

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

From: dormanleadership@gmail.com <dormanleadership@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, April 17, 2023 1:48 PM

To: DesignReview <DesignReview@sonoma-county.org>

Subject: Kenwood Ranch Winery

EXTERNAL

Given the minimum amount of time provided for a thoughtful and thorough review of addendum number two related to the Kenwood Ranch winery, I respectfully request an extension of time for that public review prior to further consideration by the design review committee.

Timothy Dorman

Managing Partner

Dorman Leadership Group

415 407 1410 ((o/m))

Sent from my iPhone

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED OUTSIDE OF THE SONOMA COUNTY EMAIL SYSTEM.

Warning: If you don't know this email sender or the email is unexpected, do not click any web links, attachments, and never give out your user ID or password.

From: [Chris Koch](#)
To: ["Roger Peters"](#); [Tennis Wick](#)
Cc: [Susan Gorin](#); g_carr@sbcglobal.net; [Caitlin Cornwall](#); [Scott Orr](#); [Derik Michaelson](#); [Hannah Spencer](#); [Georgia McDaniel](#)
Subject: RE: DRH21-0010: Kenwood RanchWinery--Request for Public Circulation and Rescheduling of DRC Hearing
Date: Monday, April 17, 2023 2:19:05 PM

Dear Director Wick,

I support the request made below to give the community time to properly review the documents behind this agenda item.

Chris Koch
Kenwood

From: Roger Peters <rjp2ca@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2023 3:23 PM
To: tennis.wick@sonoma-county.org
Cc: susan.gorin@sonoma-county.org; g_carr@sbcglobal.net; caitlin.cornwall@sonoma-county.org; scott.orr@sonoma-county.org; derik.michaelson@sonoma-county.org; hannah.spencer@sonoma-county.org; georgia.mcdaniel@sonoma-county.org;
Subject: DRH21-0010: Kenwood RanchWinery--Request for Public Circulation and Rescheduling of DRC Hearing

Director Wick,

Yesterday Permit Sonoma posted the Agenda for the April 19th Design Review Committee (DRC) hearing. The only item scheduled is the Kenwood Ranch Winery (DRH21-0010). For the reasons outlined below, the Valley of the Moon Alliance (VOTMA) requests that the hearing scheduled for next week be taken off calendar, and that the proposed Addendum #2 be circulated for 30 days for public review and comment along with the Initial Study that was included as an Attachment to Addendum #2.

The proposed Kenwood Ranch Winery was approved more than 16 years ago, with two major fires and a significant drought intervening. Addendum #2 is proposed to be considered with less than a week for public review. Such a hyper accelerated review is not warranted given the passage of time here, those severe events, and in view of the very lengthy documentation that has just been released. In its recent operational review PS committed to increased public transparency. It should start here by circulating Addendum #2 for public

comment, or at least providing adequate time for interested parties to review and react to the lengthy documentation. The hearing on this matter should be scheduled at a time following that review period and the opportunity for the public to comment on Addendum #2 and associated documents..

That the documentation issued yesterday is considerable is hardly contestable. The documents posted for review consisted of the Staff Report and 17 attachments. Included in those attachments as Attachment 5 was proposed Addendum #2 to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Sonoma Country Inn project (the predecessor name for what is now known as the Kenwood Ranch Inn and Winery). Addendum #2 (Attachment 5) in turn includes 37 attachments. Notably, Attachments 21-23 of Attachment #5 consist of Volumes 1-3 of the Initial Study for the Winery, prepared by ESA. Those volumes, first seeing the light of day yesterday and dated February 2023, consist of 1368 pages. Addendum #2 itself is 43 pages.

In addition, Attachment #26 to Addendum #2 is a "Tree Construction and Fire Impacts Summary" dated January 13, 2023. That Summary in turn references 4 prior reports by the retained Arborist for the project, which were prepared in 2021-23 and appear to assess the direct impacts of the Glass Fire on the project site. VOTMA had previously inquired multiple times of PS staff as to the existence of any such reports and was not told of or given access to those reports. That information is directly relevant to condition compliance for both the Winery and the Inn/Spa/Restaurant, and for assessing evacuation and visual screening issues relevant to the Winery project. The various reports referenced in Attachment 26 are not part of the documents released yesterday and VOTMA specifically requests here that they be made available publicly as quickly as possible.

Thank you for considering this request that 1) the public be given ample time to review the relevant material and submit comments, and 2) the hearing on this matter be rescheduled to occur after that period has passed.

Regards,

Roger Peters

Roger Peters
VOTMA

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED OUTSIDE OF THE SONOMA COUNTY EMAIL SYSTEM.

Warning: If you don't know this email sender or the email is unexpected,
do not click any web links, attachments, and **never** give out your user ID or password.



LAW OFFICES OF TINA WALLIS

3558 Round Barn Boulevard, Suite 200
Santa Rosa, California 95403

tel (707) 595-8681
website www.twallislaw.com

April 17, 2023

Hanna Spencer
Georgia McDaniel
Sonoma County
Permit Sonoma/PRMD
2250 Ventura Blvd.
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

RE: File No. DRH 21 – 001
APN: 051-260-013

Dear Ms. Spencer and Ms. McDaniel:

The purpose of this letter is to object to the Valley of the Moon Association's (VOTMA) April 14, 2023 request that the design review hearing, currently set for April 19, 2023, be continued because: (i) circulating an addendum is contrary to the plain language of CEQA; (ii) circulating an addendum is contrary to the legislative policy behind CEQA; and (iii) all of the documents except the staff report, addendum, and a five page memo have been public records and available to the public for some time. VOTMA knows about the Public Records Act, as it previously submitted Public Records Act requests to Sonoma County.

CEQA expressly prohibits any "interpretation which imposes procedural or substantive requirements beyond those explicitly stated in this division or in the state guidelines." (Pub. Res. Code, § 21083.1.) VOTMA asked the County to require a 30 day circulation period for a CEQA addendum. Under the plain language of CEQA, there is no circulation period for an addendum. (14 Cal. Code Regs., §15064, subd. (c).) Requiring a 30 day circulation period where no procedural requirement exists in CEQA or the CEQA Guidelines, fails to comport with the plain language of CEQA. The County has no discretion to require a 30 day circulation period for an addendum.

One legislative policy, which was adopted when CEQA was enacted states:

All persons and public agencies involved in the environmental review process be responsible for carrying out the process in the most efficient, expeditious manner in order to conserve the available financial, governmental, physical, and social resources with the objective that those resources may be better applied toward the mitigation of actual significant effects on the environment.

Hanna Spencer
 Georgia McDaniel
 RE: DRH 21-001
 Date: April 17, 2023
 Page 2 of 7

(Pub. Res. Code, § 21003, subd. (f).) Requiring a circulation or delaying *design review* consideration of a project with a vested use permit does not comport with the legislative policy requiring the County to carry out the CEQA process in the most efficient and expeditious manner. In addition to contravening legislative policy adopted as part of CEQA, delaying consideration of this design review application will discourage applicants from going above and beyond, as occurred here with this applicant as they expended significant time and money resources to address wildfire and evacuation issues even though the County could not require it.

I included two tables in this letter. The first table, lists the attachments to the staff report and when those attachments became a public record. As you can see, except for the addendum and a five-page letter from Fehr & Peers, all of the attachments have been public records for some time. Some attachments have been public records for literally decades. The second table, lists the attachments to the addendum. Every attachment to the addendum has been a public record for at least two months and some have been public records for decades.

Only the 17 page staff report, 43 page addendum, and 5 page letter from Fehr & Peers were available for the first time on April 14, 2023.

Staff Report Attachments:

No.	<i>Description</i>	Date document became a public record
1	<i>Kenwood Ranch: Winery Design Review Project Description, December 21, 2021</i>	12/2021
2	<i>The Winery at Kenwood Ranch plan set, dated 12/19/21, which includes:</i> Colors and Materials Site Plans Driveway Plans Grading & Erosion Control Plans Utility Plan Stormwater Control Plan Landscape & Planting Plans Architectural Floor Plans Architectural Elevations & Sections Landscape Lighting Plans & Cut Sheets	12/2021

Hanna Spencer
 Georgia McDaniel
 RE: DRH 21-001
 Date: April 17, 2023
 Page 3 of 7

3	Fehr & Peers, Kenwood Ranch Winery Site Plan Review, March 15, 2023	4/2023
4	BOS Final Conditions of Approval for the Winery (PLP01-0006, 11-2-2004)	11/2004
5	County of Sonoma Permit and Resource Management Department, <i>Draft Addendum 2 to the Final Environmental Impact Report for Sonoma Country Inn, March 2023</i>	4/2023
6	County of Sonoma Permit and Resource Management Department, <i>Revised Addendum 1 to the Final Environmental Impact Report for Sonoma Country Inn, March 2018</i>	3/2018
7	Impacts That Were Fully Mitigated (Exhibit A of BOS Resolution No. 04-1037)	11/2004
8	Impacts That Could Not Be Fully Mitigated (Exhibit B of BOS Resolution No. 04-1037)	11/2004
9	Statement of Overriding Considerations (Exhibit C of BOS Resolution No. 04-1037)	11/2004
10	Nichols + Berman, <i>Sonoma Country Inn Final Environmental Impact Report – Response to Comments, February 2004.</i>	11/2004
11	SVCAC Minutes for January 25, 2023 Meeting	1/2023
12	Response Letter from Tina Wallis to SVCAC, dated February 9, 2023	2/2023
13	SVCAC Minutes for February 22, 2023 Meeting	2/2023
14	Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation & Open Space District Approval Letter, June 10, 2022	6/2022
15	<i>Letters to Georgia McDaniel, Permit Sonoma, from Law Offices of Tina Wallis, Inc., March 16, 2023 and March 23, 2023</i>	3/2023
16	Public Comments	N/A
17	<i>Vegetation Management Plan Campagna Report (Sonoma Country Inn, Kenwood, Sonoma County, California, March 10, 2009</i>	2011 (recorded)

Addendum Attachments:

No.	Description	Date document became a public record
1	Kenwood Ranch: <i>Design Review Project Description with Winery Layout Comparison</i> (2004 conceptual layout and 2022 proposed layout)	7/2022
2	<i>Revised addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Sonoma Country Inn, County of Sonoma PRMD, March, 2018.</i>	3/2018
3	<i>The Winery at Kenwood Ranch Design Review Plan Set dated December 23, 2021</i>	12/21
4	<i>Sonoma Country Inn: Water Use Information, dated February 14, 2017, Adobe Associates, Inc.</i>	2/2017
5	<i>Sonoma Country Inn: Water Use Information, dated May 1, 2017, Adobe Associates, Inc.</i>	5/2017
6	<i>Hydrogeologic Report for Adequacy of Groundwater Supplies for the Proposed Sonoma Country Inn Kenwood Area, Sonoma County, California, April 2009, Richard C. Slade Associates LLC Consulting Groundwater Geologists.</i>	4/2009
7	<i>Addendum Geotechnical Consultation, Sonoma Country Inn, Kenwood, California, dated January 30, 2017, Bauer Associates, Inc. Geotechnical Engineers.</i>	3/2018
8	<i>Geotechnical Consultant, Addendum 2 – Post Nuns Fire, Lot 13, Sonoma Country Inn, dated February 5, 2018, Bauer Associates, Inc. Geotechnical Engineers.</i>	3/2018
9	<i>Letter to Georgia McDaniel, Permit Sonoma, from Law Offices of Tina Wallis, Inc., March 16, 2023.</i>	3/2023
10	<i>Letter to Georgia McDaniel, Permit Sonoma, from Law Offices of Tina Wallis, Inc., March 23, 2023.</i>	3/2023
11	<i>Review of Traffic Issues Relative to the Sonoma Country Inn Project, dated May 25, 2017, W-Trans.</i>	3/2018
12	<i>Response to Comments in Appeal of Approval of the Sonoma Country Inn Project, September 14, 2017, W-Trans.</i>	3/2018

13	<i>Memorandum</i> to Flora Li from James MacNair, MacNair & Associates, regarding Parking Lot Tree Protection, dated March 16, 2017.	3/2018
14	<i>The Resort at Sonoma Country Inn Supplemental Visual Impact Analysis</i> , dated February 3, 2017, prepared by MacNair Landscape Architecture.	3/2018
15	<i>Memorandum</i> from James MacNair, MacNair and Associates, to Flora Li, dated July 10, 2017, regarding PRMD Tree Removal Response.	3/2018
16	Letter from James MacNair, MacNair and Associates, to Flora Li, dated September 19, 2017, regarding Response to VOTMA Appeal Issues.	3/2018
17	Letter from James MacNair, MacNair and Associates, to Flora Li, dated November 28, 2017 documenting wildfire impacts to existing vegetation.	3/2018
18	Letter from WRA Environmental Consultants to Flora Li regarding Northern spotted owl assessment for the Resort at Sonoma Country Inn project, Kenwood, California, dated March 6, 2017.	3/2018
19	Sonoma Country Inn Environmental Impact Report, certified May 2004, SCH No. 2002052011.	11/2004
20	Sonoma County Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 04-1037, dated November 2, 2004, with exhibits.	11/2004
21	<i>2022 Kenwood Ranch Winery Project, Initial Study (Volume 1 of 3)</i> , dated February 2023, prepared by ESA	7/2022, revised on 2/2023
22	<i>2022 Kenwood Ranch Winery Project, Initial Study (Volumes 2 and 3, Appendices A-X)</i> , dated February 2023. prepared by ESA	7/2022, revised on 2/2023
23	<i>Acoustics Conditions of Approval Study</i> dated June 2022, prepared by Salter	7/2022
24	<i>The Kenwood Ranch Winery Design Review Visibility Impacts</i> , prepared by MacNair Landscape Architecture	7/2022
25	SCAPOSD Letter to Kenwood Ranch, LLC dated June 10, 2022	6/2022
26	<i>The Kenwood Ranch Winery – Tree Construction and Fire Impact Summary</i> (MacNair & Associates, January 13, 2023)	1/2023

27	Lucy Macmillan Letter to Ms. Tina Wallis, dated December 15, 2023, regarding potential impacts to habitat	1/2023
28	R. Giordano Consulting and Investigations and Clint Shubel letter to Tina Wallis, dated June 27, 2022, regarding Kenwood Winery/the Kenwood Ranch property evacuation recommendations during construction	7/2022
29	<i>Kenwood Winery Construction Fire Protection Plan</i> , June 27 2022, prepared by Losh and Associates	7/2022
30	R. Giordano Consulting and Investigations and Clint Shubel letter to Tina Wallis, dated June 22, 2022, regarding recommendations for evacuation planning and shelter-in-place considerations at Kenwood Winery during a disaster	7/2022
31	<i>Kenwood Winery Evacuation Plan</i> , dated June 22, 2022, prepared by Losh and Associates	7/2022
32	<i>Kenwood Winery Additional Operational Evacuation Measures</i> , dated February 6, 2023, prepared by CAS Safety Consulting LLC	2/2023
33	<i>Kenwood Winery Construction and Operational Recommendations List</i> , dated February 5, 2023, prepared by CAS Safety Consulting LLC	2/2023
34	<i>Kenwood Winery Wildfire Assessment</i> , February 2, 2023, prepared by flameMapper	2/2023
35	Kenwood Ranch Winery - AG Wilfire Guidance Response (Water Supply, Power, Utilities), prepared by Adobe Associates, Inc.	2/2023
36	<i>Best Practices for Analyzing and Mitigating Wildfire Impacts of Development Projects Under the California Environmental Quality Act</i> , prepared by State of California Attorney General's Office	10/2022
37	<i>Kenwood Estates winery Evacuation Travel Time Assessment</i> , June 27, 2022, prepared by Fehr & Peers	7/2022

Hanna Spencer
Georgia McDaniel
RE: DRH 21-001
Date: April 17, 2023
Page 7 of 7

Given that only 65 pages of documents were available to the public for the first time on April 14, 2023 for an April 19, 2023 hearing, the applicant objects to VOTMA's continuance request and respectfully requests that the County follow the law and not impose procedural requirements beyond those set forth in CEQA and that the County comport with the legislative policy of complying with CEQA in the most expeditious manner possible.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this letter.

Very truly yours,



Tina M. Wallis,
Law offices of Tina Wallis

From: [Edith Perez](#)
To: [Georgia McDaniel](#)
Subject: Permit Sonoma File DRH2110010: fully in favor!
Date: Saturday, April 15, 2023 1:57:56 PM

EXTERNAL

Hello:

This is to share my full support for the approval of the permit application for design modifications of the parcel located at 1180 Campagna Lane in Kenwood (APN 051-260-013. Supervisorial District 1).

I received the informational pages for the public meeting April 19, but as I cannot attend in person wanted to express my full support for speedy approval.

We in Kenwood need new businesses, options of things to do, and tax revenue.

We need the planned Kenwood Ranch Winery to be built and become operational. I hope that you and all members of the County can quickly approve all requested modifications. Delays will just continue to hurt our property values and happiness as residents of Kenwood.

Thanks,

Edith A. Perez, M.D.
1515 Lawndale Rd
Kenwood, CA 95452
Mobile: 1-904-716-4579

Sent from my iPhone

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED OUTSIDE OF THE SONOMA COUNTY EMAIL SYSTEM.

Warning: If you don't know this email sender or the email is unexpected, do not click any web links, attachments, and never give out your user ID or password.

From: dormanleadership@gmail.com
To: [Roger Peters](#)
Cc: [Tennis Wick](#); [Susan Gorin](#); g_carr@sbcglobal.net; [Caitlin Cornwall](#); [Scott Orr](#); [Derik Michaelson](#); [Hannah Spencer](#); [Georgia McDaniel](#); twallis@twallislaw.com
Subject: Re: DRH21-0010: Kenwood RanchWinery--Request for Public Circulation and Rescheduling of DRC Hearing
Date: Friday, April 14, 2023 6:57:59 PM

Roger,
Superb.
Grateful thanks,
Tim

Timothy Dorman
Managing Partner
Dorman Leadership Group
415 407 1410 ((o/m)
Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 14, 2023, at 3:23 PM, Roger Peters <rjp2ca@aol.com> wrote:

Director Wick,

Yesterday Permit Sonoma posted the Agenda for the April 19th Design Review Committee (DRC) hearing. The only item scheduled is the Kenwood Ranch Winery (DRH21-0010). For the reasons outlined below, the Valley of the Moon Alliance (VOTMA) requests that the hearing scheduled for next week be taken off calendar, and that the proposed Addendum #2 be circulated for 30 days for public review and comment along with the Initial Study that was included as an Attachment to Addendum #2.

The proposed Kenwood Ranch Winery was approved more than 16 years ago, with two major fires and a significant drought intervening. Addendum #2 is proposed to be considered with less than a week for public review. Such a hyper accelerated review is not warranted given the passage of time here, those severe events, and in view of the very lengthy documentation that has just been released. In its recent operational review PS committed to increased public transparency. It should start here by circulating Addendum #2 for

public comment, or at least providing adequate time for interested parties to review and react to the lengthy documentation. The hearing on this matter should be schedule at a time following that review period and the opportunity for the public to comment on Addendum #2 and associated documents..

That the documentation issued yesterday is considerable is hardly contestable. The documents posted for review consisted of the Staff Report and 17 attachments. Included in those attachments as Attachment 5 was proposed Addendum #2 to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Sonoma Country Inn project (the predecessor name for what is now known as the Kenwood Ranch Inn and Winery). Addendum #2 (Attachment 5) in turn includes 37 attachments. Notably, Attachments 21-23 of Attachment #5 consist of Volumes 1-3 of the Initial Study for the Winery, prepared by ESA. Those volumes, first seeing the light of day yesterday and dated February 2023, consist of 1368 pages. Addendum #2 itself is 43 pages.

In addition, Attachment #26 to Addendum #2 is a "Tree Construction and Fire Impacts Summary" dated January 13, 2023. That Summary in turn references 4 prior reports by the retained Arborist for the project, which were prepared in 2021-23 and appear to assess the direct impacts of the Glass Fire on the project site. VOTMA had previously inquired multiple time of PS staff as to the existence of any such reports and was not told of or given access to those reports. That information is directly relevant to condition compliance for both the Winery and the Inn/Spa/Restaurant, and for assessing evacuation and visual screening issues relevant to the Winery project. The various reports referenced in Attachment 26 are not part of the documents released yesterday and VOTMA specifically requests here that they be made available publicly as quickly as possible.

Thank you for considering this request that 1) the public be given ample time to review the relevant material and submit comments, and 2) the hearing on this matter be rescheduled to occur after that period has passed.

Regards,

Roger Peters

Roger Peters
VOTMA

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED OUTSIDE OF THE SONOMA COUNTY EMAIL SYSTEM.

Warning: If you don't know this email sender or the email is unexpected,
do not click any web links, attachments, and **never** give out your user ID or password.

From: [Roger Peters](#)
To: [Tennis Wick](#)
Cc: [Susan Gorin](#); g_carr@sbcglobal.net; [Caitlin Cornwall](#); [Scott Orr](#); [Derik Michaelson](#); [Hannah Spencer](#); [Georgia McDaniel](#); twallis@twallislaw.com
Subject: DRH21-0010: Kenwood Ranch Winery--Request for Public Circulation and Rescheduling of DRC Hearing
Date: Friday, April 14, 2023 3:23:31 PM

Director Wick,

Yesterday Permit Sonoma posted the Agenda for the April 19th Design Review Committee (DRC) hearing. The only item scheduled is the Kenwood Ranch Winery (DRH21-0010). For the reasons outlined below, the Valley of the Moon Alliance (VOTMA) requests that the hearing scheduled for next week be taken off calendar, and that the proposed Addendum #2 be circulated for 30 days for public review and comment along with the Initial Study that was included as an Attachment to Addendum #2.

The proposed Kenwood Ranch Winery was approved more than 16 years ago, with two major fires and a significant drought intervening. Addendum #2 is proposed to be considered with less than a week for public review. Such a hyper accelerated review is not warranted given the passage of time here, those severe events, and in view of the very lengthy documentation that has just been released. In its recent operational review PS committed to increased public transparency. It should start here by circulating Addendum #2 for public comment, or at least providing adequate time for interested parties to review and react to the lengthy documentation. The hearing on this matter should be schedule at a time following that review period and the opportunity for the public to comment on Addendum #2 and associated documents..

That the documentation issued yesterday is considerable is hardly contestable. The documents posted for review consisted of the Staff Report and 17 attachments. Included in those attachments as Attachment 5 was proposed Addendum #2 to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Sonoma Country Inn project (the predecessor name for what is now known as the Kenwood Ranch Inn and Winery). Addendum #2 (Attachment 5) in turn includes 37 attachments. Notably, Attachments 21-23 of Attachment #5 consist of Volumes 1-3 of the Initial Study for the Winery, prepared by ESA. Those volumes, first seeing the light of day yesterday and dated February 2023, consist of 1368 pages. Addendum #2 itself is 43 pages.

In addition, Attachment #26 to Addendum #2 is a "Tree Construction and Fire Impacts Summary" dated January 13, 2023. That Summary in turn references 4 prior reports by the retained Arborist for the project, which were prepared in 2021-23 and appear to assess the direct impacts of the Glass Fire on the project site. VOTMA had previously inquired multiple times of PS staff as to the existence of any such reports and was not told of or given access to those reports. That information is directly relevant to condition compliance for both the Winery and the Inn/Spa/Restaurant, and for assessing evacuation and visual screening issues relevant to the Winery project. The various reports referenced in Attachment 26 are not part of the documents released yesterday and VOTMA specifically requests here that they be made available publicly as quickly as possible.

Thank you for considering this request that 1) the public be given ample time to review the relevant material and submit comments, and 2) the hearing on this matter be rescheduled to occur after that period has passed.

Regards,

Roger Peters

Roger Peters
VOTMA

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED OUTSIDE OF THE SONOMA COUNTY EMAIL SYSTEM.
Warning: If you don't know this email sender or the email is unexpected,
do not click any web links, attachments, and **never** give out your user ID or password.