed campus, in addition to a large agricultural area to the east of Arnold Drive. The site is about six miles north of the City of Sonoma and about 15 miles south of Santa Rosa, between the unincorporated communities of Glen Ellen and Eldridge. SDC is adjacent to the Sonoma Valley Regional Park and the Jack London State Historic Park.

The SDC is the oldest facility in California created specifically to serve the needs of individuals with disabilities, but in 2018, the State of California officially closed the facility and relocated clients to smaller, community-based care facilities.

Through an agreement signed in 2019, the State and Sonoma County have forged a unique partnership that allows the County, together with the community, to chart the future of the State-owned property through preparation of a County-managed Specific Plan, focused on transition and overall vision and related environmental review. The goals and objectives of the SDC Specific Plan are outlined in the State of California's Government Code [Section 14670.10.5](#), and include provisions to prioritize housing, especially affordable housing and housing for individuals with

developmental disabilities, and to preserve lands outside the approximately 200-acre core developed campus and its related infrastructure as public parkland and open space.¹ The Specific Plan will set a vision for SDC which will consider land uses, transportation, economic viability, historic preservation, and conservation of the site's important natural resources.

The Specific Plan planning process began in early 2020, and is anticipated to be completed late 2021, along with an Environmental Impact Report. To learn more about the SDC Specific Plan, visit the project website at: <https://www.sdcspecificplan.com/>.

Community Engagement and Survey

The Specific Plan preparation process contains numerous opportunities for community engagement at every stage of the project to enable the community to shape and give feedback on key issues, strategies, and policies that will affect their future.

An initial community kickoff event was planned for March 2020 at the SDC site, and was envisioned as including guided hikes and walking tours, a visioning exercise, and expert panels. Due to the unforeseen shelter-in-place orders of the coronavirus pandemic, however, the outreach event for the project kick-off moved to a virtual setting and included:

- A series of interactive webinars featuring presentations and Q&A with expert and local panelists on the following topics:
 - Community Engagement
 - Market Conditions and Development Challenges and Opportunities
 - Site Ecology
 - Historic Preservation

Each webinar attracted 75-100 attendees, who asked the experts questions about the SDC site and planning process.

1. State of California, Government Code Section 14670.10.5
(https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5e44526401cadd5712640ee4/t/5e98ceec8910c72dae3cac72/1587072749609/codes_displaySection.xhtml.pdf).

- A virtual “walking tour” of the core campus, which highlighted the history of different buildings and periods of the SDC through maps and photographs
- A “pop quiz” about the SDC and local ecology
- A community kick-off visioning activity (this survey)

The survey and activities were hosted on the project website. The community kickoff event was advertised through a series of email newsletters sent by the County and the consultants to a 5,000-person list of interested parties (people who had signed up for updates on the SDC Specific Plan website, the County’s website, or Transform SDC’s forums), posted on Nextdoor, and was covered by local newspapers, including the Sonoma Index-Tribune and the Kenwood Press. Specific targeted outreach was also done to reach underrepresented minority groups in Sonoma County.

The survey was available to everyone from April 27, 2020 to June 22, 2020, and received 304 responses. It was also available in Spanish, but the Spanish translation received no responses, indicating that other tactics for reaching Sonoma Valley’s Spanish-speaking community will need to be developed for future stages of the project. The survey was not a scientific survey, and therefore the conclusions and findings are not based on standards typically followed in a scientific survey, but are meant to serve as an important reference for County staff and decision-makers in formulating recommendations to guide future development and identify key priorities for policies in the SDC Specific Plan.

Survey participants were asked to share their vision for the SDC Specific Plan and respond to questions about the planning process, priorities, and give opinions and ideas about land use, historic preservation, housing, and infrastructure. The survey incorporated ideas and statements from Transform SDC and the Glen Ellen Forum’s 2015 community workshops – community-driven outreach activities that precede the current Specific Plan process.

1.2 Survey Respondent Demographics


The survey received a total of 304 responses. As an optional component of the survey respondents were asked to describe their relationship to the SDC site, the zip code they live in, and their age.

Relationship with SDC Site

As seen in Figure 1-1 below, 73 percent of respondents indicated that they live near the SDC site. Seventy-two percent of respondents walk on the trails in and around SDC, while 16 percent use the site’s other recreational facilities. Fourteen percent of respondents were directly involved with SDC – they used to either work there, were related to a former client, or they themselves were former clients. Many respondents checked multiple boxes, indicating that the site is an important recreational facility for people who live nearby. Of the 290 people who responded to this question, 79 answered “other, please specify”; 27 comments were from people who had worked or volunteered at the site with various organizations including the SDC, and 13 respondents were advocates for people with developmental disabilities.


Figure 1-1: Q10 - “Optional: What is your relationship with the SDC site? (check all that apply)”

Respondents were also asked to provide their zip code of residence. The greatest



proportion of respondents (44 percent) live in the 95476 zip code, which includes the City of Sonoma and surroundings, including some portions within half mile of SDC, while the next highest proportion (29 percent) of respondents live in the 95442 zip code, which includes Glen Ellen and Eldridge. Other zip codes included 95405, 95409, 94931 and 95404 in Sonoma County, and about 10 respondents from Petaluma, Napa, and the Bay Area. Of the respondents who lived in the 95476 or 95442 zip codes, 99 percent selected “I live nearby” in Question 10.

Figure 1-2: Survey Response Zip Codes



Age

Respondents were also asked to identify their age range. There was a much greater proportion of older respondents, with more than two-thirds of respondents (69 percent) being older than 55, and 39 percent of respondents answering that they were older than 65. Only 22 respondents (seven percent) were younger than 34 years old. (Figure 1-3)

The Lower Sonoma Valley’s population is generally older than the county overall, as indicated by the area’s median age and share of residents over the age of 65 (Table 1-1). Median age is less in the SDC Subarea due in large part to the age composition of the Springs area, south of the site, where most residents are under the age of 35. In Glen Ellen, north of the site, the median age is comparable to the broader Sonoma Valley. Forecasts project that the population ages 65 and over will grow ranging

from 1.3 percent to 3.2 percent per year. Residents in this age bracket are projected to make up 24 to 30 percent of the county population by 2040, compared to the current share of 19 percent, due to the natural aging of the existing population.

Table 1-1: Current Population Characteristics (2018-2019)

-	<i>Bay Area</i>	<i>Sonoma County</i>	<i>Lower Valley</i>	<i>SDC Subarea</i>
Population	7,708,655	495,319	48,517	20,040
Median Age	39	41	53	40
% Over Age 65	16%	19%	32%	16%

The survey respondent demographic sample differs from that of Sonoma County as whole (Figure 1-4), because of self-selection bias. There were no survey takers younger than 18, while that age group represents 20 percent of the county population. The 18 to 34 cohort is under-represented in survey takers; those between 35 and 64 are over-represented and those older than 65 are significantly over-represented. All of the younger respondents in this survey indicated in Question 10 that they lived in Sonoma County, or were former residents of Sonoma County. To account for the differences between survey takers and actual demographic data, any differences in responses by the various age cohorts is noted in the discussion.

Figure 1-3: Q12 – “Optional: What is your age?”





Figure 1-4: Sonoma County Age Demographics (2018)




Source: ACS 2018 (5-Year Estimates)

Involvement with Prior SDC Visioning Efforts and Community Groups

Respondents were also asked about their involvement in prior SDC visioning. As shown in Figure 1-5, the majority of respondents (69 percent) had not been previously involved in the SDC planning process, whether or not they lived nearby. However, respondents who either worked at the former SDC or had been/were related to a former client were more likely to have been involved with previous outreach about the future of the SDC site.

Figure 1-5: Q13 – “Optional: Have you been involved in other visioning or outreach activities focused on SDC’s future?”



Respondents who answered “yes,” to being involved in past outreach efforts were asked to specify in the comments section which activities they had participated in. Answers included: meetings held by Supervisor Susan Gorin, the Glen Ellen Forum’s outreach efforts, community meetings at the Hanna Boys Center and the Dunbar School, and the Transform SDC coalition.

Finally, respondents were asked if they were involved in any local community groups that might be interested in participating in the SDC planning process. Groups mentioned included the Challenge Sonoma Adventure Ropes Course, Sonoma Mountain Preservation, the Sonoma Ecology Center, the Glen Ellen Forum, the Sonoma Valley



Housing Group, the Homelessness Alliance, and the Sonoma Valley Special Education Advisory Committee, along with others, which are listed in the appendix. The answers to this question are representative of the strong sense of community and self-advocacy in the Sonoma Valley, and also suggest that people who are already engaged in planning for Sonoma Valley's future were more likely to participate in the visioning survey.

2 Survey Results

Highlights of the survey are discussed and summarized below. The full set of responses to open-ended questions is included in the Appendix.

2.1 Analysis of Survey Responses

Survey participants were asked questions about their ideas and priorities for the SDC site. All questions were posed to all respondents. Some questions were open-ended while others provided multiple choices, prompting respondents to select one or multiple answers. Open-ended responses were synthesized and summarized to reveal broader patterns of responses.

The percentages below refer to the number of responses for that particular question, noting that some participants skipped certain questions. Many questions allowed participants to check multiple topics as priorities, and in some instances, respondents did not fully answer a question; thus, totals may not add up or may add to more than 100 percent. Answers are shown in the descending order that they were presented to survey participants.

Thoughts on the Context and Future of the SDC Site

The following questions were broad inquiries into respondents' familiarity with the SDC Specific Plan and the challenges that the Plan will need to address at different levels of geography and governance, as well as opinions on the significant existing characteristics of the site.

Question 1: What are the greatest assets of the SDC site? How would you like to see these assets incorporated into SDC's future?

When asked about SDC greatest assets and how they would like to see these incorporated in future planning, respondents were consistently enthusiastic about the beauty of the surrounding open space and the historic architecture of the campus. This question received 285 responses. Around 80 percent of respondents named the open space and natural beauty of the SDC site as the area's greatest asset. Of those respondents, most wished to preserve the historical and ecological integrity of the

property by designating it as open space and allowing public access to the hiking trails throughout campus, potentially linking them to the nearby Jack London State Park and Sonoma Mountain Regional Park. The second most common response (about 60 percent of respondents) was the historic nature of the SDC campus, with respondents naming both the buildings and the significance of the SDC in the region and state as assets. Forty-five respondents wished to see the historic buildings preserved and adapted, generally into locally serving businesses or institutional uses. Suggestions for new uses included a museum (6 responses), a college campus (5 responses), or community serving mixed-use services and businesses (10 responses). A few respondents noted that the dark history of eugenics on the campus is something that they hope to see the Specific Plan address.

About 16 percent of the total respondents wished to see the existing buildings and infrastructure adaptively reused for housing, particularly for lower income or higher needs populations, such as the developmentally disabled, the homeless, seniors, workers, or artists. Around seven percent of respondents named the existing infrastructure—the roads, aquifers, farms, and buildings of the former SDC—as great assets, arguing that it lays a sustainable foundation for future development and uses.

Of the 22 respondents aged 34 and younger, ten listed the open space as the SDC site's greatest asset. Ten thought that the site's potential for housing (four specifically mentioned housing for low-income, elderly, developmentally disabled persons, or "those who are in the greatest need") was a key asset. Seven mentioned hiking trails, and other responses mentioned existing infrastructure and natural beauty.

Figure 2-1: Q1 - What are the greatest assets of the SDC Site?



Question 2: What are some of the key issues facing the SDC site?

This question was the first of several similar questions which asked respondents to think about some of the key issues that the SDC Specific Plan will need to address. When asked what they thought were the biggest challenges that the SDC site faced, 38 percent of respondents identified the aging buildings, 16 percent mentioned the cost of maintenance and upkeep, ten percent mentioned the aging infrastructure, and 15 percent of respondents expressed concern about potential over-development, with some referring to the challenge of balancing new development with historic and open space preservation as a key issue. Twelve percent of respondents listed traffic as a key concern. Other issues included lack of public transit, lack of employment nearby, climate change (including droughts, water pollution, and fires), and lack of funding as key issues.

Younger respondents' answers were varied and mentioned aging infrastructure, balancing historic preservation/development and housing/employment, development overreach, and NIMBYism (an acronym for "Not In My Back Yard," a NIMBY is a person or group that raises opposition to development or construction in their neighborhood, especially if they do not object to similar projects built elsewhere) as key issues for the site.

Figure 2-2: Q2 - What are some of the key issues facing the SDC Site?



Question 3: What are some of the key issues facing Sonoma Valley that have implications for planning SDC?

Next, respondents were asked to think at a larger scale about local issues that would influence the SDC Specific Plan. The most common response to this question was the region's lack of housing stock to meet the demand, with around 61 percent of respondents listing this as a key issue. Seventy-five percent of the respondents younger than 35 years old who answered this question listed the housing shortage as the biggest issue facing Sonoma Valley. The second most frequently cited response was traffic, and the fear that new development would bring more traffic to

the area, with around 26 percent of respondents listing this as a key concern. Other frequently mentioned answers included wildfires – particularly a lack of a secure egress route during a wildfire, as some respondents indicated that Arnold Drive faces bad traffic – water scarcity, and overpopulation due to tourism.

Figure 2-3: Q3 - What are some of the key issues facing Sonoma Valley that have implications for planning SDC?



Question 4: What are some of the key issues facing Sonoma County that have implications for planning SDC?

Respondents were then asked to identify some of the key issues in Sonoma County that could influence the SDC Specific Plan. Forty-one percent of respondents mentioned a lack of housing. Other commonly cited issues were fire risk, traffic, funding, and a lack of suitable housing and services for developmentally disabled and mentally ill persons. Fifteen percent of respondents answered that Sonoma County faced the same issues as the Sonoma Valley. Thirteen percent of survey respondents skipped this question.

Sixty percent of the 22 respondents younger than age 35 listed the housing shortage as Sonoma County’s key issue, while three of them specifically mentioned the lack of housing for developmentally disabled persons in the County. A few mentioned climate change, and a few mentioned funding.

Figure 2-4: Q4 – “What are some of the key issues facing Sonoma County that have implications for planning SDC?”



Question 5: What are some of the key issues facing the State of California that have implications for planning SDC?

Finally, respondents were asked to identify some of the main challenges in the State of California that could affect the SDC Specific Plan. The most common response was the statewide housing shortage, as well as homelessness, which 30 percent of respondents listed as a key issue. Twenty-two percent of respondents answered that the state budget, or funding sources, were the main issue facing California, particularly given the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. Fourteen percent of respondents expressed concern about the impacts of climate change, including wildfires and droughts. Twenty-two percent of respondents either skipped this question or commented that their answer for California was the same as the answers they had given for Sonoma County and Sonoma Valley’s key issues.

Of the younger respondents, 25 percent listed funding, 55 percent listed housing shortages, one was worried about disappearing open space, and the remaining participants skipped the question.

Figure 2-5: Q5 – “What are some of the key issues facing the State of California that have implications for planning SDC?”



Question 6: On a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), please score each of the following as priorities for the 200-acre campus. (Note that the California Government Code already establishes the State’s intent in preserving the 750-acre area around the campus as parkland and open space, and detailed planning for that will not be done as part of the Specific Plan.)

In this question, respondents were asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with priorities in shaping the SDC Specific Plan. Several of these statements were adapted from guiding principles written by the Transform SDC coalition in 2015. The question asked respondents to prioritize the following topics:

- Promoting development that protects and enhances the community character of Sonoma Valley;
- Promoting business start-up and innovation;
- Promoting cultural uses such as a performing arts center;
- Developing new educational and employment opportunities for Sonoma Valley;

- Ensuring long-term economic feasibility and ability to pay for infrastructure improvements;
- Developing a walkable and pedestrian-friendly district;
- Accommodating needs of people of diverse backgrounds and interests;
- Preserving historic resources and SDC's legacy of community care; and
- Incorporating ecological conservation and environmental sustainability and resiliency in the Specific Plan.

Responses are shown in Figure 2-6 as they were presented in the survey, and Figure 2-7 shows responses sorted in descending order by highest to lowest weighted average score (i.e. highest to lowest priority).

Respondents were most supportive of incorporating ecological conservation and environmental sustainability and resiliency at the site, with 77 percent of respondents strongly agreeing with this priority. The proposal to develop a walkable and pedestrian-friendly district, received similar strong support, with 70 percent of respondents rating the statement as a 5, or strongly agree. In general, respondents were supportive of all of the proposed uses, and every statement received a 3 or higher score by a majority (more than 60 percent) of respondents. Promoting business start-up and innovation received the least enthusiastic response, with 27 percent of respondents saying they strongly or moderately disagreed with that proposal. Of those who rated business start-up negatively, respondents were more likely to also oppose cultural uses and educational opportunities, whereas, like the general sample, they were strongly in support of ecological conservation. The percentages of respondents who agreed or disagreed with the listed questions did not change significantly whether the respondent lived nearby or not.

Respondents were also given the option to specify other priorities for the site. Three hundred and one respondents answered this question, and 82 chose to comment. Thirty percent of those who commented wished to see housing and homelessness be made a priority in the Specific Plan as well, while about 12 percent shared the idea that the SDC was built to care for the developmentally disabled and should continue to do so. Other common themes included support for a community arts center and other community services such as non-profit or educational facilities, and the desire to see the site remain entirely open with no new development.

While results did not vary significantly whether the respondents lived nearby or had been involved with the former SDC, they did change depending on respondent age. Figure 2-8 shows the weighted average, or highest to lowest priority, of respondents aged 34 and younger. While they shared the same desire for ecological sensitivity and conservation, they were much more interested than the general sample in preserving the SDC’s legacy of community care, which fits with earlier responses from the same group indicating that the SDC’s closure and subsequent lack of housing for local residents who needed care was a key issue in both Sonoma Valley and the county. Younger respondents were also least likely to prioritize Sonoma Valley’s existing community character; two of the seven respondents less than 35 years old who commented on this question stated that they do not identify with the existing “community character” of the region, given that they have faced an entirely different housing market than older residents.

Figure 2-6: Q6 – “On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), please score each of the following as priorities for the 200-acre campus.”




Figure 2-7: Q6 – “On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), please score each of the following as priorities for the 200-acre campus.” (weighted average, overall)





Figure 2-8: Q6 - “On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), please score each of the following as priorities for the 200-acre campus.” (weighted average, respondents less than 35 years old)



Thoughts on Development and Preservation

In this section, respondents were asked to provide initial feedback on potential land uses and preservation strategies. Respondents were allowed to select multiple answers and give open-ended responses to the questions.

Question 7: Much of the infrastructure (water, wastewater systems, roads) and buildings at SDC are in disrepair and will require extensive improvements to meet needs for new residents and workers. Which of the following uses should be considered to help pay for improvements and ensure long-term economic sustainability? Check all that apply.

In this question, respondents were asked to select or write in strategies to fund infrastructure improvements. Respondents were able to choose from a variety of income-generating land uses, including commercial and office uses, market rate housing, tourism-oriented uses, and/or a nature or wine-focused resort, or "other," in which respondents were given an open comment space to suggest alternatives. More than 90 percent of survey takers answered this question. It should be noted that in response to Question 2, 41 percent of respondents identified the disrepair of the buildings and infrastructure on the former campus and the associated cost of repairing those structures as one of the key challenges of the SDC Specific Plan.

Respondents voiced only moderate support for the suggested methods of generating revenue that would pay for upkeep. Commercial/office uses received the highest support, with 53 percent of respondents selecting this land use for consideration in the Specific Plan, and 48 percent expressing support for market-rate housing. Nature/wine focused resort and other tourism-oriented uses received 33 percent and 30 percent support, respectively.

In the comments section, responses varied widely (Figure 2-9). About 30 percent of respondents supported housing at the site, and 20 percent of respondents specifically indicated affordable/low-income, workforce, and senior housing. About 12 percent of respondents were in favor of an educational use for the site, such as an extension of an existing college or university. Other themes in the comments included a desire for development to serve the communities nearby or any new residents on the site, with services, businesses, and other local-oriented amenities;

suggestions for the repairs to be funded through property taxes or through federal/state money; interest in sustainable farming; and artist housing/maker spaces. About 17 percent of respondents commented on tourism, with mixed preferences – some respondents (6 percent) were supportive of agritourism or eco-tourism as well as retail, whereas others (12 percent) were opposed to any new tourism uses in the area. Fifteen percent of the comments mentioned wine, with a generally negative response towards any vineyard use in the area. Many of those respondents also commented that wine and nature should not have been grouped together as options for a resort, stating that those two uses are antithetical.

The levels of support or general mix of the comments did not change significantly whether respondents had indicated that they lived nearby, or had chosen “agree” or “strongly agree” with the guiding principle “Ensure long-term economic feasibility and ability to pay for infrastructure improvements” in Question 6. Similarly, respondents who identified infrastructure as a key issue in Question 4 provided responses to Question 7 that were consistent with the overall distribution of answers and themes in the open-ended option.

Responses did vary significantly, however, depending on respondents’ age. Respondents under 35 years old were 24 percent more supportive of market rate housing than the general sample, and, overall, indicated higher levels of support for all of the proposed land uses. (Figure 2-10)

Figure 2-9: Q7 - Which of the following uses should be considered to help pay for improvements and ensure long-term economic sustainability? (Multiple Choice)




Figure 2-10: Q7 - Which of the following uses should be considered to help pay for improvements and ensure long-term economic sustainability? (Multiple Choice) (Younger demographic)




Figure 2-11: Q7 - Which of the following uses should be considered to help pay for improvements and ensure long-term economic sustainability? (Overall comments)



Question 8: How best do you think historic preservation should be balanced with the need of new development? (Check all that you agree with)

When asked about how historic preservation should be balanced with the need of new development, respondents were strongly in support of preserving buildings on campus that were eligible for the historic register (Main Building and Sonoma House; 70 percent), and preserving others when not difficult or expensive, and of preserving lawn, street trees, and other historic landscape elements (68 percent). About half of the respondents (51 percent) were in favor of adaptive reuse/preserving facades or elements of character of buildings. There was lesser support for either preserving less and re-building most of the campus from the ground up (39 percent) or preserving all buildings with historic significance even if expensive (37 percent).

Younger respondents had different preferences than the main sample. The largest majority (62 percent) of younger respondents were in favor of preserving National-Register/eligible buildings and preserving others when not difficult or expensive, 57 percent wanted to promote adaptive re-use/preserve façades or elements of historic character of buildings, 48 percent supported preserving a few buildings and otherwise designing new buildings to meet contemporary standards. There was lesser support for either preserving historic landscape elements (40 percent) or preserving all buildings with historic significance even if expensive (19 percent). (Figure 2-13)

Figure 2-12: Q8 – “How best do you think historic preservation should be balanced with the need of new development?”





Figure 2-13: Q8 – “How best do you think historic preservation should be balanced with the need of new development?” (Respondents less than 35 years old)



Question 9: Which of the following types of housing are most desirable at SDC? (Check all that apply)

Next, respondents were given the opportunity to identify which types of housing are most desirable at SDC. Several choices were offered, and respondents were free to check all boxes they deemed appropriate. Suggestions covered a wide variety of housing types including live/work units, housing for specific residents such as seniors and families, cohousing, and town homes. Most of the suggested housing types received support from over one third of the respondents.


Fifty-seven percent of respondents were in favor of live/work units; 50 percent supported housing for seniors; 49 percent supported housing for families; 46 percent supported a mix of different housing types; and 43 percent of respondents were supportive of co-housing spaces. Respondents did not voice strong support for higher density housing types, including townhomes and row houses, or three or four story multifamily housing. Two hundred ninety-two respondents answered this question, and 123 chose to leave a comment in the "other, please specify" section.

In the comment section for this question, many respondents expressed a strong desire to see that housing serve people who have been affected detrimentally by the current housing shortage, including public servants, seniors, artists, and low income persons. Of those who commented, 30 percent of respondents were supportive of affordable/low-income housing, or housing that would be affordable to service workers and seniors, and 21 percent of respondents wished to see housing specifically for developmentally disabled and/or homeless persons on the site. In this question and throughout the survey, there was a group of about eight participants who advocated consistently for tiny house villages for homeless State and County residents. Some survey respondents, however, expressed desire to see some form of limitation placed on the development allowed to occur in the area (25 percent).

Respondents less than age 35 were most supportive of a mix of housing types, with 61 percent choosing this option. Forty-eight percent supported housing for families; 38 percent supported co-housing spaces; about one third supported the remaining options; and in the comments, three of the younger respondents (13 percent) stated

in the “other, please specify” option that they did not wish to see any housing built on the SDC site.

Figure 2-14: Q9 – “Which of the following types of housing are most desirable at SDC?” (all respondents)



2.2 Next Steps

Responses from this online survey and input from other forthcoming community outreach activities, including community workshops, informal community conversations, and additional online engagement will help inform the development of project alternatives and the ultimate design of the SDC Specific Plan.

3 Appendix: Open-Ended Responses

1. What are the greatest assets of the SDC site? How would you like to see these assets incorporated into SDC's future?

1. Its ecological resources, including the wildlife corridor. These should be protected and thoughtfully linked to the developed site.
2. The campus and the wild lands. The wild lands should be maintained as such and open to the public. The campus should be developed for a community affordable to people who work in Sonoma Valley, including interim use for affordable housing.
3. The greatest assets I see that exist at the SDC site are 1) the human history of occupation story (from indigenous peoples thru developmental hospital period, and even thru the adaptive reuse planning story), 2) the mostly uninterrupted wildlife open space corridor, 3) the water resources, and 4) the potential for future recreational opportunities. Incorporating these assets into SDC's future could include selectively preserving and adaptively re-using the historic hospital and support structures, though I disagree that the historic period of significance should have been decided to end at 1949 as there are architecturally significant structures present that are post-1949 that should be saved and interpreted as well. There should also be an effective way developed to tell the human story of the site (not necessarily thru a new museum as has been suggested by others, though that could be a possibility if it is determined through a planning process to be the most efficient method for telling the historical story, or through some sort of indoor or outdoor orientation or welcome center, or tactile exterior wayside panels or digital apps. The wildlife land and water corridor through the SDC site is important to preserve and enhance, BUT ONLY while also including some recreational opportunities (such as hiking, trail biking, equestrian, and dog walking on and OFF LEASH) through some of that same corridor. The fresh water asset, as well as the recaptured and treated water resources should be fully evaluated for how to most effectively use the water asset both on-site (for potable uses as well as irrigation) while also replenishing the Sonoma Valley aquifer.

4. hiking trails, historic buildings, peaceful quiet place
5. It's beauty and wide open spaces
6. All of the grounds
7. Historical buildings & huge acreage of beautiful property
8. The historic buildings and associate landscape. Adaptive reuse is the key
9. The beautiful Sonoma Mountain and it's open space. Also surrounded by two parks; Jack London Historic Park and the Sonoma Co. Regional Park. Also SDC and it's 130 year legacy of caring for society's most vulnerable citizens. It was very first Developmental Center on the west coast and it played an intrigral part in California's history, not to mention the huge influence it had on Glen Ellen's history. The legacy of this facility must never be forgotten.
10. Site, setting and outdoor space
11. scenic open space, wildlife corridor: maintain these by clustering development and limiting extent of new buildings.
12. Parklike setting, adjacent to Jack London and Sonoma Regional
13. Space, history
14. Open Space! Housing, parks, and more housing and parks!
15. Beautiful and expansive property. Mixed use that serves the community at large.
16. Open space
17. The open land and the charming architecture of some of the buildings, especially those on Arnold Drive. I would like to see all of the undeveloped land be preserved with some clean-up of old infrastructure. The orchards and other farmland could, in my fondest dreams, be leased out to provide

food. Conversations around me often mention how nice the campus would be for a college, using those lovely old buildings.

18. It's greatest assets are its historic building stock and natural environment
19. water shed and groundwater recharge, nature, existing building,
20. Open space. Avoid high density housing
21. The land held in trust. Improvements- buildings,etc held as a leasehold
22. Much land. Use it for the county's homeless: build tiny home villages, each with 30-60 people. The people who live there should have a major say in how they operate their village. No feeling that they are prisoners in lock-down. Also build low income housing--very low income.
23. The former SDC property is a huge slice of paradise with abundant plants and animal life, varied terrain, and priceless water resources. All of the remaining SDC property needs to be kept in the public domain forever along with a commitment to serving the needs of the developmentally disabled on this site as well. Let's make this law! While we will need to create other uses for the SDC property, perhaps following the example of the transformation of the Presidio in San Francisco, a commitment to both the land and carving out ways to serve the developmentally disabled in Northern California needs to be included in perpetuity.
24. Beauty, design, acessibility, plan and layout of the campus.
25. The wild uplands must be preserved as open space; if at all possible some of the oldest building should be preserved. Recognizing the need for housing don't forget attendant traffic; could some of the dorm like building be sold to a nonprofit to rent out as artists' studios?
26. The open space for all to use should stay open - for humans and as an important corridor for animals to move between Sonoma Mountains and the Mayacamas. It is also sparsely populated, which is a key issues with local traffic on Arnold Drive. .It should be thematically connected to Glen

Ellen and be walkable to the village. Its beauty needs to stay linked to Glen Ellen area.

27. Asset: quiet beautiful location. The feel of the space should remain the same even if parts are renewed.
28. Location, open space and history. Preserve the open space and make it to the public. Memorialize the history.
29. Physical Beauty of the site; The close proximity to nature, the wide diversity of habitat and natural resources. This is the perfect site for a college that has sustainability and the environment as its focus. A "Think/experiment Tank" if you will to help us get creative minds wrapped around the problems people have created over the past 150 years.
30. The open spaces, beautiful hiking trails, unspoiled mountainside, beautiful lakes, opportunity for affordable housing in Glen Ellen. The legacy of care and agricultural sustainability this campus has represented for generations.
31. The natural resources on the site and critical wildlife corridor.
32. The collection of historic buildings
33. There are two: 1) The 700 acres of wildlands that must be preserved as public parks and wildlife corridor 2) The 200 acre campus that can be converted to affordable housing and clean agricultural and business uses.
34. Open space could be made into park, some buildings could be converted into affordable housing, shops, artist workspace, office space, cafes, museum. Scenic setting as aesthetic backdrop.
35. Open space, history, historic buildings, landscape...would really hate to see housing forced on Glen Ellen as it can only absorb so much traffic on its roads, bridges, etc.
36. open space, ready housing.

37. The wildlife corridor is vital to our valley's ongoing ecology and must be retained "open." The campus offers a unique potential for both statewide/national/global sustainability leadership including onsite housing that is affordable for its new employees.
38. The buildings and land. These buildings are beautiful and rare and should be preserved to help also preserve Sonoma's heritage.
39. The grounds and open land are the greatest assets of the SDC site. It provides essential space for wild life, and allows us to step away from our busy lives to reconnect with nature. I would like to see the paths and the open space maintained. The infrastructure that already exists should not be expanded.
40. The open space is the greatest asset. I would like to see the existing buildings utilized for a combination of housing, non-profits, perhaps a small boutique hotel. How about moving Dunbar School onto the SDC site? Easier bus access, more foot traffic to the school.
41. The infrastructure and roads are usable if maintained. Some of the buildings could be updated at far less cost than new construction.
42. this is a relatively self-contained, calm and beautiful space that should be retained as a site for housing people with disabilities
43. Space and housing for the homeless, College Satellite campus, Beer and Wine innovators, commercial and residential parcels, Sell off parcels, no more than one per customer, make it like the presidio, only with some homeless housing in one of the buildings. Library,
44. Wildlife corridors, backcountry & location
45. Amount of acreage and landscape.
46. Assets are its peaceful location, housing historic building
47. The size of the property, 1,670 acres, is its major asset. Also, the original building, structure, and surrounding vegetation are very attractive assets.

These can be put to good use to provide affordable housing for the low income people and the unsheltered.

48. Walking areas; the lovely natural, unhurried environment; preservation of the important historical landmark buildings such as the one shown above!
49. the size of the property, the location, the view, easy acces. Leave open space and natural beauty.
50. Beauty of the site, historic buildings, open space for housing, youth needs, recreation
51. The hundreds of acres of open space are not only gorgeous they must be preserved as open space. As I understand the situation from various parties at a couple meetings, the buildings/campus is in dire need of the maintenance that has been deferred. If any of that is to be saved I think the first order of business would be determining which are beyond rescue and demo those ASAP. Then create a list in order of which units need the most work/money to make usable. After such a determination further assessment to find suitable applications for each and the cost/benefit. But back to my first point... what can we do to preserve the maximum acre of open lands?
52. Beauty, space for hiking, - I would like to see this turned into a dynamic elderly living facility and low-income housing area
53. Beautiful open land above the main center at Eldridge - should be preserved as an open space park for public use.
54. It seems to me that the amount of space would allow a mix of living developments
55. The surrounding undeveloped area is a great asset that should be retained as open space and become part of the parks division. The developed area should used for potential commercial use to bring jobs to the area. Perhaps even converting some for residential.

56. Creek access with 300 foot wide swath of protected area and public access to a few places along the creek (only 2 places in valley give vague access--maxwell park & another small park in the springs.
57. the beautiful, park-like setting
58. The open space and trails, interesting architecture, and gathering spaces: I think it's an excellent idea to link SDC's trails to Jack London. A shuttle (non-fossil fuel) even if just on weekends would be a fun way to make one-way hiking possible. I'd like to see some of the homes preserved, maybe rented to non-profits or used for guest artist housing. Would some of the housing be suitable for seasonal agricultural workers? I'd like to see some community spaces too, room for workshops, yoga classes, meetings. Some buildings look large enough to be maker spaces. There should be a museum some where to honor past residents and show how SDC fit into the greater community. Sure would like to see the emphasis be on community and education, social issues--not high-end housing.
59. Great variety of housing alternatives in which many nonprofits could offer housing for low income people and even for the homeless that could generate revenue for the State.
60. The beautiful property should be retained for public recreation.
61. Some of the older buildings have unique historical and architectural value. It would be nice to upgrade and utilize these structures for the benefit of the local community and our visitors. Some potential ideas: a Jack London museum + library, a natural history museum which also houses a wildlife rescue/rehab facility and/or a small steelhead and salmon hatchery
62. Keep the main building as a museum with the driveway leading to it. Also keep the greens on either side of the drive and the beautiful trees. Much of the area behind the main building to be kept as greenspace. On the opposite side of the road where the little houses are could be used for housing affordable housing.

63. Open lands, forest. All those buildings! Keep the undeveloped areas the same...no new building. Rehab the buildings for college classes, small businesses and affordable housing.
64. Some part of it -- 5 acres, at least, should be turned over to non-profits to develop, build, and maintain small villages of 40 mini-houses per acre with on site services for the homeless clients. I represent a new non-profit that is raising private (non gov) investment to produce such villages.
65. Land and buildings
66. Spacing and housing for those who are highest in need, with the support of a welcoming community.
67. The historical buildings, the untouched land and wildlife corridors, the history of those who lived and worked there and called it home. The land and building need to be protected and preserved and the team guiding this process needs to have a significant number of former employees on it. These are the people who knew and loved and cared for the people who called this place home. It's essential they are included.
68. The land which I'd like to see be used for solutions for homeless and low income people.
69. Its too beautiful
70. Space between buildings, trees, historic registered buildings
71. I would love it to be preserved as a open space by the land trust !!!!!
72. Large property, history of service to vulnerable community members, rural setting
73. Enviromental
74. This is a beautiful place where people who were unable to care for themselves had a home. I would like to see it returned to a place where

indigent, veterans, persons with addictions and other mental illnesses can be treated and respectfully cared for.

75. The greatest asset is the SDC location in Sonoma Valley, nestled with Sonoma Mountain and Glen Ellen. The rural aspects must be maintained.
76. location and buildings
77. The hiking trails, and access to the reservoirs has been incredibly important throughout my life. They must be protected.
78. The grounds and space to care for clients
79. Open land, homes or business sit.
80. Outdoor space for the public, possible training / learning site
81. Multi use Buildings, Beauty, nature in the heart of the valley
82. Existing places to sleep
83. The infrastructure is already there for further development with open spaces already incorporated and mapped into the design
84. green space
85. The history! The fact that it was self sufficient in the past with farming, etc everything needed.
86. Protect and Preserve Majority of Open Space Assets
87. The land and the trails in the hills leading into Jack London are it's greatest assets. I feel like using it for a nature center or for use as limited housing with facilities that can be used by persons with disabilities would be a great way to save the legacy and history of the place.
88. The open spaces and preserves.

89. SDC is a site where individuals with disabilities can live safely, yet still access things in the county such as schools, adult programs, employment opportunities and be close to their family.
90. Restoring of architecture
91. The asset of the space is its self containment and size, as well as its geographical placement.
92. Open space with varied use buildings to serve individuals with exceptional needs
93. Its open spaces, the admin building, salvageable existing buildings. Should be dedicated to community uses: history, community center, NGO offices
94. It's ability to house individuals with a variety of needs.
95. It is a large, beautiful campus located near a regional park.
96. Open space, history of being a self sustaining village
97. The enormous expanse of undeveloped green space. Roads providing access to that green space. Some of the structures may be of use to the community as low income or indigent housing, as public meeting halls, or office space for positive community programs. There may be structures suitable for community health clinics.
98. Natural beauty that will be balm to anyone, particularly to people who are diminished, who have been abused, who need recovery. Many buildings consigned to the dust-heap of history by people without imagination, could be rebuilt by able men and women lacking jobs, by homeless or incarcerated men and women who would respond to the challenge, who would build important and useful skills, and contribute to sheltering residents and services we now lack. We would do well to keep in mind that all governments will be hard-pressed to fund any construction/services because of financial and infrastructure debt and voters' unwillingness to pay higher taxes. Saving buildings, environmentally appropriate, using experienced supervisors and willing learners, will be a gift. However, that

possibility is slim because people with their hands on the leavers of power have little imagination, narrow vision, and are excited by the promise of a blank-slate.

99. History of caring for our neighbors. Healing beauty of nature. Local cultural identity and meaning.
100. State owned land. Housing (market rate and affordable) is the largest threat facing Sonoma County and the state. Build housing.
101. The SDC site presents a real opportunity for preserving important historical buildings while supporting business growth, affordable housing, and sustainable development.
102. I would like to see open space open to the public to enjoy. It is a vital wildlife corridor and habitat. People and wildlife alike need protected open space.
103. The large scope and beautifully landscaped environment. To maintain and sustain the grounds, enhancing with improvements.
104. The natural beauty, coupled with the potential of the developed land.
105. trails, historical
106. The architecture. The buildings just need to be modernized then maintained.
107. I'd like to see Camp Via reinstated as a much needed camp for people with Intellectual Disabilities, like my own daughter. I have to send my child 3 hours away, as we have nothing near us.
108. The grounds are vast and hold history and beauty. Welcome students to come and visit and walk and learn. I'd love to see a program that collaborates with schools

109. The undeveloped natural areas on both sides of Arnold Drive. The western lands should be incorporated in Jack London Park. The eastern lands should be incorporated in the Regional Park.
110. Housing infrastructure, space away from neighboring homes
111. Environment (trees, shrubs, open ground) Buildings with unique architecture, open concept of housind.
112. We should respect that these assets were intended to serve people with developmental disabilities.
113. Housing that is affordable for people who work in Sonoma Valley. I envision a diverse community in a neighborhood with lots of character. I know that renovation might be financially unfeasible, but the buildings as they are could be subdivided into so many unique apartments and single family homes.
114. The mountain and the watershed. Continue to allow the public to access trails and enjoy beautiful grounds.
115. Open Space - Transitioned to JLSHP and SVRP; Architecturally Interesting and open pasture-like campus - Retain some, demolish others
116. 1. Wild lands and animal habitat. 2. Significant architecture. Which should not be lost.
117. Existing infrastructure , campus configuration and feel.
118. The land
119. Infrastructure, location, historical use
120. It's open space and the flow of wildlife, maintain or expand it. Access by the community not limited to a select few. Existing buildings to refurbish or derelict buildings on sites that can be rebuilt. Relationship to Sonoma, Sonoma County and the larger Bay Area. Mature and established urban/suburban vegetation. A potential funding source to support the

people who once needed its services to boost anemic resources for people with disabilities.

121. It is beautiful
122. Natural assets, Historic buildings, location in the valley
123. Open space, quaint old buildings. Restore the old buildings for housing and services. Keep all of the open space for recreation.
124. Potential for a vibrant community adjacent pristine and ecologically important lands and waters.
125. The historic buildings and beautiful architecture. I would like to see these structures be preserved and rehabilitated to maintain the historic features for use by future generations to come.
126. Facilities, grounds
127. The History
128. Historical buildings and grounds, open spaces, trails, a wide range of usable buildings
129. the land is incredible. sdc should be a park.
130. the creek and wildlife corridor are critical to wildlife and water resources in Sonoma Valley
131. Visually beautiful historically maintained
132. Natural beauty, along with a large amount of room to develop housing and mixed use without ruining the beauty.
133. The land. This is a beautiful site home to many birds and animals. I would like to see much of the trees and green space retained for public use.
134. It is a beautiful and lightly developed space in Sonoma Valley that can expand the quality of life for all. I would like the specific plan to provide for

housing and jobs that keep this uncrowded character while providing self supporting revenues

135. the large size of the site, the beautiful trees
136. The open space and some of the historic buildings.
137. History, nature. As much preservation as possible
138. open space - keep it accessible to hikers, biker?, horseback riders, wild animals.
139. The grounds are amazing. I hope the development keeps some open space to enjoy the beautiful grounds.
140. Open space
141. Housing, to use for senior housing
142. Public open space. Access by the public to the open space.
143. open space
144. Open space, historic buildings
145. The Open Space/Wildlife Corridor/Historic Buildings/Proximity to Jack London State Park
146. scenic beauty, open space/existing building density, wildlife corridor, historic significance, architecture character, original intent of service to the community and desire to continue that theme, rural/small town feel surrounding SDC, beauty/views,
147. historical buildings in the south east area
148. All of the open space, wildlife and natural resources.
149. The greatest assets of the SDC site are the vast undeveloped land that surrounds and is the SDC property. It is a huge buffer to development and a vital interface with wildland

150. The natural beauty of the location. Would like to see nature incorporated into any future building
151. The open space and natural landscape is the greatest asset and should be preserved for future enjoyment.
152. The hiking trails. Please keep them open.
153. It's beauty and history and low building density should be preserved
154. The SDC's open space and agricultural focus (farm, horse facilities, nursery, fruit trees, water systems) should be preserved and continue to benefit the community.
155. Nature & wilderness (also wilderness corridor). These should be prioritized. This also is a historical site that deserves respect. The combination makes for a place of healing.
156. Mixture of developed and undeveloped grounds. Natural beauty. Space. Keep the undeveloped grounds undeveloped. Concentrate development on what's already developed.
157. Wildlife corridor, open space, peace and tranquility, water on site, and size of property.
158. The open space and access to Wildlands - the habitat corridor and creek - it would be beneficial to maintain as much open space as possible
159. Open space. I would like to keep it that way.
160. I love the green belt and hiking, biking and horseback trails, and how they connect to Jack London Park. I also love driving through the green, expansive grounds with the beautiful lawns and trees, and hope they are preserved!
161. Wild lands, good access to Sonoma Creek (rare in Valley), fertile bottomlands for small farms, potential for fine new affordable housing & community

162. A large site useful for multiple use and a planned leasehold community
163. Green space/nature and the historical buildings. Keep open natural lands and as many retrofitted buildings as possible.
164. The natural environment.
165. Open space to the west, annexed to Jack London State Park, limit access to State Park entrance and not through SDC, also accessible to adjacent properties due to historically allowed. Open space to the east, annexed to Sonoma Valley Regional Park
166. The park-like setting and the cottages and the inviting ballpark in the front. The design of a village with access to open land.
167. historic location of scientific and social significance
168. It's access to open space I'd like to see that remain as part of the future plan.
169. Open Space, Wildlife Corridor, Historical Significance, Tradition of Care. Incorporating these assets will require an intensive planning process. But in a nutshell--develop only the core campus at a scale in harmony with surrounding lands and communities. Some business and employment opportunities and the opportunity to live and work at the site
170. All the trails for hiking and mountain biking. I'd like to see that maintained and expanded. I'd like the trail system, which is currently tied into Jack London State Park, expanded and officially tied into North Sonoma Mountain regional park
171. The open space and the main building. Open space to be incorporated into Jack London and Sonoma Valley Parks. Building renovated and small hotel would be ideal
172. The open space, nature, the fact that it's so remote and untouched in many ways.

173. The amazing architecture and grounds
174. Green Space and Recreation i.e. links to Jack London and Regional Park
175. It is stunningly beautiful. Please maintain the character and open, gracious look to this historic property.
176. Wide streets and sidewalks. Safe walking/hiking. Designate the road and trails up onto the hill as open space.
177. Nature!
178. Open space to West and East of main campus; Historic main building; Interesting architecture of many campus buildings; low-density of campus area
179. Maintaining open space and bucolic campus like feel
180. Assets: Open Space and physical layout. Preserve open space. Use structures for community activities: Farmers market, swimming pool, sports/rec area, parks, limited housing due to arnold being only road in/out at his point.
181. Nature, Historical value
182. That there is a formerly developed area to work with.
183. It's history and the beauty of the site.
184. Open space on Sonoma Mountain to be kept open and available to public
185. Open space. Hiking areas
186. The location holding both natural areas + developed sites.
187. The natural beauty and ecological significance, and the cultural legacy of caregiving
188. Open space, retention of historical buildings
189. open space, ecology,

190. Beautiful location. A park for hiking.
191. The open space, both the less disturbed lands west of the campus but also the more disturbed farm lands east of the campus.
192. Open space, access to Sonoma Mountain, wildlife corridor
193. the incredible open space; beautiful buildings
194. The beautiful open spaces and trails. I'd like for them to be accessible to the local community for hiking, biking, horseback riding and walking.
195. Open space and very valuable watershed for Sonoma Valley residents; wildlife habitat and corridor linkages in Sonoma Valley, added biodiversity & habitat value to Jack London SP; maintain pre Covid-19 levels of use; avoid further development in hills; consider Camp Vienu (spp) for future youth camping / outdoor facility
196. Open Space, Land that has been farmed should be used to extend a valley coop ag development
197. The land is special - it is beautiful, peaceful, and full of wildlife. Some of the buildings on the property (e.g., the administration building) have lovely architecture and historic significance. Also, the SDC has been home to many patients over the years, and I think that history needs to be honored in some way. I love how close the SDC is to Jack London State Park and the Regional Park. I would love to see the SDC site incorporated into a larger connected park (or something like what was done with the Presidio) with some historic sites/buildings being preserved.
198. The open space of the property is a prized gift to have in Sonoma County and should be conserved and incorporated into other surrounding open spaces (i.e., Sonoma Valley Regional Park, Jack London) not just for residents but also for wildlife and the ecosystem as a whole. This is an opportunity to take care of the land instead of always taking from the land. In addition, the intention of this property was to serve Californians, and that intention should be honored. The Administration Building is historic and should be

preserved as part of the property's legacy and an acknowledgment of the value of serving those in need who lived and died there. This is our opportunity to preserve a historic site like the Presidio in San Francisco.

199. there's buildings for the homeless to be evaluated
200. Still learning about the history of Jack London "Beauty Ranch" and his history and influence on not only SCD but also Glen Ellen, SCD, and Eldridge.
201. Historical and environmental resources are paramount. Every effort should be made to retain as much as possible, including more recent buildings, like the cool Nelson Treatment Center. Little details are part of the story, down to the wonderful homemade swings. The scale of the place, partnered with the mature landscape and surrounding environment create its immense charm.
202. Beautiful land and architecture
203. The infrastructure and open space
204. Open space, campus setting
205. Natural setting. Open space. Community farm with animals. ecology tours.
206. Natural and historical landscapes in the heart of the Sonoma Valley. A place for humans, wildlife and plants to flourish.
207. Where are you taking comments about this process?
208. Open space, wildlife corridors, affordable eco-village housing
209. Precious undeveloped (and developed) natural land.
210. Geographic location and natural setting.
211. The open spaces and the community connections are SDC's greatest assets. Both need to be woven into future redevelopment of the campus, with the open spaces transferred to the appropriate park entity as soon as possible.

- 212. Open space, which should be preserved as vital habitat.
- 213. Natural ecology
- 214. Open space, wildlife corridor, walkability, peace and quiet. I would like to keep them in the future.
- 215. The wildlife corridor. Potential live-work spaces for artists/creatives
- 216. its siting within the Valley and its weather patterns are advantageous for a strong agricultural focus
- 217. Esplanade entry mountain view. North side buildings transform to overnight Lodge with large verandas appealing to for hikers, bicycles and equestrians. South side performing arts and community classrooms
- 218. its history and culture of compassionate care which has been a significant influence on the north Sonoma Valley neighborhoods
- 219. The site's greatest assets are its open space and natural resources. I would like the vast majority of the site to be open to public use for recreation.
- 220. Its open space and access to additional open space. Some buildings of iconic character (while others are tear-downs)
- 221. original brick buildings and open space, ideally a mix of museum and educational opportunities modeled on the SF Presidio, as well as an emergency resource in times of evacuations, with an emphasis on respect for people and nature
- 222. Open space
- 223. Open space/trees/natural beauty/wildlife. The future development should be mindful and respectful of the open space and nature. Do not turn this into "anywhere USA". This property is a rare gem and must be respected as such.
- 224. Preserving the open space for wildlife and hiking.

225. It's natural beauty and benefit to wildlife is its greatest asset. I would like to see future development mostly be limited to the existing area of existing buildings, preserving as much of the natural beauty as possible.
226. land, water and infrastructure
227. Combined open space and built land. Preserve the large oaks and habitat for wildlife while infilling some areas.
228. The amount of land/property plus the current infrastructure (roads, fields, building-related services such as electrical, gas, sewage, etc.)
229. Previous use as a service site for the disabled, pre-existing use should be a guide for the future. The open space and adjoining Regional and State parks. The lay-out of buildings and spacing will allow for multi-use of the parcel.
230. Natural setting and historical buildings-remodel/refurbish and reuse existing buildings as much as it is economically possible; preserve trees and all other natural features as much as possible; don't add lots of paving and disturb natural run-off
231. Historic buildings, us of residential buildings, trees,
232. Open space and access for local community and all. Many of the smaller buildings have significant architectural qualities that define the "small town" atmosphere and should be retained in some capacity. There are also larger buildings that are architecturally and historically significant and should be saved.
233. Open space, history, creeks - do not leave building to rot. Use them for community events
234. Preserve nature, proximity to Jack London is an asset
235. Multiple assets. The property itself provides A wildlife corridor, which needs to remain. The infrastructure of roads, and services of a small town are indispensable for any future business or housing opportunities. MOST of

all, i want to see this property remain for Local people to use and learn from . !!!!! The 2 dam/ reservoirs on site are also a bonus. Water is everything . I would love for this land to remain open for hiking , biking, horses and learning about a local ecosystem. Eldridge is the heart of the North Valley. We should raise organic food in the eastern meadows, focusing business and housing closer in the "village".

- 236. The historically significant buildings and parts of the campus. I would like to see them preserved, but also used for appropriate applications.
- 237. The SDC's greatest asset is the open space, which must be preserved and open to the public. As redevelopment takes place on the old campus, vistas must be preserved as well as open fields, which have a calming effect as one enters the campus from either north or south on Arnold Dr.
- 238. Keep open areas between buildings, keep mature landscaping, keep charm of the old buildings.
- 239. Open space, natural habitat for birds, wildlife
- 240. Beautiful location, housing and office space, hiking trails/outdoor recreation. Some exciting potential uses could be a community college campus, elder/low income housing, etc.
- 241. The beautiful open space, trails, and views. Keep trails open and make a park over a great deal of it
- 242. The open space is the greatest asset and should be maintained with redevelopment of the core campus.
- 243. Open space, some infrastructure, and a location close to a highway.
- 244. Open Space, low-impact recreational opportunities, at upper elevations. Flat acreage valuable for mixed use, some involving income.
- 245. I love that it attracts the animals and maintains the country feel
- 246. open space, historic buildings, history, housing

247. The beautiful land is the greatest asset. Much of it is undeveloped and provides space for wildlife and humans to enjoy the outdoors. Keep the open space please!!
248. The Greatest assets of the property are the undeveloped uplands which are a pristine natural area - they should be preserved for hiking and wildlife in perpetuity.
249. The walking trails and campus for walking
250. It's location is a locus for many hiking/walking activities.
251. location, open space/iconic buildings
252. main building and the wonderful grounds/open space
253. The natural beauty of the area
254. Open space for public utilization in a variety of manners. Infrastructure that can be updated and transformed into community assets
255. The upper wilder lands should remain as wild as possible with the addition of trails.
256. I would like to see SDC become a model rural community with a mixture of houses blended together, gardens, a farm, some small shops, a meeting place for events and meals, and some nondenominational sacred space.
257. open space public access. residential housing for low-income and homeless
258. The beautiful land, historic buildings, it's history and recognition of the clients and staff who lived and worked @ SDC.
259. The unspoiled nature, open space and recreational opportunities. Protect these, and keep them in the public domaine.
260. I would love to see the beautiful older buildings and homes saved, refurbished and incorporated into future plans

261. Lots of open land. Land open to public recreation.
262. The greatest assets are the open forests and parts of sonoma mountain that are the last piece of the mountain not owned and privatized by wealthy land owners. I hope the SDC's future keeps the land open for public use and the undeveloped parts stay undeveloped.
263. It's beautiful, park-like setting. I would love to see it become part of the Regional Park or of Jack London Park.
264. Beautiful campus- lovely old growth trees- wildlife corridor
265. Watershed,lakes,natural environment,wildlife. They should all be protected.
266. Open Space and a beautiful location
267. The open green space...hiking trails.
268. Access to nature, walking areas. Keep it open to the public for recreation, temporary housing (maybe for women's shelter or another beneficial organization)
269. Location aesthetics
270. The land
271. The locale and its proximity to Sonoma Mountain (watershed and sacred to local tribes) should be open to some measure of public access.
272. a mix of open space, wildlife corridors and potential residential devilmnt for all ages. A Danish model.
273. To me the biggest asset is the expanse of land, undeveloped space, and access to nature coupled with existing utilities. Beyond the main building, I don't know that the remaining building are architecturally interesting or particularly well-built.
274. The hiking trails. Keep them open, wild and dog friendly.

275. Open space, wild life corridor and some beautiful (at least from the outside) buildings
276. Access and adjacent to open space and other parks
277. wildlands and scenic location
278. The hiking trails and the many buildings!
279. LARGE ACREAGE AND LOTS OF GREEN SPACE
280. Open space must be protected and added to parks. Period.
281. Location, some existing infrastructure, site variability; balance recreation/resource management with development.
282. Historic structures and a large campus area with opportunities for infill development that provides for broader community needs, such as employment, housing, and amenities. Ecological value is also extremely high. Part 2: Long term open space access secured and context-sensitive but bold development of the site.
283. natural beauty-nature reserve with hiking options, possible orchards/vineyards, learning site, e.g. SRJC extension
284. The open space. I would like to maintain the open space and have it open to the public while developing the campus in a way that provides resources for the community.
285. location. History. Self-contained community. Housing for special needs. Beauty. All should carry through

2. What are some of the key issues facing the SDC site?

1. Economic viability. Community compatibility. Fragility of the ecological resources.

2. Keeping both the woodlands and the campus out of the hands of for-profit resort developers . . . and giving the board of supervisors the backbone to convert the campus to an affordable, sustainable community.
3. How to best adaptively re-use the historic structures and which ones to remove, SDC's failing infrastructure, and Sonoma's strong advocacy groups who will each try to press their missions, often at the expense of other's desires. Sonoma Valley's need for more low and middle income housing is sure to affect the SDC. And funding many of the proposed alternative uses is surely to be a key issue as well.
4. potential overdevelopment,
5. Being over utilized and not keeping site of its limitations de to traffic
6. the infrastructure and determining what buildings can be saved
7. Preservation, updating old buildings to allow new use
8. Ownership of the property itself and a local government that may not have a shared vision and understanding of that historic preservation and economic redevelopment can occur at the same time.
9. To me when you say "issues' it immediately implies problems. This piece of property has so many wonderful resources going for it that, the main issue I see is the struggle between redevelopment (housing; business oportunities; growth) and those who wish to retain the rural feel and open space, as well as historic preservation of parts of the original campus
10. Repair and maintenance
11. How to handle traffic in and out; how to pay for improvements, e.g. buildings, water and sewer systems, other infrastructure; how to make new activities economically self sufficient yet affordable. E.g. provide housing but not McMansions, yet provide economic incentives for sensitive development
12. Many competing visions. having enough money to maintain the site.

13. Lack of finding, aged infrastructure, aging buildings
14. Infrastructure, NIMBY's
15. Ingress/Egress. Environmental issues.
16. Buildings on the east side of Arnold Drive are mostly less worth preserving, giving a convenient reason to make way for affordable housing.
17. Balancing competing interests
18. physical plant outdated, possible water pollution
19. Protecting the wildlife corridor, risk of overcrowding and destroying the landscape and safe, peaceful, environment that honors the history of the site.
20. Seismic upgrade costs may preclude use of the nonhistoric buildings
21. Sources of money to build and for upkeep.
22. The key issues facing the SDC site will initially revolve around funding costs for transforming the site and choosing uses that will generate funding for the site's use in perpetuity.
23. Cost of repair to infrastructure and preservation of buildings.
24. I've seen the study as to costs to bring the existing built environment up to code.
25. Balancing the need for affordable, smart, sustainably designed housing while not overwhelming the rural character of the area. Traffic for new housing- where will it go? Hwy 12 is already clogged heading into Santa Rosa several hours in the morning and in the afternoon each week day.
26. Key issues: traffic increases and possible negative impact on surrounding communities
27. Aging infrastructure, traffic generated by development.

28. The upkeep of the existing buildings (Code ? Earthquake retro fits?
Asbestos clean up ? etc)
29. Financing the removal of problematic buildings that are unusable in the
future. Assuring the open spaces remain unspoiled.
30. development and concentration of use
31. Funding for maintenance of buildings, compatible uses which will not effect
the integrity of the buildings
32. Funds to convert the existing buildings and bring them up to code for
housing and business purposes. Pressure to divide that valuable land into
estate parcels, which must be prevented.
33. Need for appropriate balance between multiple uses, not contributing to
traffic, over-tourism.
34. Hoping it does not become a tourist venue. Hoping it does not create more
traffic and population than the Glen Ellen VILLAGE can absorb
35. lack of available public transportation, food resources, and clear agreement
on its future use.
36. Use it for public purposes in recognition of its history...do not give it to a
private corporation for any of its preferred actions.
37. Loss of history. Expansion. Overuse.
38. Traffic access. I have concerns about Arnold Drive being the only accessible
traffic route, particularly during fire season.
39. the open space should be preserved. As a public asset the process must be
transparent.
40. Buildings no longer up to code, Hazard waste, inequity in access
41. Dilapidated buildings & infrastructure

42. Whether the land will be used to improve the lives of the wealthy vs creating housing and jobs for low income people.
43. Buildings in need of repair
44. The building is old and need extensive and costly upgrading. Also, I understand that it was damaged in the 2017 fire.
45. Sustainability.....who and what will provide funding for its upkeep/ grounds maintenance?
46. Disrepair of buildings
47. Clearly there is the cost of repairing/maintaining the structures and as I understand it the infrastructure for heating/cooling is centralized. Can any of the buildings be put to use as they are without maintain the heating plant? The demand will be great and perhaps overwhelming, for different entries to get a foothold. This must be managed vigorously to make a comprehensive coordinated plan prior to letting anything go.
48. old and unhealthy buildings. Who will care for the vast acres of land?
49. Old, out of code, crumbling buildings. These should be demolished and removed. No money should be wasted on preservation.
50. Hard to say. Renovation of existing buildings is one.
51. The expense of maintaining very old buildings. Who will pay for it and how will it be done to retain the history and architecture of the location
52. we've discussed these for 5+ years! housing, openspace/wildlife corridor protection, lighting, clustering human use, rentable bottomland/farmland near the old animal place, bike trail from 12, NO ROAD access from 12
53. decay of the structures
54. How to make it financially viable. How to restore/preserve buildings in a cost-effective way.

55. Housing code issues vary considerably.
56. development into housing . This will destroy the property, and habitat areas for wildlife. It also would mean increased traffic on already congested roads.
57. Deferred maintenance of a number of buildings, relatively poor traffic flow, overuse of irrigation
58. The age of the buildings. Demands to use the undeveloped areas.
59. A balance between preserving the natural beauty with allowing some experimenting with small villages of permanent housing for the vastly underserved populations in Sonoma, including the homeless.
60. Making everyone happy/lack of affordable housing
61. Budgeting. There is not enough money placed into education and housing and therefore a large program is hard to build, staff, and maintain.
62. Upkeep and preservation and prevention of development for tourism and real estate.
63. Water and deferred maintenance.
64. It lies there waiting for use to utilize expediently
65. Age, access to and from is limited which means widening of other roads to/from key access areas (hwy 12)
66. It needs to be preserved as open space
67. Money, competing desires, lack of will to help the most vulnerable
68. Greed
69. Greedy people who don't consider the lives of unfortunate people deserving of such a beautiful property.
70. The key issue facing this site is over-development.

71. it's not being used to its potential
72. It need maintance and care.
73. Cost of updating
74. Updates
75. Rehabilitation of buildings and physical plant. Development of nature trail
76. Community involvement in further plan
77. maintenance costs
78. Dilapidated buildings and heating/cooling systems, security~ it's an attractant for homeless and anyone wanting to cause trouble/vandalize
79. Affordable Housing via Eco-Village Concept
80. The buildings are old and falling apart. Clearing those would be a major task.
81. I'm worried that the land will be sold to the private sector and be used for profit (winery, resort etc.)
82. Staffing and resources
83. Decaying infrastructure
84. I would say that the key issue is development and the direction in which it will take.
85. Should NOT be used for profit -- individuals with exceptional needs continue to require varied services that are incredibly difficult to get in the community
86. transferring open spaces to appropriate agencies; salvage of useful buldings; demolition, removal, and repair of buildings and lands they are on; long term management

87. Current buildings are outdated/run down
88. The buildings were allowed to fall into disrepair.
89. cost of infrastructure, traffic, out of town visitors, protecting wildlife
90. Preserving the open space from profiteers who want to commodify it and extract profit by peddling it for elite housing.
91. Towering above all others is lack of vision, absence of trust in men and women's abilities to do what was not thought possible, paucity of curiosity. The Sonoma Valley NIMBY will rise, well-financed and vicious if anything utilitarian is proposed.
92. Distance from city centers
93. Maintaining historical buildings while retaining affordable housing.
94. Pressure from developers. Cost of maintenance and restoration of buildings
95. That it remain publicly owned, rather than given away to private developers.
96. Its history is not very politically correct
97. The buildings and how outdated they are and how much money it would take to make the grounds useable
98. How to develop it so it is financially self-sufficient.
99. Transportation, aged buildings
100. maintenance of environment, purposeful use of resources
101. This site was intended to serve people with developmental disabilities. No provisions were made for adults with developmental disabilities now that the State has dismantled these centers.
102. The balance between housing and employment. Education facilities are a popular idea that I do not exactly not support, but housing is the greatest

- need. Ideally both housing and secondary to that non-hospitality employment opportunities are provided on the site.
103. Money needed to retrofit all of the buildings for use by the community. Vocational schools, health centers, shelters, affordable housing.
 104. What to do with the campus that retains character and is sympathetic to this area of Sonoma Valley
 105. How to avoid losing its history. Environmental losses. Population increases.
 106. Age of the infrastructure, location.
 107. How to balance out the open space with potential for future development
 108. Expense of building retrofitting, old infrastructure, lack of economic value in some of the plans
 109. Greed and control by single organization.
 110. Maintenance
 111. I'm afraid of the high-risk of insensitive development. Crude, cheap quality housing, insensitive to the natural surroundings. Increased vehicle traffic with little effort to encourage more active transportation.
 112. It needs a lot of repair.
 113. Limiting factors include need for infrastructure upgrades, wildfire risk, traffic, local opposition to development.
 114. Cost of repairs, community compatibility, saving buildings before they are lost for good
 115. Underutilized, waste of space. Preservation vs revisioning. Infrastructure.
 116. Wildlife Preservation. Land use. Historical Preservation
 117. transitioning to a usable, beautiful, money neutral place

118. hopefully it will become full of houses or turned into a vineyard
119. erosion around the creek, aging storm water infrastructure
120. Unsure
121. Infrastructure — water, power, and WiFi/Internet. The location is not convenient to employment in Santa Rosa or Petaluma. One two-lane road access. And the community is resistant to development.
122. Many of the buildings are becoming dilapidated.
123. Aged infrastructure that needs modern day sustainable energy and hvac throughout the campus.
124. Striking a balance between disparate community needs.
125. Safety and need to act quickly to prevent loss of valuable structures
126. making sure it doesn't become too congested with traffic
127. Arnold Drive is a 2-lane road. It is a semi-rural setting so nothing too dense.
128. Economics. Age of buildings
129. infrastructure repair
130. Impact on the surrounding communities
131. congestion
132. Disrepair
133. TRAFFIC. Very limited access from Arnold Drive and Highway 12. This is the key issue for any further development and change in land use.
134. potential infrastructure limitations; i.e. water, roads, sewer. potential negative impacts on sonoma creek wildlife and water quality. condition of existing buildings,

135. development in balance with area
136. Removal and cleanup of all the toxins that are found throughout the core buildings such as asbestos, lead etc.
137. Development that is in line with historical use. There is a need to keep the rural, calm, quiet, wild tone for this property and this project.
138. Cost to save historic buildings. Community not wanting change
139. Obsolete and deteriorating infrastructure; environmental and hazardous material abatement.
140. Potential for overcrowding, traffic
141. Protecting the land so that it benefits all residents.
142. Humans who only see profit at the cost of destroying nature and wildlife.
143. Failing infrastructure and structures. Limited access. Seismic concerns. Competing priorities with loud supporters who don't want compromise. Money.
144. Dilapidated buildings, antiquated infrastructure, cost of demolition and upgrades, traffic corridor
145. Management And security in the short term, traffic and infrastructure in the long run.
146. Money
147. I hope it's not broken up and sold to the highest bidders. I think it should be used for non profits and organizations that prioritize the public good!
148. time pressure. Lack of funding for long term. No one responsible for seeking appropriate housing developer. State keeping control until last minute.
149. development with fee simple ownership

150. State owned property with input from people out of the area
151. Pressure to develop it.
152. aged structures and facilities; traffic; parking
153. If too many people access the homes and streets, Glen Ellen and Sonoma Valley will have a traffic problem that will approach gridlock. Homes must be affordable and have common grass areas. Providing public transportation will not stop the parking and traffic problems.
154. deterioration of structures, public access
155. Scale of new development, maintaining wildlife corridor
156. All of the buildings that need to be torn down or renovated - this will cost a lot of money
157. Buildings need significant repair, people will see money with the land and just want to build.
158. Open spaces
159. Old infrastructure with some building containing hazardous materials
160. Age of buildings.
161. Building rehabilitation is expensive but necessary if they are to be used.
162. What to do with campus area that retains character of region and is economically viable
163. Administration, exploitation, shortsighted planning
164. worried about overbuilding housing=traffic. Corporate takeover. Big box stores, magamansions.
165. over development

166. It's location with regards to developing a lot of housing. It's far from services, it's not near a jobs center, yet it seems the county wants to use it for housing.
167. Threat of overdevelopment and loss of character of the site.
168. Rehab/demo of old buildings with asbestos and water supply.
169. Traffic congestion if over developed
170. Too many varied entities want a piece (or the entire thing) of it.
171. Balancing the reality of the need for housing and economically productive development with the community's desire to have a pristine eco-park
172. Lack of updated infrastructure
173. Sustainability
174. Cost to bring in infrastructure and update existing
175. How to maintain the western lands as open space, and how to manage them. What to do with the farm lands.
176. Potential loss of the aforementioned assets
177. dilapidated structures/ roads, trees...everything needs maintenance
178. Upkeep of the buildings and adjacent grounds.
179. maintainance of structures, bruch control and wildfire mitigation; monitoring of wildlife use
180. Probably how to clean up the buildings that are too far gone
181. Aging buildings (funding to modernize them and/or decommission them/hazardous materials) and funding to keep up maintenance of the property; it is also an important area for wildlife access to other Sonoma open spaces

182. Aging buildings and funding to maintain buildings, property, the existing infrastructure, and managing hazardous material clean up. The site is a critical corridor for wildlife and a prized ecosystem.
183. I don't know--financing I imagine
184. Preservation of historical buildings overall esthetic of the campus.
185. Funding, traffic, and sustainability must be key issues. The pressure to provide new housing must be balanced by respect for the property's historical and ecological values.
186. Over-development
187. costs to redevelop
188. Congestion and/or encroachment on open space if not appropriately redeveloped
189. Economic development that doesn't sacrifice environmental concerns.
190. Decaying infrastructure, lack of protection for wild spaces, lack of integrated future plans. The site will deteriorate further without proper stewardship and a equitable, sustainable future plan.
191. I think the question of what the State will accept as value for the property is crucial. If they only accept dollar value then we have WASTED the last 5 or more years trying to prioritize community values. We cannot proceed with business as usual. The site needs to be developed to give value to sustainable communities, renewable energy sources, wildlife and wildland preservation, multigenerational living in small communities in open space, work spaces that rely on telecommuting, etc
192. Financial viable model for sustainability; concentrated affordable housing area
193. Developers vs nature preservationist

194. The outdated infrastructure is probably the biggest issue, since it will impact any campus redevelopment. It will also be a challenge to make sure redevelopment is compatible with the surrounding town of Glen Ellen and doesn't negatively impact traffic and the semi-rural charm of the place.
195. Making sure it gets developed in keeping with the common good (such as renewable energy, affordable housing and the environment)
196. Impact to the natural ecology of the area
197. How to pay for up keep. How to incorporate use of the site. Future traffic as only two lane roads to and from SDC site. Keep it in scale to local area.
198. Infrastructure, reuse, governance, time. And imagination.
199. infrastructure preservation and adapting new technologies to overcome the costly hurdles to provide improved infrastructure
200. Dealing with old well built patient buildings, on East side. Arnold Drive only access..
201. cost of removal or remodel of facilities and local impacts of new uses
202. A land-grab for private corporate interests is the greatest risk. This site should remain as public as possible. Over use and greater traffic would be totally destructive to this area and the neighboring communities of Glen Ellen and Sonoma.
203. Hubris. The tendency of local leadership to believe that something is extraordinary when it is in fact ordinary. If we are not realistic in what we have, years will be spent trying to make it comparable to locations that are incomparable. (ie: comparing the SDC site to the Presidio)
204. pressure from wealthy investors/developers, overdevelopment, overuse, historic preservation
205. Loosing open space to developers

206. The location is very natural in a rural setting. Do not ruin that aspect! No safe pedestrian or bicycle path exists to connect to The Springs or Sonoma. A path, perhaps along the former railroad right of way should be built so residents could bike or walk to these areas as well as Altimira and the charter schools. We must reduce our carbon footprint!
207. The age of its buildings is a key issue. Wood-framed buildings were never intended to last forever. It would conceivably be more costly to try to preserve the existing buildings than to create new development. There is a point where nostalgia no longer serves us.
208. remediating/removing campus buildings and infrastructure, finding appropriate uses for the campus, working with very limited accessibility, public transit, housing/work ratios, water, sewage
209. How to reinvent the best fitting buildings for a new purpose and design new buildings that have enough in common or blend well with them.
210. The amount of remediation/construction needed to create a functional, operational "next thing"
211. Most buildings will need to be demolished. The County will need to determine how to provide electricity and water to future development. Close attention to traffic density.
212. Find "best use" scenario without creating a lot of new car traffic
213. Keeping the historic character of the site intact, infrastructure
214. The site is the most beautiful in the heart of Sonoma Valley and should be maintained whether as open space or re-purposed for a combination of public and private use.
215. Money
216. developers, onslaught of tourists, events, wine industry lobbyists

217. Infrastructure is old and outdated... also many structures. Evaluation of what to keep, what is historical, ...? How to keep illegal pot growers OUT and off the land. We need to keep the pristine gift for our valley residents, and for all people to enjoy and learn.
218. I'm a big advocate for the historical preservation and sustainable development of the campus, we need a balance of the two.
219. Pressure to overdevelop, cram full of houses, or bring in a developer that will cater to the elite - no Hilton!!!!
220. Encroachment from developers.
221. Greed, collaboration, politics
222. Some/much of the housing requires repair or replacement.
223. Demolition of buildings which contain hazardous materials. Protecting the habitat of the wildlife
224. The cost to upgrade physical plant limits development opportunities. Similarly, two lane road limits amount of traffic area can support.
225. Clean up costs of current buildings. Keeping the site free from unscrupulous developers.
226. Sub-standard buildings; possible toxins, preserving respect and honor for site's history
227. Do not let large developer co,e in and ruin the whole space
228. funding, land use
229. Potential overdevelopment.
230. The lower part of the campus will need much remediation as there's lots of deferred maintenance on the buildings- they will need to be demolished or remodeled for other uses.

231. gorgeous old buildings being demolished rather than renewed
232. Commercialization/greed.
233. infrastructure upgrades; Area vulnerable to wild fires; ,Developers creating non affordable housing, and over building
234. traffic considerations; sustaining financial health
235. Letting special interest groups determine outcomes
236. Greedy developers. Money to renovate and operate.
237. Too many old buildings, broken infrastructure, large costs.
238. risk of fire.
239. SDC is a regional assist. Meaning certainly Sonoma County and probably all the NorthBay.
240. Balancing economic development with the social good
241. Deferred maintenance, aged systems, traffic impact
242. Old aging buildings that are beyond being able to salvage for use.
243. I see the biggest issue are the maintenance of all the buildings.
244. The old and pretty decrepit buildings.
245. Please don't it go to developers. How to finance and maintain such a large facility
246. vandalism, homelessness, deteriorating structures, heating/cooling of buildings, failing water transfer system, maintaining open areas in a fire safe manner
247. Old buildings that don't meet earthquake standards.
248. The land, an amazing public resource, being sold for private development.

249. Maintenance, traffic congestion, speeding,
250. aging buildings
251. The right mix of use at the site - public spaces, private/residential, possibly some commercial use.
252. State of existing buildings, toxics?, NIMBY, resort development & high end residential estate pressure, fire, water.
253. Productive use of the space. Preservation of nature and wildlife corridor.
254. Limitations on use due to traffic/access/water. No proximity to transit and retail.
255. Development of office and residential buildings
256. dilapidated buildings, pressure to build something tourism-oriented
257. NIMBYISM
258. PRESERVATION AND KEEPING OUT DEVELOPMENT
259. Overdevelopment and commercialization of the campus that will degrade the wildlife corridor and the rural character of the site. Any housing or development must follow the existing cottage-style, clustered, low rise architecture within the existing developed footprint. No big buildings, homes, or apartment complexes. No new roads. No new lighting. No stadiums.
260. Infrastructure, hazardous materials, traffic, NIMBYs, wildfire, cultural resources
261. Major cost hurdles to overcome, the campus is an island, transportation constraints through the valley, a desire for limited development which makes viable proposals ore limited.
262. Cost of building renovations, pressure to develop into housing

- 263. The age and condition of the infrastructure
- 264. infrastructure limitations, VMT generation, NIMBYism

3. What are some of the key issues facing Sonoma Valley that have implications for planning SDC?

- 1. Housing, economic stratification, water resources, traffic.
- 2. As a result of the pandemic, more and more high-paid technology workers will be looking for work-from-home residences in the county, as well as second homes they can use for vacations. This will drive prices up and push working-class families out, unless sites like the SDC can be developed as affordable, sustainable communities.
- 3. Affordable low and middle income housing, the growing depletion of Sonoma Valley's underground aquifer and the advancing loss of the Sonoma Valley rural & agricultural feel & lifestyle.
- 4. traffic, overcrowding
- 5. Traffic, water quality issues, public transportation access, fire evacuation
- 6. traffic. However there used to be hundreds of employees before...
- 7. Homelessness; support for NPOs; finances
- 8. I suspect people are worried about traffic that any new uses will bring to the part of the valley.
- 9. The need for affordable Housing and employment. Traffic
- 10. Zoning restrictions an increasingly competitive market economy and declining revenue
- 11. Need for low income FAMILY housing. Fire preparedness, including emergency exits, ground water limitations, public transit.

12. affordable housing is one of the biggest issues. SDC can be viewed a a location for some of that housing.
13. Funding, traffic, diverse and conflicting desires
14. Housing, Affordable housing, health disparities
15. Over crowding/traffic from tourism. Lack of affordable housing for locals
16. Congestion, over population, fire risk
17. definitely our housing shortage could be addressed with some of this property. Off road bike trails could be developed. Makers spaces and other resources for artists and craftspeople would be wonderful
18. SV is faced with the high cost of housing, gentrification, loss of historic resources, and preservation of a natural environment vulnerable to fire and manmade disasters
19. Affordable Housing, public transit, natural groundwater recharge
20. Crime, overcrowding, destruction of open space, high density new development that risks destroying the rural nature of the Sonoma Valley.
21. The lack of affordable housing for local housing. Land costs are exorbitant in the Sonoma Valley. If development proceeds with leaseholds, it would mitigate perhaps the greatest expense of building housing. Also housing footprints would be reduced with cluster townhouse and apartment designs surrounding common areas and community gardens with access only for owners and guests
22. There are thousands in need of living spaces and various services--plan for that, prioritize that.
23. If we recognize how integral Sonoma Developmental Center (SDC) was in Sonoma Valley's economic well-being for many decades and how SDC's closure leaves an unfilled economic hole in the Valley, conscientious plans for the future use of the site must choose next uses that support the

economic well-being of Sonoma Valley. By extension, if Sonoma Valley is economically stable, Sonoma County and its neighboring counties also benefit.

24. Lack of practiced diversity. Cost of living to the exclusion of many.
25. affordable housing; low cost studio space
26. Affordable housing shortage can be addressed on this site, but need appropriate infrastructure development planning (utilities, water, traffic) to make it work sustainably. (
27. The limits of infrastructure and increase in traffic as there are limited ways to access.
28. Affordable housing. I don't believe that the SDC site is a good location for high density housing due to traffic, sewer and water.
29. Perhaps some locals would be concerned about traffic in and out of the campus, but it would be such a good cause, I think they would buy in if it was handled well and the neighbors felt they had a say in the process...
30. Loss of habitat diversity. Narrowing of economic diversity (too much mono culture). Preserving our history. The need for healthy, affordable locally grown food.
31. Lack of stringent historic preservation laws and enforcement. Impacts from the tourist and wine industries, lack of affordable housing
32. The lack of affordable housing, which will only get worse as the ramifications of Covid-19 are felt, is the biggest issue facing Sonoma Valley. SDC is a huge opportunity for providing needed housing in an environmentally friendly way for low-income workers in the Valley. Lack of funds. Pressure to build market rate housing, which must be prevented.
33. Wildfire danger, safe egress in emergency, unaffordable housing costs, traffic impacting safety and quality of life, preservation of nature and

wildlife corridors and habitat, cultural divisions, social and economic inequality

34. Traffic, tourism...Traffic, tourism, housing
35. How to develop a economic model not dependent on tourism and rich homeownership.s
36. Water/drought, fire risks, climate change, transportation/GHG emissions
37. Housing and free or government subsidized education for those who don't have access to it.
38. Overpopulation. Tourist industry. Affordable living, or lack of.
39. Again traffic and Arnold Drive. If we have fire issues, how can we safely evacuate the population for the Northern part of the Sonoma Valley along Arnld Drive?
40. SDC is a state and county asset. SV residents should be heard but not have veto authority.
41. Homeless, police power, Need a more diverse economic base, NIMBY
42. Affordable housing and open space
43. Same as above and below statements.
44. Funding, possible housing, work training, rehabilitation
45. The housing crisis in Sonoma Valley for lower wage workers should be taken into consideration.
46. Crowding in the populated areas....not much distance between homes, esp. in the newer developments.sdc has lovely grounds, with good spacing between buildings and sections.
47. Homelessness and housing insecurity continue to grow.
48. Affordable housing

49. There is certain to be a huge demand for additional housing... probably with developers aching to create "affordable" housing. Then there is the homeless issue and the ongoing and likely growing need for shelter. Again, there may be extreme pressure to create a solution for that issue with what's available without taking into account the total picture.
50. Choosing to maintain small businesses as opposed to potentially higher income options such as large corporation businesses
51. Infrastructure of Sonoma Valley is limited, and can not support any additional housing nor hotel/rental facilities.
52. I would like to know the transportation schedules in place and if they would be increased given it is developed for housing use.
53. Traffic and over population are an issue for this valley with limited space. I would not suggest ANY new building, but rather a repurposing of the buildings.
54. low cost housing, socio-economic balance, nature of community
55. affordable housing and office space
56. Lack of affordable housing, the wealth gap, a growing reliance on tourism to drive the economy instead of having a healthy mix of agriculture, business, arts, education.
57. The extent of homelessness is critical and growing. SDC should entertain ideas for utilizing the existing buildings.
58. See above.
59. Water scarcity, too much development in fire prone areas, lack of continuity of undeveloped areas
60. Need for affordable housing! And lack of access to college level education.
61. Lack of good transportation

62. Sonoma Valley has a number of community issues that are being addressed. Sonoma county is tasked with addressing homelessness, unemployment, and numerous other issues that are prevalent in Sonoma County.
63. Housing and employment. SDC was a large employer in our valley. Housing has been driving people out. If housing becomes a use for the property former employees should be given a priority in accessing that housing.
64. The effect of fires, COVID and homeless individuals economic uncertainty.
65. Traffic and historic value
66. Access, expense, density of population planned
67. It is beautiful the way it is! Leave it open as a preserved space
68. Homelessness, greedgreed
69. I don't know.
70. The key issue is who speaks for the interests of the wildlife that has called this area their home for thousands of years. For once, humankind has the opportunity to harmonize competing interests while maintaining habitat for wildlife.
71. housing shortage/ affordability
72. Where are we going to place our very needy clients?
73. Traffic, affordable housing, jobs
74. COVID, lack of places for learning language, skills for work, etc. for low income, still in high school, etc. We need work ready citizens with support to help them thrive in our valley. We need more space to enjoy the outdoors besides the plaza.
75. A lack of affordable housing, migrant farm worker housing. Low income housing. A lack of affordable space for art organizations, small business start ups.

76. Homelessness
77. Housing, business use
78. homelessness, affordable housing, no community pool
79. Funding
80. Affordable Housing and Preservation of Open Spaces
81. We need to preserve the history of the site as well as provide a space for all residents to enjoy.
82. Deinstitutionalization has impacted clients in the community negatively. Clients of Regional center who need more behavioral support are bouncing around from crisis home to crisis home (typically not in Sonoma county even when they're parents/families/conservators reside in Sonoma county).
83. Traffic, housing, housing of non profits, education facilities
84. Sonoma Valley is seeing a divide, where as needed services are being sacrificed for the needs of those in higher income brackets.
85. Not for profit -- this should benefit community members (housing, health care, individuals with exceptional needs, etc.)
86. housing, tourism, traffic, food production, fire protection
87. Lack of a appropriate housing opportunities for people with emotional/behavioral/cognitive needs.
88. Our families, who have children that need placement in a facility like SDC now have to send their children out of state to find care facilities that are adequate to house them. Not having access to the SDC has major implications to the Sonoma Valley, the county, and the north state.
89. too many tourists not respecting nature

90. Absence of affordable housing. Homelessness. Shortage of affordable health care. Gentrification.
91. Whether to allow use of the SDC site for anything short of culturally embellishing the Valley
92. Housing and economic displacement
93. Affordable housing, which is primarily a supply & demand problem. Stop letting people pretend Sonoma County isn't linked to the rest of the Bay Area and California. It is. Build housing. If you don't, eventually the state will make you and you'll have less control. So might as well do the right thing now.
94. lack of affordable housing and a looming post-COVID need for more affordable housing
95. Loss of habitat for wildlife. Diminishing water table. Drought. Too much reliance on tourism. Increasing population, congestion, traffic.
96. Increased traffic; opportunities for diverse populations; community based to create additional opportunities for diversity
97. The need for housing.
98. The valley has a need for affordable housing. SDC is not the place to put affordable housing!
99. Traffic flow I suspect. Growth patterns. Need for housing. Jobs.
100. Affordable housing. Traffic on Arnold Drive.
101. Homelessness, lack of affordable income
102. quality of life, support healthy lifestyle
103. Sonoma Valley is home to a diverse population of residents, including people with developmental disabilities.

104. Housing affordability, diversity and inclusion/segregation, aging population.
105. Affordable Housing for families; Business diversity (not just wine/tourism!)
106. 1. Increased population. 2. Pressure on infrastructure. 3.loss of open space and animal habitat.
107. Traffic, housing shortage, need for well paid jobs.
108. Congestion and funds to maintain the property
109. Traffic, economics, lack of agreement of SDC use
110. Fire, water, wildlife, open space for recreation, housing, public space
111. Developers, construction companies and wineries have an unduly strong voice and control over the decision-making process for local development.
112. Housing. This would be a great place for housing instead of trying to stuff it all into the already very overcrowded Springs.
113. Local opposition to development for many reasons. Need for housing. Project must strike a balance
114. The key issue facing Sonoma Valley is the high cost of living and lack of affordable housing. With low housing inventory and a high cost of living, many local residents are now housing insecurity. The region also has a high homeless population. With the SDC, our community has the rare opportunity to preserve historic architecture while providing affordable housing for local residents.
115. Affordable housing, built out. Also racial, social and economic justice.
116. Encroaching on wildlife.
117. the lack of open space, over crowding, diminishing natural resources
118. i guess money

119. transportation planning for increased traffic is critical for SDC to address if it is to be redeveloped
120. Unsure
121. Employment opportunities, affordable housing, and an increasing population of weekenders who buy homes here but live elsewhere.
122. Very worried that a real estate developer is going to turn this site into condos
123. Our roads can't handle the traffic of a developed SDC that links to the City of Sonoma and the Santa Rosa area. The whole valley needs an urban type transpiration sysyem.
124. the cost of housing
125. Affordable housing and transportation.
126. Lack of housing but I am concerned with increase in car traffic, noise and pollution
127. housing - for teachers & workers
128. Housing prices are high. Job opportunities for high paying jobs in the nearby community are low so you it will be hard to attract young families.
129. Need for housing
130. Aging population, infrastructure capacity, water availability
131. Traffic, public services, affordable non-profit spaces, affordable housing. Fires -- traffic in the event of. We have limited roads in and out. Had the Springs area been affected by the fires and all of those homes evacuated, people most certainly would have died in large numbers due to the population density in a small area and limited road access for evacuation. Racism needs to be addressed. Some of the opposition to affordable housing options is linked to racist stereotypes, in particular related to the

Latinx community -- despite the Latinx being the virtual backbone of the valley.

132. traffic, crime
133. Water, transportation and wildfires.
134. housing, fire danger, potential losses of open space,
135. housing shortage
136. Traffic, job creation and retention, housing.
137. Housing. Too much tourism. Traffic, congestion, over loving Sonoma Valley. Keeping open space and wild lands. Making sure there is a wildlife corridor.
138. Lack of infrastructure & water
139. Traffic! Any new use of the SDC is going to create more traffic on Arnold Road. Any plan for use must have a complete traffic assessment and plan for moving vehicles to Hwy 12 and avoiding neighborhoods and the town of Glen Ellen. Developers may have a desire to overbuild in order to achieve the most financial gain, without considering the character of the surrounding communities.
140. Lack of commercial and light industrial businesses need diversification from tourism.
141. Preventing a McMansion development where only the wealthy enjoy the land.
142. Too many secondary homes and vacation rentals, hence not enough housing for locals. Too many people eyeing SDC for housing development, ready to destroy its majesty.
143. Affordable Housing. Equity. Traffic. Fire risk. Preventive electrical outages. Traffic. Limited access.

144. Shortage of affordable housing, need for expanded economic base, development of green economy, centralized administration facility for multitude of non-profits,
145. Available affordable housing, Transportation options, fire resilience, income that isn't dependent on tourism
146. Housing
147. Over-development, loss of affordable housing, and loss of economic and cultural diversity.
148. sustainable, affordable housing is the biggest. service workers need housing. traffic.
149. 1) ground water shortages due to extensive vineyard development 2) limited housing availability 3) increased auto traffic as workers must commute from afar to their employment in the Sonoma Valley 5) Wildfire risk
150. Lack of housing. Traffic. Funding for public infrastructure.
151. traffic
152. The over-abundance of wineries and wine tasting establishments....and we do not need another wine-focused resort. One site is already approved for Kenwood and now for sale as well as the new hotel in Boyes.
153. lack of appropriate & useful development, economic impact
154. Lack of open space access. Overcrowding.
155. Housing, traffic, tourism
156. Traffic and Housing
157. Probably lack of affordable housing,
158. Affordable housing.

159. Housing shortage in this area as well as increase in wild fi in NorCal. Loss of money in budgets due to Covid 19 impact.
160. Traffic is already high. Any large business use at SDC will bring traffic to a stand still. Roads leading up to SDC need repaving.
161. Housing affordability; retaining semi-rural feel
162. Quality of life, environmental impacts, open space preservation
163. overpopulation. lack of diversity. traffic. financially sustainable.
164. Water, fires, lack of public transit, bad roads, no local governance.
165. Overcrowding, Traffic, Loss of wildlife corridor
166. Housing, community, sustainability, profitabilit
167. Over growth of a quaint area
168. Lack of affordable housing, lack of good-paying jobs, gentrification of the Sonoma Valley.
169. Attracting sustainable businesses that provide good careers. Developing the economy outside of tourism
170. Lack of affordable housing
171. Housing affordability
172. Lack of affordable housing, transportation other than cars
173. How to secure and improve the integrity of the habitat corridor of which the western SDC lands are a part. How to reduce the carbon footprint of the Valley's residents and businesses. How to meet our water supply needs, while maintaining healthy ecosystems, including healthy aquatic and stream habitats.
174. low income housing;

175. Lack of affordable housing, services/shelter for homeless, overreach of commercial development
176. keeping the fringing open-space and viewsheds west and east of Sonoma Valley; highway crossing for wildlife with need to mitigate in-valley road kills (seem very high to me) potential low-income housing and building space for wide-range of non profits; possible environmental campus, linked with middle-high schools, local colleges
177. With the coronavirus we need local food production and care for all the people
178. Population density already stressing existing infrastructure (e.g., traffic on the 12 and Arnold - particularly with commuters), lack of funding for new infrastructure, fire risk, lack of affordable housing, tourism, limited housing for vulnerable populations (mentally ill, homeless, developmentally delayed).
179. Lack of affordable housing, population density already stressing existing infrastructure, lack of infrastructure to support increased population, traffic and deteriorating roads/bridges, lack of real estate to support additional infrastructure, tourism, and lack of funding to support any remediation efforts.
180. the same
181. While the state status as stipulated affordable housing as a key component, this may not be congruent with the optimum use of the facility/property. Educational and other uses should be considered.
182. Same as above.
183. Traffic, overdevelopment
184. Traffic and the need to develop the SDC facilities without overpopulating the area. also the lack of fishing opportunities in the Valley. Developing the lakes on the property for fishing would be a fantastic addition to the valley's recreational diversity

185. Housing affordability and education opportunities
186. Housing
187. Disproportionate inequitable ratio of private to public wildlands; affordable housing; climate change adaptability; insufficient public transportation and adult educational / training centers, and now than ever with the pending aftermath of COVID, we need greater economic access and diversification!
188. I don't get the feeling that the team running this process is doing more than ticking boxes. Sorry, I am sure you each care personally, but the approach is very off putting and "us versus them". Too little time for questions, too little knowledge of the community and the depth of involvement of the community in the process already. As one of you said you have never worked in a project with so much base knowledge already collected. We do not need a team to tell us what we need and want. We need a team to figure out how to get what we need and want. We have set goals, now figure out how to accomplish them.
189. Affordable housing, public transportation, climate change
190. Housing. Tourist traffic, revenues.
191. Affordable housing is a huge challenge in the valley. Too many second homes and air bnbs make it almost impossible for working people to live here. We've also found out, through coronavirus, just how important being able to walk is for area residents, so having adequate and accessible parkland is critical.
192. Affordable housing and destruction of wildlife habitat
193. Encroaching building on the natural ecology of the area
194. SDC is in a small town, can't support a lot more visitors or workers. Traffic, road maintenance. Funding.
195. Housing, open space, post-covid employment.

196. Site access if the future development plans do not consider a second main artery into the site for vehicle staging
197. HOUSING for families who are local and earning less than 150000 and young people starting out and working in local service industries
198. need for housing and mental health care for elders and homeless and low wage workers
199. Fire danger is critical. Need for low-income housing is great: not market rate.
200. Maintaining the character of the area as a world-class place to visit while also providing infrastructure and housing for locals.
201. living in wildfire habitat, monoculture of grapes, balancing tourist dollars with needs of residents already living here
202. We are losing all of our natural resources to building and Vinyards.
203. Too many high-end second homes. We need to keep in mind that a healthy community has various income levels who live here full time. Traffic. Those who say no traffic issues on Arnold are fooling themselves. A bike/pedestrian path could help alleviate some vehicle trips.
204. Sonoma Valley's economy is largely based on the wine industry which, in the face of climate change, may be at risk. We must diversify our economic base in order to be sustainable.
205. housing, housing, housing, housing, economic development
206. Need for housing and employment. Placing services near housing.
207. Cost, traffic, environmental impact
208. Lack of affordable housing. Limited public transportation.
209. wild fire, water shortage and housing shortage

210. Truly affordable housing (30-60 percent of AMI), no more tourist amenities
211. Open space & housing! This site represents a significant portion of the valley and the largest percentage of publicly held land. Whatever the plan for change, it should be a 100 year plan including an additional 100 years to implement any significant change. Future uses should follow historical models never allowing large scale development that the Valley infrastructure cannot support, i.e. water, sewage, etc.
212. Too much development without thought for infrastructure needs
213. tourism, development, attorneys
214. The price of land and construction will surely be a factor in what can be done with this community of buildings etc. So, its' costs! What i do NOT want are the wealthy privatizing this prime land for a golf course, or a private club, or for their shareholder;s gain. This land should belong to the public .
215. Lack of affordable housing, traffic, water, too much tourism, lack of habitat for flora and fauna, climate change.
216. The need for low density affordable housing.
217. Developing an Eldridge identity of its own
218. housing availability
219. Traffic. Arnold drive cannot handle anymore traffic. Also rural quality
220. Limited hotels to support tourism and lack of affordable housing.
221. The need for mental health and developmentally disabled treatment facilities has not gone away. Homeless shelters and treatment centers are needed. Much more affordable housing needs to be developed for the near poor and the very poor.

222. Consider housing, small commercial, non-profit hub, public transit, bike lanes. Need recreation emphasized.
223. We need to be sure whatever is done has through research. We want to do the right thing,
224. development costs, traffic, housing, open space
225. Too much traffic! Old roads and infrastructure. Strained public resources such as firefighters, hospitals and schools.
226. Access to open space, affordable housing
227. Too many old people stopping any development - and they are the only ones getting involved so it's not a fair demographic opinion
228. More access to the outdoors in safe spaces.
229. Over development, increase in fire/police, infrastructure upgrades, environmental, wildlife
230. population density/traffic congestion/pollution
231. Need for housing for families and low income.
232. Work-live housing. Allowing public access for recreation without the same restrictions imposed by state.
233. Lack of affordable housing. Increasing population. Gentrification.
234. expensive land, not enough farming, inadequate public transportation, lack of diversity
235. housing. recreation.
236. The usable buildings should be utilized for Non-Profit Organizations (i.e. the San Francisco Presidio model) at a reasonable lease fee. Additionally to serve the developmentally disabled population with crisis and medical care.

237. Need for low income housing, space for social services, educational and training opportunities. All could be staged here.
238. Community resistance to change/growth
239. Traffic and parking if area becomes open to vast communities.
240. A key issue is keeping the green areas open for locals and not selling to wealthy land owners.
241. The cost of living in this valley and the fact that it is becoming more of a tourist destination than a place to live. We should NOT let the SDC become, for example, a hotel or a resort.
242. Land Trust opportunities to keep Sonoma from overdeveloping- our beauty is the reason people come here. Look at downtown Napa- too overly developed
243. affordable housing, homelessness, water shortage
244. Affordable housing.
245. Traffic, Traffic and more Traffic
246. Housing and accessible outreach centers for people in need of support. Recreation areas & outdoor learning for youth.
247. Traffic, Wildfire vulnerability
248. Traffic, preserving historic character, reliance on visitors and tourism.
249. high need of affordable housing for all ages, public transit, bike paths, access to open space, water, fire.
250. Income inequality. Affordable housing. Reliance upon wine/hospitality industries for revenue and employment. Traffic.
251. Housing crisis. The sdc buildings could be low income affordable housing.

252. Costs of maintaining public parks, housing shortages and need to protect open spaces.
253. Spread of development
254. the site should be used in a way to help address problems and not exacerbate them (e.g., bringing more tourists). It would be wonderful to have a project that creates non-tourism-related jobs which will be more reliable over the long-term, given wildfire/smoke/pandemics... and that help alleviate issues surrounding affordable housing, lack of non-service jobs, and environmental issues like climate change
255. Lack of low income/affordable housing, ensuring a design that benefits all residents, not just those who have means
256. PRESERVATION OF A GREEN ENVIRONMENT AND CLEAN AIR AND WATER
257. Development pressure to build more, more, more without long-term planning or projections. Allowing a new community or intense development here will forever degrade the Sonoma Valley as a natural treasure that survives primarily on visitor-serving businesses. Of course climate change, lack of transportation, air and water quality and future generations must be prioritized over short-term profits and a "housing crisis" that ebbs and flows over the decades. Once Sonoma Valley and SDC is paved over, it won't ever recover.
258. NIMBYs, housing, water, fire risk, infrastructure
259. Affordable housing, wildfire risk, traffic congestion.
260. Need for housing
261. Affordable housing primarily
262. A shortage of housing; fire resiliency

4. What are some of the key issues facing Sonoma County that have implications for planning SDC?

1. Housing, economic stratification, water resources, climate change.
2. See above.
3. Sonoma County infrastructure, including the condition and width of roadways/highways and water needs are not keeping pace with the County's unchecked population growth.
4. traffic, overdevelopment
5. Fire evacuation and public transportation, affordable housing
6. don't know
7. Same
8. An understanding that this is a project that will benefit all of Sonoma County not just the 1st district.
9. Same as above
10. Decreasing tourism visitation and perceived fire threat
11. Low income housing; improved access to services for Latin/x community, public transit east-west, developing new revenue sources to support county programs
12. having enough money to maintain parks and open spaces.
13. Funding, emergency services, ...
14. Housing, Affordable housing, health disparities
15. Over crowding/traffic from tourism. Lack of affordable housing for locals
16. Resources which could offset the pollution caused by county industry would be a boon.
17. High cost of housing & commercial rents, vulnerability to natural and manmade disasters

18. same as #3
19. Crime. Suburban spread.
20. same answer as #3
21. Some of the key issues currently facing Sonoma County are economic ones. The current economic challenges facing the County stem from the unresolved effects of the financial crash of 2008, the costs of the devastating fires of 2017 and 2019, and now the costs of the pandemic rocking the world. Sonoma County cannot at this time produce adequate funding from its own coffers to meet the needs of redeveloping the SDC property.
22. Same as #3
23. Same as for the valley- affordable, sustainable housing, traffic; jobs that are not low wage hourly jobs.
24. We need to find best and highest use in order to benefit all of the county.
25. Affordable housing.
26. A college would bring in jobs, and a market for housing professors, and college staff, more business for the local economy. I would think the county would be highly in favor of this.
27. The need to reprioritize what it means to be sustainable, and healthy.
28. need for housing, esp. affordable housing, budget for redevelopment of site
29. Lack of stringent historic preservation laws and enforcement. Impacts from the tourist and wine industries, lack of affordable housing
30. Lack of affordable housing. Lack of funds.
31. See above #4
32. See answer to #3 above.

33. Sufficient housing affordable for ALL of our residents. Opportunity for global leadership on sustainability.
34. Lack of affordable housing. Lack of training and educational facilities in the form of trade schools, etc.
35. Fire hazards. Natural disasters. Lack of affordable living.
36. The demand for affordable housing, and the inherent infrastructure needs for supporting increased housing density. Public transportation, water quality, roadways that can handle the increased traffic, health services that can serve an increased population.
37. The housing uses for individuals who are homeless are huge. SDC is an asset in this struggle.
38. Economic and cultural diversity, NIMBY, Traffic,
39. Affordable housing and open space
40. Lack of housing for homeless and low income people. Environmental issues including water use.
41. Funding, vision for its future,
42. The same housing crisis exists in Sonoma County overall, not to mention the yearly 3,000 homeless people.
43. Keeping up the roads, abatement challenges for environmental noise, creating more paths / bike lanes that are safe for walkers and bikers.
44. Homelessness and housing insecurity continue to grow. Affordability of housing
45. Affordable housing , youth needs
46. Same as for the Valley but with the additional desire for more open space for all county residents.

47. United States
48. Sonoma County as a whole may not care so much what happens to SDC as many people in the county are too far away from the location to know what is going on there
49. This site is NOT appropriate for homeless sheltering.
50. Attracting developers, and money. Should be a nonprofit situation, that would need State and Federal support.
51. Homelessness and low income housing availability have been issues where SDC has been brought up as a solution. I do not support this as the site is too rural and lacking in public transportation to accommodate this population.
52. above
53. affordable housing
54. Same--plus pressure for being a bedroom community to a growing San Francisco.
55. The County must avoid a single developer's purchase and develop a corporation who will entertain MANY different concepts that UTILIZE the EXISTING Buildings!!!
56. all of the above, and lack of mental health facilities. financial implications are unknown.
57. All of the issues listed under item 3, plus a lack of museums, libraries and other public resources for learning
58. The housing issue is number one. The entire county needs affordable housing..both owned or rented.
59. No town, city or the county at large has a practical building policy addressing affordable housing for 50% of the population. A tsunami of newly-unhoused is coming with the effects of COVID-19, which the county

is completely unprepared for. A small piece of that land must be considered for small villages of mini-houses coupled with in-site support personnel to help the clients.

60. Lack of good transportation
61. Children and adults with significant disabilities have no options for appropriate housing. Families can not always support their children or adult children with severe disabilities.
62. Real estate developers. They are like vultures on this land. They shouldn't even be a part of the planning team.
63. Homelessness & budget issues created by the fires, COVID
64. homelessness and preservation of historical monuments.
65. Too much growth changes the character of SDC
66. Please no development!!
67. Homelessness is at a crisis level and neither City or County have figured out a way to shelter or house 2,000 people. The crisis is likely to get worse as economics continue to be affected by COVID-19.
68. Greed, politics
69. Racism. Lack of police transparency. Incapacity to see past money.
70. The key issues facing Sonoma County have to do with greed and over-development.
71. housing shortage/ affordability
72. No care for aging Special Needs Adults and Elders.
73. Affordable Housing, jobs
74. COVID - Lack of funds, setting up opportunities without asking for trash pick up or education or something in return for all that is given to citizens.

Perhaps a community center type place where things like evacuation location, place to get COVID tests, learn English, learn how to write a resume...but county wide...

75. We need state funding support in order to develop
76. Homelessness - there is no affordable housing for the truly poor. Please keep some space for housing and even better mental health services
77. Need for more open space to use in this part of the county
78. budget, homelessness
79. Funding
80. Ditto
81. The influx of wineries and vineyards have added to the increase in population and traffic all over the county.
82. Lack of adequate housing for clients with behavioral and mental health issues.
83. Funding
84. Same as 3
85. Sonoma County has a huge housing issue for individuals with intellectual disabilities and high behaviors, in need of more intensive treatment over a long scope of time. Individuals from Sonoma County, with family residing in Sonoma County, are forced into housing through large corporations in other counties, such as Solano County, and are basically cut off from family and virtually warehoused. This county needs to take responsibility for its marginalized populations and their right to live a life of dignity in their community.
86. Not for profit -- this should benefit community members (housing, health care, individuals with exceptional needs, etc.)

87. housing, tourism, traffic, food production, fire protection
88. Lack of a appropriate housing opportunities for people with emotional/behavioral/cognitive needs. I know serval young adults who have had to move out of county or out of state to receive an appropriate housing placement out of county or out of state. It is truly unfortunate that SDC is No longer around to serve our most vulnerable population.
89. We need the SDC to serve its purpose as the SDC. My special needs, aggressive, dual-diagnosis students don't have safe and viable housing options.
90. developments with unintended negative impact - ie wildfires, traffic, infrastructure
91. Absence of affordable housing. Homelessness. Shortage of affordable health care. Gentrification.
92. Debt that is beyond what is generally alluded to in the press. Overwhelming need to house people who can not afford to rent or buy, and homeless residents. Then, complete lack of courage or vision among county leaders.
93. Housing and economic displacement
94. Housing. We need more of it. California and the Bay Area are growing. People will move to Sonoma County.
95. lack of affordable housing and a looming post-COVID need for more affordable housing
96. Same
97. To keep it away from developers instead of retaining community based use, especially for affordable housing and socially inspiring activities
98. The need for housing.

99. The valley has a need for affordable housing.SDC is not the place to put affordable housing!
100. Priorities for county may get in way of SDC planning? Find allocation. Priorities for housing and services that can't happen at SDC currently but are needed county wide.
101. Affordable housing.
102. Homelessness, lack of affordable income
103. Sonoma adults with developmental disabilities are in need of housing and programs to support their care and independence, helping each individual reach their fullest potential, whatever that may be.
104. Housing affordability, diversity and inclusion, gentrification, homelessness, sluggish government.
105. See above
106. Lack of funds
107. Economics, lack of county money
108. Fire, water, wildlife, open space for recreation, housing, public space
109. Same as above
110. Same as above
111. Like the Sonoma Valley, the greater Sonoma County has a housing emergency. With the rising cost of living and low housing inventory, especially after the fires, creating more affordable housing is critical to maintaining socioeconomic diversity as well as addressing issues of housing insecurity and homelessness.
112. Same as above. #4
113. Acquiring the funds to properly implement the "Plan"

114. same as above
115. covid is a problem right now. hopefully money will not be a problem
116. climate change and wildfire risks, affordable housing
117. This is a question for the planner
118. Employment and housing. Also climate change.
119. We need non-agricultural jobs and affordable housing for the workers.
120. the cost of housing, rising greenhouse gas emissions related to transportation and buildings
121. The need for funding sources for County services.
122. Same as above
123. fire risk
124. Housing prices are high. Job opportunities for high paying jobs in the nearby community are low so you it will be hard to attract young families.
125. United States
126. Same
127. Aging population, infrastructure capacity
128. Traffic, public services, affordable non-profit spaces, affordable housing.
129. high rent, housing prices
130. Same as above.
131. housing, fire danger, potential losses of open space, funding of added open space to regional park,
132. housing shortage

133. United States
134. Traffic.
135. Housing. Too much tourism. Traffic, congestion, over loving Sonoma County. Light pollution. Making sure we keep open space.
136. Lack of infrastructure, water, tax dollars
137. The county seems to not have enough funds to monitor traffic and keep roads and bridges in top repair. How funds will be allocated and managed in oversight of the property needs to be thoroughly planned and executed.
138. Overcrowding
139. We need low income housing. SDC is space for housing but we need to ensure infrastructure is appropriate for any development, like public transportation and water use.
140. Lack of funding to protect this area as a wildlife sanctuary and place of healing
141. Economics. Money. Plus Same as #3.
142. Lack of funding, shortage of affordable housing, training facility of skilled labor, skilled nursing care for senility patients,
143. Same as above
144. Housing and jobs
145. Overcrowding, high costs and uneven access to services and amenities.
146. housing, homeless, funding, groundwater sustainability, traffic
147. the same issues as #3 above
148. Lack of housing. Traffic. Funding for public infrastructure.

149. The inability of the County to meet their own immission standards with increased development and tourism once the economy opens up. The SDC will create a whole new community with fire, medical, and public services. Glen Ellen may feel the biggest impacts. Before CoVid the post office parking lot was a hazard and parking is limited everywhere.
150. lack of appropriate & useful development, economic impact
151. Housing, transportation, climate change, tourism, employment
152. Traffic and Housing
153. Affordable housing.
154. See question #3
155. Budget is key factor now, after COVID -19.
156. United States
157. Housing shortage, pandemic
158. Homeless crisis, financial issues, housing issues
159. The economy. Lack of workforce housing and good paying jobs.
160. Lack of high paying jobs.
161. Tax role
162. Being fair in development
163. Lack of affordable housing.
164. Uh —maybe not asking the exact same question twice? (C'mon — how hard is it?)
165. Money
166. Housing affordability

167. Lack of affordable housing, transportation other than cars
168. housing; low income housing
169. Lack of affordable housing, services/shelter for homeless, overreach of commercial development
170. how to fund upkeep of the SDC properties and land, need cost sharing options associated with meeting critical needs (housing for working families, not second homes; watershed protection with wildlife adaptive mitigation, state funded; places for residents to take nature walks for maintaining sanity in this crazy world
171. Same as # 3. How can we survive in the new world.
172. Population density already stressing existing infrastructure (traffic), lack of funding for new infrastructure, fire risk, lack of affordable housing limited housing for vulnerable populations (mentally ill, homeless, developmentally delayed), fire risk, lack of funding for emergency services
173. Lack of affordable housing, fire risk/protection, lack of funding for emergency services, tourism, agricultural issues, healthcare capacity, and real estate market uncertainty
174. same answer
175. I live within 4 miles of the SDC and don't have a vision towards other parts of the County.
176. The same as answer #2, but the importance of the ecological corridor becomes more apparent when considering the larger scale. An opportunity for small scale local food production also becomes an interest, especially after COVID19. From questions 2: The pressure to provide new housing must be balanced by respect for the historical and ecological qualities of the site.
177. Homelessness (see #5) and the loss of construction trade people. setting up some sort of trade school would be a great asset for Sonoma County

178. Housing affordability and education opportunities
179. Same as above
180. Disproportionate inequitable ratio of private to public wildlands; affordable housing; insufficient public transportation; climate change adaptability; and now than ever with the pending aftermath of COVID, we need greater economic access and diversification!
181. How can the County maintain equilibrium in face of rapidly moving world wide forces like climate change and world pandemics?
182. same as #3
183. Never enough housing.
184. Sonoma County is going to be walloped by the double economic whammy of the wildfires and now COVID-19. It will be important for there to be a Plan B in the event the specific planning process or the disposition takes longer than expected and/or costs associated with both issues change.
185. Affordable housing and destruction of wildlife habitat
186. Competing funding needs for disasters
187. Funding. Housing and work for local workers. Road maintenance. Keep it in scale to local area.
188. cost burdens to maintain the facility
189. HOUSING, for all ranges except estates, found ubequteosly in hills and glens nearby.
190. gentrification, tourism, lack of affordable housing
191. Monied interests will try to control the transition of this area for commercial profit. Unless fought off, it will be like the English nobility and upper middle classes appropriating the commons. This questionnaire was drafted to support commercial interests (e.g. questions 6, 7), and includes questions

and possible answers that promote commercial players and ignore/suppress non-commercial stakeholders (e.g. open space, public use and recreation, and low-income housing uses).

192. same
193. lack of workforce housing, poor public transportation, lack of vocational training programs
194. Housing is an issue. Perhaps make a plan to only build on existing plots. Build up not out. Make the plan to have co-op housing.
195. Lack of frequent public transportation. Low wage jobs. Mono-culture. We can do more than grow grapes and pot.
196. The County would be well served by expanding employment opportunities.
197. housing, housing, housing, housing, economic development
198. Great need for housing, especially low cost. Addressing climate change through development by keeping construction/energy/water use AND human movement at the forefront.
199. Same as above
200. Managing the popularity of the county with preserving open space.
201. Three mentioned above plus homelessness
202. Truly, deed restricted affordable housing, local jobs
203. Housing and infrastructure - water! California is entering a mega-draught period that cannot be ignored. In some cases, no change is better than dramatic change. Perhaps the best example is that of historic preservation to retain the integrity of the community.
204. Finances too many people pushing for housing without thought for infrature, employment and transportation

- 205. deep pockets, developers, wine industry, politicians, personal interests groups with
- 206. I;m not sure .. except for the pressure of affordable housing. And lack of... i do think some affordable housing should be included here. But mostly general public use.
- 207. Same as above.
- 208. Political/developer collusion
- 209. Cost to maintain parks, fire,
- 210. Limited resources to fund development and infrastructure upgrades.
- 211. Lack of affordable housing, mental health services, homeless services and open space/parks
- 212. Bike paths, housing, non-traditional enterprise, mixed community education, any level
- 213. need for more open space, green belts, housing
- 214. Same as above.
- 215. Too many old people stopping any development - and they are the only ones getting involved so it's not a fair demographic opinion
- 216. Homeless
- 217. Same as above
- 218. same as above
- 219. homelessness
- 220. Cost factors and how much private development to allow.
- 221. The same as above.

- 222. same
- 223. housing. recreation.
- 224. Money. Don't allow the campus to be sold to developers. Perhaps some low-income housing and veterans with safeguards for buildings and vast open space.
- 225. Same as above same as above
- 226. Lack of affordable housing, lack of high paying jobs, traffic on highway 37 limiting access to Bay Area
- 227. Fire prevention and maintenance
- 228. The pressure to sell to developers.
- 229. Same as above.
- 230. housing for low and middle class families- open space- wild life protection-
- 231. Homeless population, affordable housing
- 232. Giving permits to developer selling their building projects as "low income housing" that are really low quality living spaces without adequate space for kids and inadequate parking.
- 233. Housing in general. Job security now with the pandemic.
- 234. Sprawl, over building
- 235. Same, including development pressures.
- 236. Same as for Sonoma Valley
- 237. (Same as above)
- 238. Costs of maintaining public parks, housing shortages and need to protect open spaces.

- 239. climate change, natural lands preservation, affordability of housing, need for more jobs that are not service-jobs or tourism-dependent.
- 240. Fire risk, affordability, lack of jobs
- 241. PRESERVATION OF A GREEN ENVIRONMENT AND CLEAN AIR AND WATER
- 242. Development pressure, climate change, short-term profits over long-term planning, lack of transportation, lack of social services, inequity due to low pay, putting profits over environmental protection, wildfire risk.
- 243. NIMBYs, housing, water, fire risk, infrastructure
- 244. Affordability, a question of "identity" in a rural county with a site that was a large institutional complex, development costs.
- 245. Need for housing, economic downfall due to COVID
- 246. Affordable housing and A large homeless population
- 247. Never has it been more clear how important a strong and resilient local food system is for our community resiliency. I strongly believe that there needs to be a strong opportunity for use of land at SDC to grow food -- for a small scale farmer and for community gardening opportunities.
- 248. Housing shortage; jobs; fire resiliency; open space

5. What are some of the key issues facing the State of California that have implications for planning SDC?

- 1. Housing, economic stratification, water resources, climate change.
- 2. Behind the development of the state's technology economy stands the conversion of both manual and mental work to robotics, eliminating human workers. The state (indeed, the world) faces the problem of converting a society built on paid work to one built on productive leisure. Bending people's minds around using public space for public good is an important step toward handling that conversion.

3. Same issues as in question 4, as well as the need for seismic retrofitting of existing and future structures and infrastructures. Global warming causing species and habitat loss and redistribution is also an issue for the SDC.
4. loss of open space and historic buildings
5. same as above
6. they don't want to be financially responsible
7. Financial, homelessness
8. I'm not able to answer.
9. Whether or not to have the open space included into the State Park system; sell it to Sonoma Land Trust or sell it to a private developer. Also how to deal with an Historic District
10. Budget
11. drought, power outages, fires. Proper management of forests.
12. Funding for affordable housing.
13. Lack of affordable housing
14. Now, of course, money could be generated, probably by the disposal of the property but how much better if it could come from some uses for the property.
15. High cost of housing & commercial rents, loss of natural and open space, vulnerability to natural and manmade disasters
16. budget issues
17. Not applicable. SDC future needs to focus only local and regional concerns, not statewide.
18. ditto #s 3 & 4

19. My answer to question number 4 largely applies to answering this question.
20. Same as #3
21. same as # 4.
22. We need to be an asset and not a drain to the state
23. Affordable housing & jobs.
24. Budget ! I understand that there is \$800 million earmarked for this project, so that would go a long way to beginning the transformation. Also the Cal State University system would be the envy of the country in putting forth such an endeavor at this time in our paknet's history, adding to California's reputation as a forward thinking state.
25. The need to refocus our resources so as to reprioritize what it means to be sustainable, and health.
26. budgeting!
27. Lack of stringent historic preservation laws and enforcement. Impacts from the tourist and wine industries, lack of affordable housing
28. Lack of affordable housing. Lack of funds.
29. See above #4
30. How to meet the demands of its citizen in a time where tax revenues are falling?
31. Same as #4, plus looming budget deficit. How can we get the new SDC to be financial self-supporting?
32. Again, affordable housing and affordable trade-themed education.
33. Open space. The sate of California needs to preserve as much open space as possible. Preserve and maintain the SDC open space. Food production. The State of California needs to localize food production as much as possible.

Perhaps some of the SDC land should be used as a model sustainable farm/ranch. It would emphasize a part of the historic legacy of SDC. Water use and quality. Droughts are becoming increasingly prolonged and intense. The SDC water supply should be preserved and managed as a model for the State.

34. The short term budget problems should not get in the way of the long view best possible uses. Even if it takes longer, do it right.
35. Housing, economic diversity, water, jobs, catering to the rich creating even more disparity
36. Affordable housing and open space
37. Same as above.
38. Understanding its value, its location, funding and securing the open space
39. Same housing crisis for affordable housing and homelessness.
40. Wildfire management / utility lines maintenance
41. Homelessness and housing insecurity continue to grow. Affordability of housing.
42. Housing and homeless issues
43. CA
44. Homelessness, an aging population, and need to access affordable housing that is safe and close to required resources (e.g. grocery stores or schools)
45. California has no money due to pandemic - so forget about relying on state for redevelopment funds.
46. Permission and financial support.

47. Lack of water (droughts) loss of jobs, with businesses moving out of the state. Over population and crowding. Inability for our youth to make a living to remain i. The state.
48. above
49. affordable housing
50. Wealth gap, social justice, climate change ... and how will covid-19 affect our economy going forward.
51. The key issue is to resist an immediate single entity's purchase and to incubate many different housing and other ventures that will slowly begin to generate income for the state that will continue to build. In other words, Issue Conditional use permits (leases) to develop INOOCCE resisting an immediate SALE to one or more parties of large parcels.
52. financial impacts, mental health needs, maintenance of property.
53. All of the issues listed under 3 and 4, plus overpopulation, extinction of native species, overuse of water, forest and other resources - an overarching tendency to accept overpopulation and unsustainable exploitation of resources as inevitable
54. Industry leaving due to high taxes etc, Could start up industry use this space affordably?
55. The super majority Democrats cannot pass housing bills (SB50) to address the biggest need we face in California. Budgets will be strained further with layoffs and lower collection of taxes. The land here provides one opportunity to be creative with land use for thousands of residents presently being ignored.
56. The high cost of living
57. Funding. It would be essential in the development of this program to find a way to appropriately staff and fund that program.

58. Funding and real estate vultures. This is prime California real estate. It needs to be protected.
59. Budget issues
60. Take those prisoners in the article Chronicle 6/16/20 Disabled inmates face brutality. Put them back into the CDC and treat them with respect.
61. Expense, overdevelopment in the middle of parkland, public transportation
62. Nothing of it's left as a open space !!!
63. Homelessness, uncertain income for state budget, police violence issues
64. Politics, greed
65. The incredible need of homeless individuals and those who are unstable in society to have a place to live the fullest lives possible and to have caretakers that are surrounded and uplifted by where they work so that they can carry out the job.
66. The key issue facing the State of California is excessive political intrusion.
67. housing shortage/ affordability and environmental concerns
68. Ther are very few, vetted agencies for Special Needs Adults and Elders.
69. Affordable Housing, jobs
70. Funding, but with more opportunities becomes more jobs. We need a place to go exercise, connect, learn, report to when earthquake, fires, or pandemic...We can't just have low income housing...They should pick up trash, learn ways to help the county and give back too.
71. We need financial support in order to make the upgrade improvements
72. Cost of housing, lack of treatment.
73. Funding

74. Ditto
75. The budget of the state and the unemployment rate will be a key issue.
76. Lack of adequate housing for clients with behavioral and mental health issues.
77. Funding
78. Money
79. The State of California needs to address housing issues for individuals with intellectual disabilities that aren't able to integrate into assisted living types of housing. It is unethical for housing such as Sonoma Developmental Center to be shut down without development of adequate alternatives within Sonoma County.
80. Not for profit -- this should benefit community members (housing, health care, individuals with exceptional needs, etc.)
81. cost of building demolition and land rehabilitation at site; housing, traffic, fire protection, disposition of open spaces
82. Lack of a appropriate housing opportunities for people with emotional/behavioral needs.
83. We need the SDC to serve its purpose as the SDC. My special needs, aggressive, dual-diagnosis students don't have safe and viable housing options. They are in repeated cycles of 5150 holds, sedation, and return to their home/facility. A valuable way to use this land would be to set up a program that incorporates a hospital, like SDC, and a Delancey Street-type program, with revenue sources like an on-site cafe, restaurant, wine tasting, Christmas Tree lot, mechanic shop, moving company, dry cleaners, that could be used to train the homeless/mentally ill/ cognitively impaired in job skills while earning revenue to support the campus.
84. budget

85. Destruction of natural habitat and loss of open spaces. Liquidation of public assets to elude needed taxing of corporations and wealthy individuals. Misdirection of public assets away from social and community needs, in deference to corporate lobbyists seeking profit at public expense. Pandemics (present and future). Global economic downturn impacting California economy and accustomed affluence. Income disparity. Abandonment and disregard of human needs. Incitement of anti-immigrant bigotry to mobilize conservative voters.
86. Lack of money to invest in making the property useful, need to armor the state against wildfire and Existential Climate, and a likely voter swing to the right reacting to covid, state financial and infrastructure debt.
87. Housing and economic displacement
88. Housing. Affordable Housing. Also, good for the over 60 folks that benefit from Prop 13 and inflation in property values, but protecting the senior folks that aren't really contributing to the economy and taxing young, working people is a recipe for disaster for the state. Needs to be addressed.
89. lack of affordable housing and a looming post-COVID need for more affordable housing
90. Same
91. Affordable housing; providing health and human services; infusion of funds
92. California
93. The valley has a need for affordable housing.SDC is not the place to put affordable housing!
94. Housing. Services for those needing. Yet jobs could be created and those are needed statewide
95. Homelessness, lack of affordable income, state revenue shortages due to covid

96. Adults with developmental disabilities are in need of housing and support for independent and supportive living.
97. Housing affordability, homelessness, COVID-19, inconsistent, unpredictable, adversarial, regressive Federal Government.
98. See above
99. Lack of funds
100. Cost of maintaining a state run institution and land
101. revenue shortfalls, short sighted solutions for feather's in political caps.
102. Same
103. Need for housing. Less of the local concerns about impacts such as traffic and congestion.
104. Similarly, the State of California has an issue with the cost of living and lack of affordable housing. With increasing wildfires, many homes and communities will continue to be destroyed. In the wake of COVID-19, many more people will face homelessness and housing insecurity. The state has the rare opportunity to preserve historic landmarks while creating more affordable housing that could be a model for reclaiming spaces to address the critical housing issues.
105. Budget and above answers.
106. Financial (same as the County)
107. also same as above
108. the budget
109. climate change and wildfire risks
110. Homelessness and lack of free mental healthcare

111. Employment and housing, climate change. Also racial justice — by 2050, California will not be majority white, and SDC is in a very white area. How to plan for more diversity.
112. The State needs to stop thinking about selling the property to the highest bidder and look at the long term growth that is needed.
113. the cost of living, especially housing
114. Same as above
115. ?
116. We need a legal path to citizenship that doesn't take so long. We need higher paying jobs outside the dense city populations. More autonomy for private landowners.
117. CA
118. Aging population, need for affordable senior housing
119. See all of the
120. health care
121. The cost of redevelopment.
122. housing, fire danger, potential losses of open space, funding to maintain added open space to Jack London Park,
123. Recession
124. California
125. Crime and a failing justice system that victimizes criminals.
126. Housing. Overcrowding. Resources, especially water. Light pollution. Loving areas too much, so that it actually changes them for the worse.
127. Lack of infrastructure, water, and tax dollars

128. The state is facing a severe budget shortfall and will not have the means to support the property beyond the initial phase and will be eager to unload the management of the property and may be less responsive to community needs in order to exit from the ownership and management of the property.
129. Sub optimal educational opportunities / equity
130. Funding.
131. Similar. Must balance budget and covid just made that worse.
132. Shortage of affordable housing, lack of funds, difficulty monetizing clean air, open space, peace of mind, long term and effects of over development
133. Habitat and wildlife corridors, water, energy,
134. Budgets
135. I assume that budgets are being impacted by repeated extreme fire seasons, and by losses of jobs, income and housing.
136. budget after covid, housing, homeless
137. state derived money for grants
138. Lack of housing. Traffic. Funding for public infrastructure.
139. The State with the new fiscal crisis will probably want some kind of financial return from the project.
140. lack of appropriate & useful development, economic impact
141. Housing, transportation, climate change, tourism, employment
142. Housing
143. Affordable housing
144. Money shortage due to Covid 19 impact

145. Budget
146. California
147. Quality of life, Housing shortages, pandemic
148. financial issues, homeless crisis, corporate influence on our state government
149. Funding! No money to do anything.
150. Loss of open space, poor education system.
151. Bad press for the mismanagement.
152. Old deteriorated buildings
153. Lack of affordable housing.
154. Housing costs. Overall cost of living
155. Money
156. Cost of living is very high
157. \$\$,
158. Lack of affordable housing, services/shelter for homeless, overreach of commercial development
159. all of the above. The state should seed an self-sustaining endowment fund for at least 25-100 million, to be guided by ecologically sensitive criteria, for maintaing this highly valuable land parcelestablisset up
160. Will CA be controlled by the bankers and well to do?
161. Population density already stressing existing infrastructure, lack of funding for new infrastructure, fire risk, lack of affordable housinglimited housing for vulnerable populations (mentally ill, homeless, developmentally delayed),

- tourism, unemployment, renewable energy, lack of funding for emergency services, agriculture/water resources
162. Lack of affordable housing, fire risk/protection, lack of funding for state run emergency services, tourism, agricultural issues, healthcare capacity, COVID-19, and risk of a recession/depression
163. same
164. See my response above
165. This campus is a rare example of the most advanced treatment centers of the time and incorporated several many sustainable principles. Here is an opportunity to retain as much of the detail and character of the place as possible as a shining example of sensitive redevelopment.
166. Homelessness and where to build housing for those who cannot afford it. Some of the buildings good be converted to homeless shelters with areas dedicated to helping the homeless get back on there feet
167. Access to outdoor space
168. same as above. Did i miss something? what happened to attention to detail?
169. Affordable housing, growing population, equitable access to wildlands, economic diversification in non-urban areas, climate change adaptability, aging infrastructure
170. How is the State planning to move forward into the next reality? Financial unraveling, seriatim health crises, vast unemployment and underemployment, economic inequality of inexcusable proportions, immigration pressure both for and against, aging population, millenials stuck with repeated setbacks, climate change moving more like COVID19 than not bringing with it drought and fire, etc etc
171. ditto

172. Same
173. Both the state of CA and the county will have wildfire and COVID-19 costs to deal with over the next few years, which will no doubt have implications for disposition of SDC. I imagine developers will as well: the economic impacts are going to be profound worldwide. Again: Plan B is in order. Redevelopment potentially could be postponed, and it'll be important to have a contingency plan (or plans) for maintenance of the property in the meantime. This also make transfer of the open space in a timely fashion (immediately) even more critical. Wildfire mitigation is one consideration, as well as protection of natural resources and the wildlife corridor, as well as recreational opportunities.
174. Air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions
175. Competing funding needs for disasters
176. Funding. Support for local communities.
177. If the State of California is willing to divest its financial interests in the site there should be a benefit for future tax revenues
178. HOUSING for people
179. affordable housing, elder care, mental health education
180. See 3 and 4
181. same
182. all of #3 and #4
183. Homelessness, maybe turn some of the SDC's existing buildings and farms into a live work space where there are no restrictions on who can live and work there. Have training programs for those who want to work but have lost the industry they used to work in. This way a person or family can learn new skills live without working about the rent and can help to keep up the

facility at the same time. The farm can be used to help feed the people living there while teaching them how to farm.

184. Too many low wage jobs. People enslaved to the 1%.
185. I feel that there should be an obligation to help serve the needs of our developmentally disabled population, adhering to the original intent of the SDC site.
186. liability, political will to give up possible economic returns, decision to fund remediation and removal of buildings
187. Responding / preparing for climate change; carbon emissions, need for housing
188. Same as above
189. The lack of affordable housing throughout the State affects the quality of life for all of us.
190. as mentioned above in #3&4; job creation easily accessible without long commutes
191. Truly affordable housing
192. The impending state deficit in light of the recent economic challenge brought on by the covid19 crisis.Let no man pressure the state to
193. Same
194. loss of nature, loss of undeveloped land, place for flora and fauna to live
195. I'm even less sure about state issues. I would think the large economy here would benefit how this use would move forward, but with current administrations privatization bent, we have to fight to keep this open.
196. Same as above.
197. Political/developer collusion

198. Cost of demolition, habitat
199. Coronavirus has significantly depleted state funding options, which means project will need private financing to move forward.
200. Lack of affordable housing, mental health services, homeless services and open space/parks
201. Housing and transportation to and from housing sites
202. housing and development in the face of climate change
203. Same as above.
204. unknown
205. Jobless
206. Same as above
207. same as above
208. limited finances due to COVID
209. Demolition issues with their costs.
210. The same.
211. pressure, traffic, tourism, speed, desirability combined with very high cost of living, lack of connection to the natural world
212. housing. recreation.
213. State of California should help contribute to the Sonoma County budget for the first several years to assist the plan's success.
214. Same as above
215. Cost of living, cost of doing business, fire/natural disaster danger
216. Funding to maintain safety of property

- 217. The lack of local understanding.
- 218. Not sure how to respond to this question.
- 219. COVID- possible hospital? I have very littel knwledge of this pr0cess but I invisionthis property becoming a higher education facility or research facility.
- 220. After Covid19 there will be many
- 221. Same as 4 above.
- 222. Language barrier and economic barriers
- 223. population growth, finance
- 224. housing vs. open space
- 225. Income inequality. Affordable housing. Aging infrastructure.
- 226. (Same as above e)
- 227. CA
- 228. climate change
- 229. California
- 230. ENHANCEMENT OF NATURE AND WILDLIFE
- 231. The State of California is far more sophisticated when it comes to addressing climate change, housing, development and all the other issues. The state is committed to protecting open space, reducing GHGs through city-centered development, and sees sprawling out into the greenbelt as a primary cause of GHG emissions and VMTs. If Sonoma County would take these things seriously instead of allowing the Builders Exchange, Sonoma County Alliance, North Bay Realtors and the Farm Bureau to run the county, we would all benefit and we could perhaps actually move toward a climate

resilient future. Right now that is NOT happening, despite all the climate emergency resolutions and the establishment of the RCPA.

- 232. housing, water, fire risk, infrastructure
- 233. See response to #4.
- 234. Same as #4
- 235. Same
- 236. Local food access to address food insecurity
- 237. Housing shortage; jobs; economic recovery

6. On a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), please score each of the following as priorities for the 200-acre campus. (Note that the California Government Code already establishes the State's intent in preserving the 750-acre area around the campus as parkland and open space, and detailed planning for that will not be done as part of the Specific Plan.)

Respondents who selected "Other (please specify)":

- 1. Create an affordable, sustainable community on the campus.
- 2. Though your "Note" added to the Question #6 suggests this comment is irrelevant, I don't support that preserving the 750-acre area around the campus as parkland and open space should have been separated out from the overall SDC campus planning, but I believe the voters approved this without the option of waiting to include it within the overall SDC campus re-use discussion.
- 3. Provide community recreation services for example, a "maker house" that has a wood shop, metal shop, 3D printer, artist studios, etc, available by membership/for rental.
- 4. Relieve housing burden and homelessness
- 5. HOUSING!!

6. I would support some of these objectives if I didn't think that many of these terms are coded and will be miss-interpreted to be what proponents want them to be.
7. these questions seem framed to steer things in a certian direction, it seems like Affordabke Housing is being back-burneerd
8. Include a community center that includes sports, arts, open space, event venues, and agriculture.
9. Satellite Campus of Sonoma State focused on training for the Hospitality Industry.
10. Be a model for sustainability, and environmental protection and land use, and city planning.
11. Decouple the need for business and development from the ideas of innovation and promoting the community character of the Valley. Work toward a plan that can be an example to other communities.
12. Develop low income housing and supportive services.
13. Community Services should be a component of the area, Senior services, Homelss, immigration...the entire gambit should be included in every development
14. Creates low and middle income houseing
15. Job training and housing for the under served
16. A Performing Arts Center sounds terrific, as one is needed in our area!
17. low low income hosing
18. NO homeless sheltering at SDC campus.
19. Create an assortment of villages that are attractively designed.
20. Provides housing and overnight parking facilities for homeless folks.

21. The redevelopment objectives and plans should be based on examples of success elsewhere. I have worked in the biotech field for almost 40 years, and creating incubator sites for start ups and innovation has been tried in many places over my career with few notable successes and many significant failures - not a realistic idea for SDC in my opinion.
22. I didn't mention performing arts center needs above..but we definitely need one. The Vets Hall is too expensive and the other spaces too small. I sing in the Sonoma Valley Chorale. We need a better "home" than borrowing churches. Many groups do.
23. business as usual is a path to stasis on important social issues. Our non-profit can provide detailed plans for how to use 5 acres to address a profound social need w/o the county or cities raising bond issues to pay for it.
24. It would be wonderful to have it be a model for the US with regards to housing, or education. For example it could be a small college as well as a life care community. Pairing old with young people. Or, it could be a small college whose main focus is solving the homeless problem throughout the country, a think tank and also housing for former homeless. In any case it should be a bit of public/private much like the Presidio
25. We did have some compassion in our culture until this was dismantled.
26. All 950 acres need to be left alone
27. Give homeless people a place to live where they are not bothered by police and have basic amenities. Affordable Housing.
28. Promote the care of the people who were kicked out and restore the space to meeting the needs of the homeless, addicted and mentally unstable in our county.
29. Thank you - teacher and college professor
30. Cultural arts and business start up.

31. Serving the community of people with disabilities as well as behavioral and mental health issues.
32. Accommodates the needs of those with intellectual disabilities with higher behavioral needs who can not be served by assisted living in Sonoma County.
33. Retain historical and moral claim of disability and low-income/marginal community whom SDC was supposedly created to benefit.
34. "community character." I mostly recognize people working their butts off that can't afford to live here and retired folks that bought property for \$100k 30 years ago and pretend they live in the "country".
35. Affordable Housing
36. Decision making with representation which reflects diversity (economic, gender, ethnicity)
37. support people with developmental disabilities, as was the original intent of this resource. Adults with developmental disabilities are in desperate need of housing and services. No solutions were offered when the large state institutions were shut down. This year, the governor is proposing to cut funding for programs for adults with developmental disabilities again. We must care for this vulnerable population, today and into the future.
38. Where is housing on the list? This should be the first priority. Also, unpack "community character" of Sonoma Valley. This translates to white with a largely segregated Latino population, with little to no diversity that includes black people and other people of color.
39. Revenue generation for funding support for disabled people.
40. Housing is not mentioned. It needs to be a more focal part of this survey.
41. I agree whole heartedly with "Preserve historic resources and SDC's legacy of community care" But this would have to include the Dark Chapter in Medical History hoovering over SDC. This also includes Identifying all the

location of unclaimed remains with a catalogue of where they are in and around the County and on the SDC site, other than the cemetery.

42. Affordable housing, and environmental integrity.
43. this site should be used for dense housing, transit should connect to this area
44. Provide affordable space for Sonoma valley nonprofits and artists
45. Prioritize protecting this area as an essential wildlife corridor
46. Perhaps more support for the local arts and music, including education, studio spaces and display/performance venues..
47. Please do not make it a homeless center
48. sports/rec area, swimming pool, park with structures for kids (Think Howarth park)
49. have an oversight committee, advisory or more empowered to advise and monitor whatever management structure is given the responsibility for implementing the agreed to management plan. Consider putting the preferred management plan and alternatives to a popular vote of Sonoma Valley residents and taxpayers
50. Teaching facility for surviving the way our grandparents did.
51. find room for the homeless
52. Protection of ecological corridors
53. Strongly agree with a trust model (Presidio-style Trust) for oversight/governance on the property to ensure redevelopment adheres to the principles articulated in the draft vision and guiding principles developed for the last community engagement event put on by the SDC Coalition. This will be even more important should recent world events throw a wrench into the works and slow the disposition process.

54. any development needs to support Sonoma Valley first. Needs to be on a scale that relates to the site and the local community.
55. Create a residential learning campus for elder care
56. Preserve open space and recreational uses. Promote low-income housing and arts uses.
57. Preserve the open area with baseball field near the bridge. That vista of Sonoma Mountain is priceless and we must not lose it.
58. On the 2nd item on this list, I'm more interested in preserving SDC's legacy of community care than I am in preserving historic resources.
59. statewide firefighting training center with related housing. Housing for county employees, housing for teachers, first responders.
60. This survey is misleading in how questions are asked. For example, I care about the legacy of care but do not believe we need to preserve the older structures. It is distressing that you left out any mention of affordable housing. It is unclear until we know what is in place what the infrastructure improvements will entail. The study showed that most buildings should be torn down, hence why a need for extensive improvements?
61. Ensure that whatever development takes place, it does not generate so many car trips that results in bumper to bumper traffic already present on Hwy 12
62. No high rise housing
63. Promote renovation of historically significant buildings for use by the performing and visual arts.
64. Promote sustainable agriculture and living practices. NOTHING to do with wine please. There are plenty of wineries and areas dedicated to this. Important, but enough already !

65. Promote development that preserves the character of Glen Ellen and enhances viability of the wildlife corridor
66. Affordable housing, community health services, homeless services and open space/parks
67. open space/recreation in the hills
68. climate change
69. We are a tourist funded county! Too many people forget that that is what pays the bill, and they complain about traffic, tourists etc. We need them and should accommodate them.
70. But no more wine tasting locations
71. become a model ecological community where residents live with nature and nature is not separated from human use as "open space"
72. Mixed use/small businesses; retail, residential, restaurant, office, fitness, etc
73. car free spaces, more pedestrian uses, casual gathering spots, less campus feel, no high-rises, green renewable building & native landscape
74. No luxury hotels, retreats or facilities, no vineyards or big ag, no big development, only low rise small scale cottage development, no performance centers or big conferences. Small scale and sustainable with zero-emissions, zero-waste and limited car accesse.
75. Sdc was always an anomaly in Sonoma Valley. The redevelopment shouldn't be constrained by the "norm" in the valley. It should respect that a large complex can function as part of the community.

7. Much of the infrastructure (water, wastewater systems, roads) and buildings at SDC are in disrepair and will require extensive improvements to meet needs for new residents and workers. Which of the following uses should be considered to help pay for improvements and ensure long-term economic sustainability? Check all that apply.

Respondents who selected "Other (please specify)":

1. Local, state, and federal subsidies.
2. Not just a nature/wine-focused resort but one more broadly defined as agricultural-focused resort that could include farming and fruit trees (ie a more broadly defined agri-tourism, or farm-to-table experience). We need to diversify Sonoma Valley from it's one-crop (viticulture) focus and economy. Affordable housing should also be incorporated, perhaps as housing for employees of commercial ventures at SDC, thus reducing the infrastructure congestion that would be otherwise be exacerbated by employee commutes to/from SDC, which in a less-direct way helps to ensure long-term economic sustainability of the site (and broader Valley community) as well.
3. Who are the new residents you speak of? Have decisions already been made? It doesn't sound like it from #6 ??
4. Americorps center, enough wine tourism and resorts
5. College that is run properly (unlike most CSU schools) with a focus on teaching and sustainability. Light on top heavy administration !
6. Involve entities that enhance the vibrant natural resources surrounding the campus without over burdening the natural spaces and the neighboring town of Glen Ellen.
7. Cannabis development and low income housing.
8. Mix it up, Cultural diversity entertainment, include wine, but limiting it to wine is a poor choice, diversify...at least 3 different world interest components: Wine & Beer innovators, Local Crafts and arts Boutiques auditorium style, and programs for learning about wine beer arts and some sports bar restaurant type large.
9. I am not happy with any of these uses, but do not know of any others.
10. Please DO NOT turn this into a tourist resort, available to only the privileged

11. A University of Ca. Science type facility, one devoted to /studying animal and botanical life in our area.It can be open to the public for tours and offer classes for the educational advancement of residents in the area.
12. Keep development TO A MINIMUM.
13. State and Federal and grant/donor assistance
14. workforce housing and co-housing projects
15. I would not mind an "Asilomar-type" development - small, moderately priced, nature-oriented. This may provide low impact cash flow to fund development of the site for lower commercial potential, environmental and education purposes such as the ones I've suggested in reponse to the first question.
16. We need the county to subsidize improvements so AFFORDABLE housing can happen. Market rate housing has ruined the chances of so many to live here, NO MORE WINE CULTURE!!! Enough of that already!
17. My concern is the tendency to "drive into the future looking in the rearview mirror." If the same old sources and forces are listened to, a lot of someones will make a pile of money, no social needs pressing on the county will be addressed. Don't miss this opportunity to also do what must be done: face up to homelessness. I can be reached at terryrow1@comcast.net to make a forma presentation on how we can build & maintain small villages on a small piece of that property w/o cost to the county.
18. Think Presidio
19. Please return those who are now in jail
20. None of the above!
21. Government dollars.

22. Cut the police and sheriff budgets and put money into improvements and social sustainability.
23. Nature - NOT WINE
24. Art, culture, education, business, housing
25. Government grants and Regional Center moneys to support housing and programming for people with disabilities
26. Housing for individuals with intellectual disabilities and high behaviors, as was its original intention.
27. Taxing of corporate and individual wealth - including wineries, to provide for the needs of those discarded by the present profit-economy. Create an endowed community college or skills training facility, and fund it through endowments. Payment by air-polluters to preserve and/or increase tree-cover, thereby reducing carbon overload.
28. Resort? The community blames every other problem on tourists, so bring more?
29. Affordable Housing
30. Public/private matching funds; educational opportunities (much like SSU Osher Learning Center; amphitheater style entertainment
31. support for people with developmental disabilities
32. In moderation! Like 10% allocation. The community should have a vibrant mix of amenities in walking distance for residents.
33. Mixed use, arts, skip the exclusivity and disenfranchisement of local use by prioritizing wine or pot tourism
34. Please do not make Sonoma County the new Marin County. We do not need a Cavallo Point Resort. This county focuses so much energy on tourism. COVID-19 and climate change should refocus how we view this

- development We need mixed use with a focus on affordable housing. create another
35. Low/moderate income housing that are subsidized. Or let the State/County own the land and the developer only own the buildings.
 36. We have enough resorts and tourist sites. The area is increasingly becoming a weekend community. The development of employment and housing at SDC is an opportunity to attract people who want to live here, not just buy a weekend home.
 37. Prior to the pandemic, I would have suggested a Conference Center. Now, I am not sure about that idea. Absolutely NO resorts! This valley does not need any more.
 38. Offices & Education only. No housing and no tourism.
 39. I hope if housing is included, some affordable housing will be required.
 40. all of the above in moderation
 41. not sure what is meant by othr tourism uses?
 42. Portland Ore had a poor farm back in the 1920's. That is the future.
 43. educational/training/events center
 44. A Sonoma Institute, focused on sustainability and resilience, with a focus on wildfire recovery. Can involve the creative arts. Educational trade schools. Agriculture other than wine (we have plenty).
 45. Small creative businesses that support Sonoma Valley. Employment for local population. Don't need more wine tourism. Art gallery, Museum, small cafes, botanical garden.
 46. use coop financing, subsidized housing, and local workers
 47. Don't make improvements that can only be "paid for" for allowing commercial development. Parks! Open space!

48. I don't see this as a viable office area. We have too much wine stuff already. Art studios, wood shops, artisan space. Homes like the ones Ledson built on W. MacArthur and W. Spain in Sonoma. Nothing too dense--open space between things to maintain the natural feel and preserve trees. No gated, huge homes for the 1%. Any "market rate" homes should be 1200 sf--not much larger. Complement the neighborhood to the South so real people can afford a home.
49. State funding, bonds
50. A combination of market rate and low income housing is critical for this County. There are funding opportunities for low income housing.
51. Nature and wine together is an oxymoron.
52. Senior housing and care facilities.
53. Low income housing . Eco friendly housing with common areas to share. Let's keep tourism as shopping and resort, OUT of this area. But allow visitors to day use with hiking , biking, etc. Our hotels are underutilized .
54. I wish we could just remove everything in disrepair and reuse what can be used. I really hate to see new buildings going up in this beautiful place that sits right in the middle of the wildlife corridor. I so wish we could let it be for the plants and animals and have as little human activity there as possible, other than people simply enjoying nature. I know this is a pipe dream and, from an economic standpoint, development has to happen, but it makes me sad all the same.
55. Joining forces with such entities as Burbank housing.
56. But strict limitation on location within sites do only if part of work- live concept
57. nature and wine are put together here??? yipes. State grants should help. Not tourism, not offices, not market rate housing!!! a range of housing...a community land trust...cooperative small local businesses...farming, including hemp...a whole new economic model

58. Affordable housing
59. None of the above. Terrible choices. How about non-profit climate center, hiking and rustic camping. The state should repair the infrastructure. No one wants any of the above except for developers. How can you even put nature and wine resort as one choice? Clearly these choices are already being made behind closed doors. What about a sustainable farm school? You have to think beyond the items above!!!!
60. Institutional use, research facilities.

9. Which of the following types of housing are most desirable at SDC? (Check all that apply)

Respondents who selected "Other (please specify)":

1. Existing dormitories are adaptable for housing.
2. Allow the re-use of some of the historic houses/structures as residential housing and live/work units, as well as some of the historic houses to become "resort" overnight accommodations.
3. With respect to #8 (which does not have a write-in option) I don't believe any of these solutions meet my expectations for how historic resources should be treated. Again, the phrasing seems coded to get responses that will support the proponents' position
4. deed-restricted housing for lower AMI renters and owners; also, to comment on #8, historic preservation people should not be allowed to dominate the discussion of buildings,
5. Convert dormitories to student housing and married student housing and staff housing (rents paid !)
6. Innovative lower income housing that that recognizes the value of each person regardless income or status.
7. I would really like to see us have some homeless housing created.

8. Job training, counseling and housing
9. In addition to the above, people with very limited incomes and people without income who are homeless, who are willing to provide upkeep of their own dwellings, immediate neighborhoods, could be offered housing there. They could join forces, share talents of the upkeep, and it would be self-sustaining, once established. Some one or a group would have to monitor, supervise this, but it's an idea. The people living there would be able to gain new skills in job-training too! g
10. NO significant additional development!!! NO GALLAHER!!!
11. A mix of 40 to 100 unit tiny homes villages, based on demographics (senior, family with kids, singles, women only, etc.
12. RV Parking w/ hookups for electricity, water and sewer!!!
13. Housing for county and city employees only
14. Duplex or quad homes. No higher than 3 stories or less!
15. housing specifically for low-income residents, including homeless.
16. Put them back
17. None!!!!
18. At least five Tiny home villages of 30-60 individuals each, similar to Los Guilicos village
19. Housing for homeless especially all of them. The historic preservations shouldn't just be about the looks of the property but also about the historic use.
20. Park (like for biking, hiking, walking, basketball, street hockey, softball, baseball...swimming... HEALTHY activities. COMMUNITY CENTER, COLLEGE TYPE FACILITY, NOT HOUSing...COVID?

21. Art studios, classrooms, amphitheater, conference rooms, meeting halls, art gallery
22. Housing and programming for clients with disabilities .
23. Housing for individuals with intellectual disabilities and higher behavioral needs that are being warehoused in other counties and separated from their families.
24. Safe parking, safe camping and tiny house settings for homeless people. Subsidized assisted community based living (apartments) fro people with developmental disabilities - integrated into community as a whole. Transitional housing for people reentering from institutionalization and incarceration. Skilled nursing facilities.
25. Build housing so the working class in Sonoma Valley and County can actually live here. Otherwise, the affordable housing gap will only continue to get worse.
26. Housing for people with developmental disabilities. A mixed housing community could also support employees working for agencies that provide supportive services and/or families of adults with developmental disabilities.
27. Literally all of the above. Do not make it a monolithic, segregated community of anyone. Re: historic preservation, remember there is a dark history of the place. When framing historic preservation, be sure to include the legacy of forced sterilization, eugenics, etc. among the other histories of the place.
28. Tiny home or single apartment courtyards
29. All of the above! With a focus on providing affordable housing.
30. Please add housing for persons with disabilities along with senior housing. Also low income subsidized housing.
31. Live/work units for artists.

32. None
33. hospice house/assisted living spaces
34. Civil Conservation Corp
35. Housing that adheres to high standards of energy and water efficiency, integrate reused, low-toxicity, fire-resistant materials. Incorporate fire-ecology into the planning.
36. Nothing taller than two stories. Anything new should be low-profile, like what's on the property now. Housing specifically for seniors or veterans may not need to be specified if affordable housing is prioritized. Seniors, veterans, and others should be able to afford it. No trophy homes or second homes; we've got enough of those.
37. cluster housing with mixed ages and cultural diversity
38. Low income housing!
39. Housing for county employees, housing for teachers, first responders.
40. Co-housing for disabled
41. Cottage Courtyards
42. Camping for underprivileged kids to come stay in a grant or paid program. Build GREEN housing or office wherever possible.
43. housing for those with low and very low income, and the homeless. Development should be replete with treatment facilities.
44. townhomes in one area where there is also local business, kind of a village in the campus center
45. Cottage housing for low income and non-profit workers in existing footprint. Nothing else.

9. Optional: What is your relationship with the SDC site? (check all that apply)

Respondents who selected “Other (please specify)”:

1. I am one of the millions of owners.
2. I did a historic resource study of the campus in 2008-2014
3. I'm a valley citizen, I should have as much say as anyone else; my wife worked there
4. I take some of my Environmental Science students up there in the hills behind the center to see interesting natural elements
5. My clients use to live at SDC
6. It is a very special place with beautiful grounds in a peaceful setting!
7. co-founder of new non-profit dedicated to housing the homeless.
8. I live in Sonoma County and, as a person with a disability, feel very connected to the history. I've known people who worked there as well as people who had family members in residence.
9. I have worked with clients who lived on site through the Northern Star program
10. My son was a client at Northern Star facility before it was moved offsite. He did very well in the program, then was moved to Telecare in Vacaville, where he has sustained verified abuse by staff (including punishment such as throwing him outside naked in the winter) and verified sexual abuse, and has made it very difficult for him to interact with family members. His mental health and overall well being has greatly diminished since leaving. I have been strongly advocating to get him back into Sonoma County and to address the issue of warehousing adults in other counties do to financial reasons. To dismantle a site like SDC without providing other structural systems to meet the needs of those individuals that it served is unethical, and talk of wineries or tourism must take a back seat to the needs of the clients who have been harmed by this gap in services.

11. My son had a severe developmental disability (autism), and was able to live independently with community based support services, here in Sonoma County. I worked for 25 years as an advocate for senior citizens and people with disabilities in Sonoma County.
12. I work at Sonoma Ecology Center, on the SDC campus and my dad worked at SDC for 30+ years
13. Friends and family of friends were clients
14. I have friends that lost family members there under suspicious circumstances.
15. I'm in love with the place.
16. Glen Ellen resident for fifty years
17. Am co-chair of SDC Campus Project study group
18. As a native Sonoman, Eldridge and SDC are integral to our valley. It emerges respect for it's history and natural assets. Many of my family worked there . It offers natural beauty and i relax knowing that it is an animal corridor preserved. Our wildlife deserves to be respected in any changes made.
19. Advocate for those with special needs.
20. 30 year resident of Sonoma Valley, environmentalist, naturalist, advocate

13. Optional: Have you been involved in other visioning or outreach activities focused on SDC's future?

Respondents who selected "If yes, which ones?":

1. Last four years. Most recently, community meeting at Hanna Boys Center
2. Attended a meeting awhile back at local library.
3. Only indirectly through my organization

4. Zoom webinars in April. Discussions with Susan Gorin and James Gore
5. I helped organize the Glen Ellen Forum's workshop in April 2018 and the SDC Coalition's visioning workshop in June 2019. I've been active on a variety of fronts aside from those events, including writing articles for local newspapers, working with the Glen Ellen Forum, Sonoma Mountain Preservation, and the SDC Coalition's Leadership Team.
6. Meetings at Hanna Center and picnics at Mortons hot Springs and GE Forum meetings
7. SDC Campus Project, community meeting for four years
8. Only to offer written opinion.. following the website for info.
9. Simply communicating with Supervisor Gorin
10. All that are open to the public. None that are invite-only by consultants and insiders and friends of Sup. Gorin.

14. Optional: Are you involved with any local community groups that might be interested in participating in the SDC planning process?

1. Sonoma Valley Housing Group
2. Not at this time.
3. Yes: Sonoma Ecology Center and Sustainable Sonoma
4. no
5. I am a board member for both the Glen Ellen Forum and Sonoma Mountain Preservation
6. Yes
7. Yes. SDC Campus Project
8. Thank you for this survey.

9. Yes, many: Greenbelt Alliance, Sierra Club, Sonoma County Conservation Action, Everybody is a Star, Sonoma Valley Housing Group, Preserve Rural Sonoma County, many others who have never been invited to participate.