

From: [Roger Peters](#)
To: [Georgia McDaniel](#)
Subject: Re: DRH21-0010 KP Winery
Date: Monday, January 10, 2022 4:32:09 PM

EXTERNAL

Thanks very much.

R

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

From: Georgia McDaniel <Georgia.McDaniel@sonoma-county.org>
To: 'Roger Peters' <rjp2ca@aol.com>
Sent: Mon, Jan 10, 2022 4:17 pm
Subject: RE: DRH21-0010 KP Winery

Hi Roger,

Per your request, Resolution 04-1037 is attached.

Kind regards,
Georgia

Georgia McDaniel, MCP, RLA
Planner III



Due to the Public Health Orders, online tools remain the best and fastest way to access Permit Sonoma's services like permitting, records, scheduling inspections, and general questions. You can find out more about our extensive online services at PermitSonoma.org.

The Permit Center has reopened with limited capacity and modified hours. Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday: 9:00 AM – 1:00 PM; Wednesday, 12:00 PM – 4:00 PM.

Thank you for your patience as we work to keep staff and the community safe.

From: Roger Peters <rjp2ca@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2022 4:13 PM
To: Georgia McDaniel <Georgia.McDaniel@sonoma-county.org>
Subject: DRH21-0010 KP Winery

Hi Georgia,

I am looking at the Kenwood Ranch Design Review Referral materials. I don't have access to a needed document--the BOS Resolution in 2004 denying the VOTMA appeal and approving the use permit. The Resolution # is 04-1037. If you can send me a copy I would appreciate it. If you can direct me to where I can find it on line that would work too. I didn't have luck on Permit History getting to a document.

thanks.

Roger

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.

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: [Georgia McDaniel](#)
To: ["C Ferguson"](#)
Subject: RE: Kenwood Ranch
Date: Tuesday, January 11, 2022 5:03:13 PM

Hi Colleen,

We are reviewing the project in accordance with the Conditions of Approval and will save your comments to the public record. We're too early in the application review to answer specific technical questions at this time.

Kind regards,
Georgia

Georgia McDaniel, MCP, RLA
Planner III

Due to the Public Health Orders, online tools remain the best and fastest way to access Permit Sonoma's services like permitting, records, scheduling inspections, and general questions. You can find out more about our extensive online services at PermitSonoma.org.

The Permit Center has reopened with limited capacity and modified hours. Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday: 9:00 AM – 1:00 PM; Wednesday, 12:00 PM – 4:00 PM.

Thank you for your patience as we work to keep staff and the community safe.

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

From: C Ferguson <nebulous@sonic.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 11, 2022 1:32 PM
To: Georgia McDaniel <Georgia.McDaniel@sonoma-county.org>
Subject: Re: Kenwood Ranch

EXTERNAL

Hi Georgia,

Thank you for the reply and the very helpful information. The conditions refer to the 2005 California Energy Efficiency Building Standards. In application, would the current adopted Standards be used by the lighting engineer and Permit Sonoma?

Kind regards,
Colleen Ferguson

> On Jan 11, 2022, at 10:20 AM, Georgia McDaniel <Georgia.McDaniel@sonoma-county.org> wrote:

>

> Hello Colleen,

>

> Thank you for your inquiry. I am the Project Planner for the Kenwood Ranch Winery. The entire project was previously known as Sonoma Country Inn.

>

> Attached is the Board of Supervisors Resolution for the project including the Winery plus the Inn/Spa/Restaurant. See pages 8 starting with Section 2.4 (f) through page 12 that relate to lighting. On page 11, in the last paragraph,

there is a reference to the Ferguson Observatory.

>

> See pages 9-10 of Exhibit B that address light pollution.

>

> See Condition of Approval 98 on page 29 of Exhibit F that addresses light pollution. The Winery project must comply with the dark sky protection condition of approval. The applicant is responsible for submitting the exterior lighting plans to the Permit Sonoma for review and approval by the Design Review Committee.

>

> Kind regards,

> Georgia

>

> Georgia McDaniel, MCP, RLA

> Planner III

>

>

>

> Due to the Public Health Orders, online tools remain the best and fastest way to access Permit Sonoma's services like permitting, records, scheduling inspections, and general questions. You can find out more about our extensive online services at PermitSonoma.org.

> The Permit Center has reopened with limited capacity and modified hours. Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday: 9:00 AM – 1:00 PM; Wednesday, 12:00 PM – 4:00 PM.

>

> Thank you for your patience as we work to keep staff and the community safe.

>

>

>

>

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: C Ferguson <nebulous@sonic.net>

> Sent: Monday, January 10, 2022 1:03 PM

> To: Planner <planner@sonoma-county.org>

> Subject: Kenwood Ranch

>

> EXTERNAL

>

> PRMD Planner,

>

> Where can I find information about the Kenwood Ranch project? I'm a volunteer at the Robert Ferguson Observatory in Sugarloaf Ridge State. The observatory's current concern with the project is light pollution and ensuring dark sky protection in lighting elements of the project. Tennis Wick referred me to Cecily Condon. Who is covering the project until Cecily returns from parental leave in March? Thanks for your help.

>

> Colleen Ferguson

> Valley of the Moon Observatory Association Board Member Robert

> Ferguson Observatory Docent

> (707) 293-4223

>

>

> 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.

> <[PLP01-0006 Final Approval - Resolution.pdf](#)><[PLP01-0006 Final Approval](#)

> - [Exhibit F.pdf](#)><[PLP01-0006 Final Approval - Exhibit B.pdf](#)>

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: [Georgia McDaniel](#)
To: ["C.Ferguson"](#)
Subject: RE: Kenwood Ranch
Date: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 2:04:21 PM

Hello Colleen,

The entire project (Inn/Spa/Restaurant, Winery and Residential Lots) is already approved and vested. I sent you the Final Resolution and Conditions of Approval. The Winery portion of the project will be going before the Design Review Committee as required by a Condition of Approval. I will put your name on the Interested Parties list so you will receive notices related to the Winery. Members will be able to attend the Design Review Committee meeting.

Your comments and questions are now part of the public record.

Kind regards,
Georgia

Georgia McDaniel, MCP, RLA
Planner III

Due to the Public Health Orders, online tools remain the best and fastest way to access Permit Sonoma's services like permitting, records, scheduling inspections, and general questions. You can find out more about our extensive online services at PermitSonoma.org.

The Permit Center has reopened with limited capacity and modified hours. Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday: 9:00 AM – 1:00 PM; Wednesday, 12:00 PM – 4:00 PM.

Thank you for your patience as we work to keep staff and the community safe.

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

From: C Ferguson <nebulous@sonic.net>
Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 8:21 AM
To: Georgia McDaniel <Georgia.McDaniel@sonoma-county.org>
Subject: Re: Kenwood Ranch

EXTERNAL

Good morning Georgia,

It's interesting to hear that Permit Sonoma is reviewing the project. I had heard that the project was currently under construction. Would you please help me understand the review process and timeline for the project? And opportunities for the observatory to provide formal input as part of the process? Is there an online location where up-to-date information is available?

I think you understand the importance to the observatory of minimizing light pollution at this project site. I'm sharing the information you provide to the observatory Board and Executive Director and very much appreciate your responsiveness.

Sincerely,
Colleen Ferguson

> On Jan 11, 2022, at 5:03 PM, Georgia McDaniel <Georgia.McDaniel@sonoma-county.org> wrote:
>
> Hi Colleen,
>
> We are reviewing the project in accordance with the Conditions of Approval and will save your comments to the public record. We're too early in the application review to answer specific technical questions at this time.
>
> Kind regards,
> Georgia

> Georgia McDaniel, MCP, RLA
> Planner III

> Due to the Public Health Orders, online tools remain the best and fastest way to access Permit Sonoma's services like permitting, records, scheduling inspections, and general questions. You can find out more about our extensive online services at PermitSonoma.org.

> The Permit Center has reopened with limited capacity and modified hours. Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday: 9:00 AM – 1:00 PM; Wednesday, 12:00 PM – 4:00 PM.

> Thank you for your patience as we work to keep staff and the community safe.

> -----Original Message-----

> From: C Ferguson <nebulous@sonic.net>
> Sent: Tuesday, January 11, 2022 1:32 PM
> To: Georgia McDaniel <Georgia.McDaniel@sonoma-county.org>
> Subject: Re: Kenwood Ranch

> EXTERNAL

> Hi Georgia,

> Thank you for the reply and the very helpful information. The conditions refer to the 2005 California Energy Efficiency Building Standards. In application, would the current adopted Standards be used by the lighting engineer and Permit Sonoma?

> Kind regards,
> Colleen Ferguson

>> On Jan 11, 2022, at 10:20 AM, Georgia McDaniel <Georgia.McDaniel@sonoma-county.org> wrote:

>> Hello Colleen,

>> Thank you for your inquiry. I am the Project Planner for the Kenwood Ranch Winery. The entire project was previously known as Sonoma Country Inn.

>> Attached is the Board of Supervisors Resolution for the project including the Winery plus the Inn/Spa/Restaurant. See pages 8 starting with Section 2.4 (f) through page 12 that relate to lighting. On page 11, in the last paragraph, there is a reference to the Ferguson Observatory.

>> See pages 9-10 of Exhibit B that address light pollution.

>> See Condition of Approval 98 on page 29 of Exhibit F that addresses light pollution. The Winery project must

comply with the dark sky protection condition of approval. The applicant is responsible for submitting the exterior lighting plans to the Permit Sonoma for review and approval by the Design Review Committee.

>>

>> Kind regards,

>> Georgia

>>

>> Georgia McDaniel, MCP, RLA

>> Planner III

>>

>>

>>

>> Due to the Public Health Orders, online tools remain the best and fastest way to access Permit Sonoma's services like permitting, records, scheduling inspections, and general questions. You can find out more about our extensive online services at PermitSonoma.org.

>> The Permit Center has reopened with limited capacity and modified hours. Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday: 9:00 AM – 1:00 PM; Wednesday, 12:00 PM – 4:00 PM.

>>

>> Thank you for your patience as we work to keep staff and the community safe.

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: C Ferguson <nebulous@sonic.net>

>> Sent: Monday, January 10, 2022 1:03 PM

>> To: Planner <planner@sonoma-county.org>

>> Subject: Kenwood Ranch

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>> Where can I find information about the Kenwood Ranch project? I'm a volunteer at the Robert Ferguson Observatory in Sugarloaf Ridge State. The observatory's current concern with the project is light pollution and ensuring dark sky protection in lighting elements of the project. Tennis Wick referred me to Cecily Condon. Who is covering the project until Cecily returns from parental leave in March? Thanks for your help.

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>> 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.

>> <[PLP01-0006 Final Approval - Resolution.pdf](#)><[PLP01-0006 Final](#)

>> Approval

>> - [Exhibit F.pdf](#)><[PLP01-0006 Final Approval - Exhibit B.pdf](#)>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

> 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.

>

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: [Georgia McDaniel](#)
Cc: [Susan Gorin](#); [Tennis Wick](#); g_carr@sbcglobal.net; [Caitlin Cornwall](mailto:Caitlin.Cornwall@votma.com); info@votma.com
Subject: DRH21-0010: Kenwood Ranch: Winery Project
Date: Thursday, January 13, 2022 5:19:49 PM
Attachments: [DRH21-0010_KR Winery 1_13_22 Referral Commentsf \(1\).pdf](#)

Ms. McDaniel,

Attached are comments of the Valley of the Moon Alliance on the referenced application. Please include the comments as part of the public record.

Regards,

Roger Peters

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.



January 13, 2022

Permit Sonoma
Georgia McDaniel

Re: DRH21-0010: Kenwood Ranch Winery Project (Winery)

The Valley of the Moon Alliance (VOTMA)
Permit Sonoma's (PS)
Referral Letter (RL)
Interested Agencies (IA)
Kenwood Ranch LLC (the Applicant)

Dear Ms. McDaniel,

The Valley of the Moon Alliance (VOTMA) is responding to Permit Sonoma's Dec. 29, 2021, communication requesting comment from interested agencies to the referenced application.

The Winery project has been essentially dormant since 2004. The two-weeks allowed to analyze and respond to this extensive filing following the holiday season and in the middle of an expanding pandemic is insufficient for proper analysis and response. For that reason, we reserve the right to submit further comments as additional information becomes available.

1. Time for comments should be extended:

VOTMA requests that agencies and private parties be given additional time to respond.

It is inappropriate to assume the absence of a response by January 13 is conclusive of anything. Current agency and private staff are unlikely to be at all familiar with such a stale project and would need a minimum of several more weeks to review the exhaustive documentation available, past and present, to provide a measured response.

A cursory review of the application finds insufficient information about the scope and extent of 2020 Glass Fire impacts on the overall Kenwood Ranch project site, including the adjacent

Inn/Spa/Restaurant (Resort) site. Fire-related impacts are relevant to drainage, erosion potential, and other physical criteria crucial to project design and building.

2. Applicant should be required to provide additional information regarding the Glass fire impacts on the project site before Design Review comments are required.

Applicant has failed to provide sufficient detail on the scope and extent of the impact of the September 2020 Glass Fire on both active project sites. The Resort site was significantly burned and largely deforested, yet the comparative references in the application provides sparse information about the actual impact on the ground. Applicant only generally describes the fire impacts on the Winery site. Fire impact information for both sites is relevant to all agencies and private parties to enable meaningful commentary.

Impacts on visual screening, lighting off-site impacts, storm water control and erosion, and treatment of affected “Preserve” areas, the creek areas, groundwater recharge, and soil impacts, among others, are potentially affected areas of concern.

3. The submitted Winery site design reflects significant alteration from the proposal as modified, with buildings moved, reoriented and combined, and parking relocated and reconfigured. Those alterations require sufficient assessment time to determine significant impacts.

As was the case when the Applicant’s predecessor applied for Design Review of the associated Resort site, the site design submitted in the application is significantly different than the design proposed and referenced by incorporation in Conditions of Approval (COA) #85. Applicant’s submission documents accompanying the documents references the alteration in the site design as follows; “Note: The winery site plan changed during public hearing and no updated site plan showing the changes was submitted to the County.” (Attch. 5 Project Description-Winery Design Review 2021”, pg. 21.)

VOTMA asserts that a review of the PLP01-0006 administrative record is needed to assess the extent to which the proposed site plan redesign either comports to the hearing discussion, or is consistent with the evergreen forest screening/buffering design principles that underly the Applicant’s entire 2004 project. (See, e.g., Resolution 04-1037 at section 3.5(c), pg. 20.)

Applicant’s site plan alters the visual screening and affects the impact of associated light sources (e.g., lighting for evening events, vehicle lights at night) required to be “fully screened from off-site view.” (COA #98).

No visualization work to address the redesign impacts has been provided.

A clearer presentation of the overall forest tree health and projected updated tree removal plans, screening plans, and impact assessments associated with this new site design needs to be publicly available. To put that information in a broader relational context, the same information needs to be provided as to the Glass Fire impacts on the Resort site.

4. Applicant's SWLID Report and associated drainage management plan must specifically incorporate the effects on the Winery site of the Glass Fire on soils, erosion, run-off related to reduced tree/vegetation cover as well as the expectation of ongoing drought under the new circumstances.

During the 17-year period the Winery project was dormant, the sites for the Resort and the Winery projects have been stressed by multi-year drought and two significant wild fires. Applicant's primary geotechnical study to support construction of the Resort was submitted in September 2020 even as the Glass Fire was roaring through that project site. Document 6 of the Applicant's submission in DRH21-0010 is an "Initial SWLIDS Report-02 Kenwood Ranch Winery." (SWLID Report). It is not clear when the data used in the report was gathered. The Custom Soil Report (pg. 57) is dated Aug. 19, 2020, a month before the Glass Fire.

There is no substantiation that the runoff curves, storm water calculations, composite porosity calculations and other data used in the SWLID Report reflect the reality that that the Winery project site burned in the Glass fire, and that a significant portion of the evergreen forest uphill of the Winery site (and directly around the Resort site) burned severely in 2020, and left a great many dead or dying trees in its wake. The effects need to be reflected in the application information.

5. Evacuation traffic congestion on Highway 12 in Sonoma Valley during the Glass Fire constitutes new information that highlights the significant adverse traffic impacts associated with the aggregate Kenwood Ranch project (deemed to have been mitigated to less than significant levels) that still exist if both projects need to be evacuated during a rapid moving wildfire.

Although the Board of Supervisors determined in 2004 that the significant traffic impacts associated with the operating the Resort and the Winery could be mitigated to less than significant levels, it is not clear that attention was devoted to evacuation planning in the face of a rapidly expanding wildfire in the project area. The evacuation experiences during the Glass Fire and other North Bay fires over the last few years have created a new factual reality on evacuation risk that requires close attention. Both the employees and visitors at the Winery and those at the Resort will be competing for access to Highway 12 to escape in the event of a rapidly moving wildfire. The design review effort for the Winery should include an assessment of how the competing operational presence of the Winery and Resort projects would impede the potential for an efficient and safe evacuation of Kenwood Ranch (as well as affect others attempting to evacuate the area via Highway 12) where an aggressive wildfire is on or approaching the combined sites. The Glass Fire and certainly the Tubbs and Paradise fires establish that the potential for adverse impacts in such a situation will be substantially more severe than previously understood. Permit Sonoma should not overlook this real safety risk.

6. A Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) analysis should be prepared for the Winery project

Applicant asserts that no VMT analysis is required for the Winery project because VMT information does not constitute new information if the underlying information was otherwise known or should have been known at the time the EIR was certified. VMT information was not known or analyzed at the turn of the century when the traffic work for this project occurred. In conjunction with today's rapidly growing knowledge and concern about the adverse environmental (GHG) impacts associated with climate change and the role automobile use plays in contributing to those adverse impacts, today the State disregards congestion analysis approaches, and instead requires analysis of vehicle mile impacts of proposed projects. This Winery project, which would generate significant VMT, has been sitting dormant for 17 years and should be held to account for VMT associated with its development and operation.

7. Closing.

VOTMA appreciates this opportunity to provide initial comments on the Winery Design Review application. To the extent that additional issues of concern or areas where conditions should be evaluated and implemented emerge, VOTMA reserves the right to supplement these comments.

VOTMA requests that these comments be added to the public comments in this proceeding and that they also be added to files governing the Applicant's pending requests for issuance of numerous building permits for the construction of the Resort portion of the Kenwood Ranch projects.

Finally, VOTMA requests that DRH21-0010 proceed to public hearing prior to any final action by the Design Review Committee.

Roger Peters

Roger Peters
VOTMA Board Member

From: [Ewing Philbin](#)
To: [Georgia McDaniel](#)
Subject: Amended Comments
Date: Thursday, January 13, 2022 2:55:23 PM

EXTERNAL

Georgia, here are my amended comments. Thanks.

> Thanks for getting back to me so quickly, Georgia. Appreciate that. We neighbor this property to the southeast. We are concerned about increased noise and vehicle pollution, the loss of oak woodlands, degradation of wildlife habitat, and the continued erosion of the rural character of the Sonoma Valley. Highway 12 traffic congestion has increased exponentially since we moved to Kenwood from Santa Rosa 26 years ago.

>

> Thanks for listening.

>

> Ewing

Ewing Philbin
Kenwood, CA

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.

-----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</i> dated December 23, 2021	12/21
4	<i>Sonoma Country Inn: Water Use Information</i> , dated February 14, 2017, Adobe Associates, Inc.	2/2017
5	<i>Sonoma Country Inn: Water Use Information</i> , dated May 1, 2017, Adobe Associates, Inc.	5/2017
6	<i>Hydrogeologic Report for Adequacy of Groundwater Supplies for the Proposed Sonoma Country Inn Kenwood Area, Sonoma County, California</i> , April 2009, Richard C. Slade Associates LLC Consulting Groundwater Geologists.	4/2009
7	<i>Addendum Geotechnical Consultation, Sonoma Country Inn, Kenwood, California</i> , dated January 30, 2017, Bauer Associates, Inc. Geotechnical Engineers.	3/2018
8	<i>Geotechnical Consultant, Addendum 2 – Post Nuns Fire, Lot 13, Sonoma Country Inn</i> , dated February 5, 2018, Bauer Associates, Inc. Geotechnical Engineers.	3/2018
9	<i>Letter to Georgia McDaniel, Permit Sonoma, from Law Offices of Tina Wallis, Inc.</i> , March 16, 2023.	3/2023
10	<i>Letter to Georgia McDaniel, Permit Sonoma, from Law Offices of Tina Wallis, Inc.</i> , March 23, 2023.	3/2023
11	<i>Review of Traffic Issues Relative to the Sonoma Country Inn Project</i> , dated May 25, 2017, W-Trans.	3/2018
12	<i>Response to Comments in Appeal of Approval of the Sonoma Country Inn Project</i> , September 14, 2017, W-Trans.	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 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.

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.



filed via e-mail

April 18, 2023

Design Review Committee
Permit Sonoma
Sonoma County

Re: DRH21-0010-Kenwood Ranch Winery (KRW)

Dear Committee Members,

In the short period of time the Valley of the Moon Alliance (VOTMA) has had to read and review the lengthy materials released last Thursday, including the draft Addendum #2 (AD2) (Attachment 5 to the Staff Report) to the FEIR certified for PLP01-0006, and the Initial Summary (IS) (Attachments 21-22 to Attachment 5) prepared in support of AD2, VOTMA identified numerous issues and questions raised by those materials that require further study and attention. Pending resolution of those issues and questions, Addendum #2 and the associated I/S should be deemed incomplete. The Design Review Committee should not use its discretion to approve and accept those documents or the Staff's recommendations relating to those documents.

A. CEQA Standard

PS prepared AD2 based on its assessment that while some changes or additions are required to the KRW Project are necessary, none of the conditions set forth in Public Resources Code Section 21166 or Section 15162 the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, title 14, Section 15000 et seq.) calling for a subsequent EIR have occurred. VOTMA believes that it is a close question as to whether the circumstances under which the KRW Project is being undertaken have changed substantially since 2004, and in particular the occurrence of two significant wildfires, an extended drought, and an overconcentration of winery events in the Sonoma Valley over the last 20 years, such that a more than an addendum is required prior to further discretionary action by the Design Review Committee. These changed circumstances both involve new significant environmental effects as well as a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant

effects. (Section 15162(a)(2))

Independently, VOTMA also believes that over the last 20 years since the initial EIR was certified, we all (collectively) have developed new information of substantial importance relating to wildfire risks in the rural wildland interface in the face of climate change that was not adequately considered and which now is understood to have substantially more severe effects than previously understood. (Section 15162(a)(3). Those are the things that happen when a project is delayed for 20 years, and the County would do well to put some more rigorous timelines in its use permit conditions, rather than “vest” projects into perpetuity.

The Glass fire in October 2020 brought all that to play in an immediate and devastating way in Sonoma Valley, and specifically on the KRV project site, and to an even greater extent on the adjacent up-slope KR Inn/Spa/Restaurant project site. Homes and businesses were incinerated by the Glass fire, traffic in the Valley was crippled, and lives were lost.

As much as VOTMA would like to see the KRW dramatically scaled back so that it was not another risk factor, or victim, or both, of the next wildfire, we realize that the regulatory battle there would be long, and the odds of success short.

So we will focus our comments here on what is before us as an addendum to an EIR that is frankly stale and out of touch with the realities we all face today as residents and inhabitants of this beautiful valley. We appreciate the time, money and effort that the County and KR have devoted to preparing an Initial Study as support for AD2, and see that it is a good faith attempt to wrestle with the issues and challenges the new winery and its surrounding neighbors will confront.

Having said that, VOTMA does take issue with the County’s statement on AD2 at pg 5 that “because the approval at issue is limited to design review, even if there were substantial changes in circumstances or new information of substantial importance...those factors would have to be relevant to impacts resulting from the requested design changes, not the original project approval.” That is hogwash; PRC Section 21166(c) and CEQA GL 15162(a)(3) are not tied to design changes.

Does the County believe that absence of an evacuation plan or wildfire risk analysis in the original EIR, or the absence there of mitigation requirements (or maybe the failure of the County to enforce such requirements as were there) that would have reduced the risk of the absolute devastation that the Glass fire inflicted (and the next fire may duplicate) on the forested area, that had been allow to sit untrimmed and unmanaged for well over a decade, are not valid subjects of the hearing before the DRC? Is not the DRC being asked to approve the environmental effect conclusions of AD2 (and the I/S) as well as the design changes proposed? It is Noticed as such.

B. Issues and Questions

1. Aesthetic/Visual Issues:

a. Chimneys--Why are there chimneys on the three front buildings" Section 1.7.4 indicated only chimneys on the Marketplace and the Commercial Kitchen. Why are any chimneys needed? The appliances are electric and "no natural gas fireplaces will be provided as part of the 2022 Project." (I/S at 1.7.7, pg1-45). Why is wood burning used for cooking (other than BBQ)?

b. Tree Mortality--The aggregate mortality of the trees on the Winery project site seems inconsistent. The "KR Winery Tree Condition Rating" dated 8-02-21 (supplied by PS staff to VOTMA on Monday April 17th) showed 167 trees on the building envelope. Of those, 117 (70%) were classified as in "poor" condition, meaning that they "cannot" be salvaged. Another 43 trees (26%) were classified as in "fair" condition, meaning that they "could possibly" be salvaged. The remainder (4%) were classified as in "moderate" or "good" condition. That was a fairly stark first report.

The "Post-Fire Winery Building Envelope update" dated 1-12-23 (also provided on by PS staff on April 17th, but appearing in another form in one of the many appendices) had the total building envelop trees at 213. Of those, 67 were listed as poor, and 73 were listed as fair, using the same scale, or 65% of the larger number. The chart showed that 74 of the poor or fair trees had been or would be removed.

In the time available VOTMA was unable to locate an assessment of the remaining trees not within the building envelope and on the KR Winery Project 2022 parcel. Apparently 120 trees were planted in 2021, but the location is unclear.

The uncertainty as to existing trees and location of the newly planted trees and the prospect for further tree planting renders the visual profiles of the winery from various spots on Highway 12 uncertain. Looking at the comparison of before and after overhead post Glass Fire (I/S figure 1-4) suggests dramatic burns across the much of the Winery project site. The compositional analysis in Attachment 34 to Attachment 5 (I/S) at pg. 62 of 86 is brutal: "Lot 12-Area A--Winery parcel that suffered severe damage from the Glass Fire with 75% mortality." "Lot 12-Area B-Riparian zone severely damaged. Mature oak, Douglas fir, bay laurel, and Pacific big-leaf maple with high mortality."

In contrast to these direct assessments, the AD2 and the I/S tend to compare the damage to the winery parcel to the Inn/Spa/Restaurant parcel by referencing that the damage to the former was less than the extensive damage to the latter. The reality is that there is and was high mortality to the trees designed to screen the Winery and that damage is a slow rolling truth. Once the trees on the building envelope begin to be removed and as other poor and fair status trees fall or are cut away, there is no assurance that the Winery will not be plainly in view in this corridor.

As much as VOTMA would like to see the depiction of the Winery as shown on Figure 1-12 of the I/S (Att 21 to Att 5, at pg. 36 of 352) as an accurate one, that simply does not seem credible, at least for the next few decades.

VOTMA suggests that KR again story pole the Winery building envelope to give a more accurate rendition of how the entire winery will look from a distance before the DRC renders its decision, and/or that a better series of rendering with age adjust trees (i.e., not mature) inserted to see what the site will look like over the next decade. Of particular interest would be to also provide a more realistic backdrop that shows the tree condition of trees to the north and northeast of the Winery site, together with a view of the Inn/Spa/Restaurant as seen in the background of the depiction of the Winery. The Winery must be seen in the broader context that we will all see as we drive from the upper north part of the valley east toward Sonoma. While VOTMA understand that absolute screening was never promised, the gap created by first the glaringly visible bulk of the Inn/Spa/Restaurant and the Winery needs further attention as a Design and Visual issue.

VOTMA also suggests that the applicant set up a community forum that meets periodically to assess and monitor progress in screening the Winery from view.

2. Traffic Impacts and Parking Issues:

a. *Winery Traffic*--The I/S goes to great lengths to argue why the CEQA process for this discretionary Design Review should not and may not legally require a Vehicle-Miles-Traveled (VMT) study as required for all projects after August 2020. At the same time, the I/S puts forward as evidence on traffic level of service impacts dated and stale studies used for Addendum #1 for the Inn/Spa/Restaurant. The I/S seeks to have it both ways to avoid addressing transportation impacts.

Over the last 5 or 6 years traffic patterns have changed, commute patterns have changed, winery events have changed, new housing has occurred and very large projects (Elnoka, SDC, Hanna) that will affect this stretch of Highway 12 are now in the planning process. The I/S is content to stick with the fact that traffic was and is a significant and unavoidable impact that cannot be mitigated and so the Board of Supervisors' (BOS) past statement of overriding conditions is still the best trump card in the deck.

It may be, but that does not negate the need to update and present a comprehensive assessment of current conditions to provide the proper perspective on benefits vs impacts, so that if and when the BOS sees this matter again, it can make its determination for this phase based on current facts and conditions. The Design Review Committee should not accept AD2 with an incomplete and inadequate traffic assessment.

b. *Mitigation Measure 5.2-8(a)*--Table 1-5 of the I/S presents a summary of the operating days and hours for the various activities. Winery events are shown as daily or on weekends. VOTMA notes that Appendix F of the Appendices to the I/S (Attachment 22 to Attachment 5 (AD2), at pg. F-5) shows as Mitigation Measure 5.2-8(a) the following: *"Until the events coordinator program in Mitigation Measure 5.2-8(b) is established, the project's proposed 30 annual events shall be restricted to weekdays (Monday -Friday during non-peak traffic hours) and/or non-times events such as food and wine pairings on the site. Weddings, banquets, auctions, concerts and other time-specific would only be permitted on Monday-Friday during non-peak traffic hours."*

If applicable, this condition would address VOTMA's winery events concerns. If this mitigation measure was in fact not adopted, VOTMA remains concerned about the impact of winery events during peak traffic hours, and believes that should be addressed in the traffic studies required.

c. *Parking*: The proposed Design for the Winery has almost entirely reconfigured the parking and retains the 147 spaces. The I/S at pg. 1-41 shows the following parking allocations and locations: trailhead--14 spaces; visitor--40, west; staff-69, east; service building--14, east; cold storage building --18, east; retail support--2 spaces.

VOTMA appreciates that for events up to 200 persons 80 spaces would be needed, plus parking for staff. It is not clear why there is a staff demand for 69 spaces, service building 14 and so forth. Those sorts of parking space requirements seem to exceed the expected use as reflected in the winery trip generation estimates set out in Appendix H in Att 22 to Att 5 and in the Wildfire Winery Project Vehicles assessment, showing 31 Winery employees at max occupancy. (Appendix V at pg. 3 in Att 22 to Att 5)

VOTMA raises this issue in part as a reflection of discussions with Tohigh International during the Design Review of the Kenwood Ranch Phase I--the Inn/Spa/Restaurant. There was concern expressed then that parking for staff to serve the Inn/Spa/Restaurant not be located at some other place on the 2004 Project. If the KR Winery functions as Phase II as a stand-alone operation does not require 147 spaces, then the redesign should reflect the lower numbers of spaces actually required, or KR should otherwise provide assurances that those spaces will not be devoted to non-Winery uses (e.g., parking for employees of the Inn/Spa/R.

3. Wildfire Evacuation Issues:

a. *Wildfire Evacuation Timing*: VOTMA appreciates the obvious care and concern that KR has devoted to assessing this important issue. As a whole, the wildfire mitigation and control efforts that are reflected in the Appendices in Att 21 to Att 5 are as comprehensive as VOTMA has seen. The residents of Sonoma Valley who were present during the Tubbs and Glass fires and who had to evacuate over the crowded roads as smoke and flames were approaching have that experience burned into their memory. They should be somewhat comforted by this attention to detail.

Although an oversimplification, in some sense the KR wildfire evacuation strategy is simply to shut down at first warning, leave the 2022 Project early (both Winery and the Inn/Spa/Restaurant, although the latter has not committed to that), and thus avoid the crowds on the roads. (Appendix V at pg. 4 in Att 22) That strategy is not unique and is one VOTMA would guess many or most of those who lived thru the past conflagration will also adopt. If that is the case, the “No Notice” scenario deserve close inspection as the more realistic outcome.

The results here are not encouraging. If VOTMA is reading the Fehr & Peers Study correctly, and assuming that the two driveway egress option is available (see below), it would take 45 minutes for the 2022 Project to entirely clear the driveways on to Highway 12. The total elapsed time to the evacuate the study area would be 150 minutes without the 2022 Winery Project and 165 minutes with the 2022 Winery Project.

That assumes everything goes smoothly. It apparently also does not factor in the extent to which other wineries, whether existing or planned, also might be holding max events at that point. VOTMA has not studied it closely enough to assess whether the Hanna Center project is factored in or how it deals with the SCD Specific Plan as adopted and the Elnoka project as it might be revised by its new multi-family residential unit developer. In truth it is a seemingly precise spitball on the wall.

VOTMA recognizes that the Winery component of that capacity demand is less than that of the Inn/Spa/Restaurant. But the issue here is not whether the Inn/Spa/Restaurant should be contributing to that capacity demand. It is the Winery that is the incremental demand component still seeking discretionary approval of its required permits. To that extent, that extra 15 minutes to clear the area is on the Winery’s back.

VOTMA appreciates that when the 2004 Project was first envisioned sometime late in the last century, the combination of a winery and event center as an adjunct to the Inn/Spa/Restaurant was an attractive combination concept. But viewed today, with an over-concentration of vineyard plus winery integrated facilities in the immediate Sonoma Valley area, the concept of an event center plus a mini custom-crush facility that together with the Inn/Spa/Restaurant will pour 816 persons onto Highway 12 within 30 minutes after a wildfire warning, seems a considerably less compelling concept. That goes directly to the tradeoff between risk and reward that the planning process and the BOS must consider. The “No Notice scenario” is troubling.

b. *Mutual Irrevocable Emergency Easement (MIEE)*--As VOTMA understands it from statements at the KR Winery Dunbar Community meeting last year, the genesis of the plan to enter into a MIEE with the adjacent Graywood Subdivision (GS) came about because the retained consultants on the Wildfire Evac and Control issues expressed concern with the timing required to evacuate the 2022 Project. The 2022 Project was told it needed another road to get out safely. Hey, why not tie into the Graywood Subdivision Road and our problem is solved?

If only everybody could have another back door to push its people out to safety ahead of everyone else trying to get on the clogged two lane evacuation highway.

VOTMA sees this as a matter of equity. Who gets priority at entrance points on Highway 12? As far as VOTMA is aware this extra egress option was not an element of any prior permitting for the 2004 Project or, until now, the 2022 Project. Did any of the traffic studies or any of the mitigation discussions relating to ingress and egress to the 2004 or 2022 Projects propose or contemplate this revision?

This is not simply a matter of mutual sharing of egress. The Graywood Subdivision has a dozen or so residential units. The combined Winery and Inn/Spa/Restaurant has over 800 persons affected. As reflected in the Wildfire Evacuation Timing study there is little that is mutual here. The Project trip assumption for the "With Notice" scenario has 1) a 50/50 split for right turning vehicles over both driveways; 2) 70% of left turning vehicles use the Campagna Lane Driveway and 30% use the GS driveway (competing with Frey Road exit homeowners turning left or right, plus east and west bound drivers as well); and 3) overall 60% of the KR Project vehicles use the Campagna Lane drive and 40% use the GS driveway. Appendix V at pg. 11. No assumptions on driveway use were provided in the "Without Notice" stamped.

As a simple matter of fairness in risk allocation the KR Project (Inn/Spa/Restaurant & Winery) should live or die with the Campagna Lane as its exit option.

It should go without saying that should the dual driveway option under the MIEE be permitted (without conceding that this option could even be allowed without permit modifications for the all the projects), any signage at the intersection of the two roads should be absolutely clear that it is to be used only for emergencies and only for egress.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments. I apologize for the lateness of these comments, but given the short amount of time to respond, the mass of the materials made available late Thursday, and the fact that PS did not respond to VOTMA's request that the hearing be rescheduled to allow closer study of the materials, this was the best VOTMA could do.

Regards,

Roger Peters

Roger Peters
VTMA Board Member

From: Kathy Pons <282kpons@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2023 9:51 AM

To: Hannah Spencer <Hannah.Spencer@sonoma-county.org>

Subject: Re: DRH21-0010 1080 Campagna Lane Kenwood

EXTERNAL

Hanna,

I want to give you a heads up that I think I found an area that needs some clarification in Addendum #2.. It is under #5 Water Use and Supply, a. Water Use Calculations. These numbers seem to have come from the Draft EIR page 5.5-9. There is a revised Exhibit 5.5-4 in the Final EIR, page 9.0-73, which uses reduced numbers for water usage. Addendum #1 also references the revised water estimate in the FEIR under it's water use calculations. Please check this out and correct Addendum #2. Thank you.

Kathy Pons



filed via e-mail

May 30, 2023

Design Review Committee
c/o Hannah Spencer
Permit Sonoma
County of Sonoma

Re: DRH21-0010 Kenwood Ranch Winery--DRC May 31, 2023 Public Meeting

Dear Committee Members,

On April 18, 2023 the Valley of the Moon Alliance (VOTMA) submitted comments on the materials now scheduled to be considered at this May 31, 2023 public meeting. During the intervening period VOTMA has received clarification on the form and function of what VOTMA characterized as "Chimneys" on the three front buildings shown in the design renderings. Based on that information, VOTMA withdraws its comments/questions on that issue.

Other than that withdrawal, VOTMA incorporates by reference its April 18, 2023 comments and questions, and extends them here for purposes of this upcoming hearing.

A. CEQA Standard

Although the "Notice of A Sonoma County Design Review Committee Public Meeting" (Notice) issued May 19, 2023 states clearly that "**The Design Review Committee considers design only**" and that the "Committee's review is limited to the design aspects and compliance with related Conditions of Approval for PLP01-0006," it also notes that the Staff is recommending that the DRC "approve Addendum No. 2 to the 2004 Environmental Impact Report." Addendum No. 2 (AD2) clearly addresses issues that go well beyond "design aspects and compliance with related Conditions of Approval." As acknowledged implicitly in the Notice, the DRC has no jurisdiction or authority to approve AD2. The DRC's proper action would be to refer AD2 to the Planning Commission for its independent consideration of the various updated broad environmental impacts addressed in AD2.

B. Issues and Questions

1. Aesthetic/Visual Issues:

As a reference point for assessing visual issues associated with structures such as the Winery being placed in scenic landscape units, it is useful to refer back to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) comments on this issue as set forth in the Resolution adopting approval of PLP01-0006. In section 3.5 (j) of that Resolution the BOS rejected then-PRMD's position that the County code required structures in scenic landscape units be screened "completely" from public view. Instead the Board found that complete screening is not necessary. The Board found that the appropriate standard is "substantially screened."

The level of expected screening post Glass fire is a work in process. On the one hand many trees since 2004 have been lost through death and/or drought. Many more were lost due to the Glass fire in 2020, and many more will die from that fire in the next years or will be removed in conjunction with the development design for the winery and its landscaped grounds. On the other hand, Kenwood Ranch has shown a sensitivity to replanting trees.

KR has taken the position that on balance over time the growth of the new trees will over time substantially screen the Winery from Highway 12 and its neighbors. But KR visual representations supporting its design review request fails to show the most current conditions at the site. They do not appear to reflect recent tree removal both on the site and in the upslope area to the northeast where the Inn/Spa/Restaurant will be located. VOTMA attaches a photo taken on May 28th which reflects the most recent view from Highway 12 approximating the view KR presents in its visual assessment. KR should present a visual projection updated to 2023

VOTMA again requests that story poles be reposted to reflect the current visual impacts. VOTMA also suggest that the DRC question KR's expert on his assessment of the health of very large oak trees that dominate the foreground of the visual assessment along Highway 12. Those trees are quite old and to an untrained eye look potentially prone to falling. In other previous early photos of the large oaks on the overall project site used by the consultant, much was made of how hollowed out the inner trunks of the large fallen oaks had become. If they fall in the next few years in the storms expected to intensify with climate change, what impact would that have on the visual screening of the Winery?

2. Parking for Inn/Spa/Restaurant Employees at the Winery

The Winery project design shows the required 147 parking spaces. KR has indicated that some of that parking is proposed to be used for employees of the Inn/Spa/Restaurant. The parking for the Inn/Spa/Restaurant, including parking for the employees, is specified in the Conditions of Approval for the Inn/Spa/Restaurant. The effect of transferring parking at the Winery for employees of the Inn/Spa/Restaurant from the spaces designated for their use in those facilities has the effect of increasing the parking for the potential patrons of

the Inn/Spa/Restaurant. The COAs were not drafted with that transfer contemplated. The parking design for the Winery may not be used to avoid the use restrictions implemented to control the capacity usage at the Inn/Spa/Restaurant. Parking at the Winery should have signage restricting use.

3. Wildfire Evacuation Plan and Use of Residential Subdivision Driveway

The wildfire evacuation plan proposed for the Winery and the Inn/Spa/Restaurant is not a Winery Design Review issue. It is an issue that had interrelated traffic, parking, operations, infrastructure, and public impact aspects that span the entire Kenwood Ranch project. The DRC should refer the Kenwood Ranch Wildfire (and other emergencies) Evacuation Plan to the Planning Commission for its review and approval.

As to the plan tendered, VOTMA has a variety of questions relating to the cumulative development in the area, traffic studies underlying the evacuation timing estimates, the projected worst case population to be evacuated, the public impact of the use of the yet to be constructed subdivision road and driveway to handle 40% of the evacuation load, and the feasibility of "early evacuation" at the Inn itself.

At a minimum, the evacuation plan proposal must provide an estimate of the increased evacuation time where the only road ever contemplated for ingress and egress for the Inn/Spa/Restaurant and the Winery--Campagna Lane, remains the only road authorized for evacuation. The residential subdivision driveway Kenwood Ranch now seeks to utilize is less than 300 yards from Campagna Lane, but is outside of the turn lanes zone required by the BOS as a safety measure when the Kenwood Ranch project was approved almost 20 years ago. The residential subdivision roads have not been constructed; nor has the driveway for ingress and egress for the three resident parcels to be served by that driveway. KR should detail the timing of permitting efforts required for that.

Kenwood Ranch should not be allowed to slip this critical winery and Inn/Spa/Restaurant emergency evacuation plan through permitting via a submission to the DRC. The wildfires that Sonoma Valley has experienced since 2017 and the trauma associated are much too important to the public be treated as an afterthought handled by the DRC.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments.

Regards,

Roger Peters

Roger Peters
VOTMA Board Member

