

## Liz Goebel

---

**From:** Chad Barksdale <cbarksdale@schoolbusing.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 29, 2022 10:40 PM  
**To:** Liz Goebel  
**Cc:** Steve Petcavich; mmachi@ebagroup.com; David Zaro; Blake Hillegas; Tasha Levitt  
**Subject:** Re: West County Transportation - Planning Commission Materials Packet - January 5, 2023

### EXTERNAL

Blake, et al,

As I mentioned in our phone conversation, I disagree with the County's position on conditions 37 and 43. As I also mentioned, this project has been hijacked without consideration of our Agency. We have received unfair treatment since this review process began. It is disappointing that the County has not taken any accountability in this process and has caused increased costs of taxpayers money in the several hundreds of thousands due to an County "error" and a significant redesign after already receiving approval. Furthermore, the staff report provides little to no information we have provided for justifications on our proposed solutions to these two condition concerns.

Condition 37 makes our Agency vulnerable to litigation due to the property being open for public trespass as well as additional costs for security and maintenance. There is 8' berm, drainage ditch, bio retention area, and numerous other potential hazards that will be unprotected and open for trespassers and damage. This site has had a chain link fence on the north side property line for as long as anyone can remember (over 10 years). Why can't we extend the current condition and fence? It doesn't seem equitable for the County to allow a neighboring property owner to install a 10' or less chain link fence on the property lines without permits to protect their property, but we are being restricted from doing the same.

This restriction or alternative fence location does not take into consideration the liabilities, ability to obtain proper insurance coverage, the provided proof of past theft/vandalism, or ongoing homelessness problems in the area. This condition and restrictions are being proposed as an accommodation without merit or justifiable reason.

The County's proposed condition 43 takes zero consideration of our Agency's needs or efforts to find resolution. Our resubmitted/proposed security lighting plan is our effort to find a solution to a problem that has no real industry standards. Consideration of access to the property, what is being stored, vulnerabilities, and past issues need to be considered. Two motion activated security lights do not provide any protection and is simply invaluable. Where do you put the motion sensors? Do we put them on the exposed north and west sides, or on all sides for two 16 foot lights facing south with back shields? What would these proposed lights secure?

I have provided significant evidence of past theft, vandalism, homelessness situations, and vulnerability to this site. Again, the proposed restrictions to the security lighting is an accommodation without merit and consideration to the factual data provided by our Agency.

Hopefully the Planning Division will reconsider their position and the Planning Commission will take action based on the data provided and not opinions or accommodations.

Chad Barksdale

On Dec 29, 2022, at 8:24 AM, Liz Goebel <Liz.Goebel@sonoma-county.org> wrote:

Good morning!

The following is a link to the DRH22-0008 materials packet in preparation for next week's Planning Commission meeting:



Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you!

**Liz Goebel**

She/Her

Administrative Assistant

County of Sonoma

Planning Division | Project Review

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403

**(707) 565-1947**

[www.PermitSonoma.org](http://www.PermitSonoma.org)

[<image001.png>](#)

[<image002.png>](#)

[<image003.png>](#)

[<image004.png>](#)

[<image005.jpg>](#)

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.